

Full Text of Unique and Form Letter Variant Submissions

Alphabetical by sender's first name

1854 Treaty Authority 42968

Please find attached comments on the PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you. Darren Vogt Environmental Director 1854 Treaty Authority 4428 Haines Road Duluth, MN 55811 218-722-8907 (phone) 218-722-7003 (fax) HYPERLINK "mailto:dvogt@1854treatyauthority-org"dvogt@1854treatyauthority-org HYPERLINK "http://www.1854treatyauthority-org"www.1854treatyauthority-org

4095481751@vzwpix.com 4305

Please approve this project as soon as possible. America and the world will need these metals soon. Thank you.

A M 16161

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

a s dorman

40914

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, a s dorman Minneapolis, MN 55412

40915

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, a s dorman Minneapolis, MN 55412

Alphabetical by sender's first name

a s dorman

49088

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, a s dorman Minneapolis, MN 55412

Alphabetical by sender's first name

A. Harle

19081

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Amethyst Harle A. Harle 1702 North 24th Street Superior, WI 54880 218 481 4318

Alphabetical by sender's first name

A. Harle

19083

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Amethyst Harle A. Harle 1702 North 24th Street Superior, WI 54880 218 481 4318

A. P. Olson

20801

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Reporting from NPR as well as stories found on Bringmethenews-com have caused me to take action. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, A. P. Olson 1552 Albany Ave St Paul, MN 55108

49639

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Reporting from NPR as well as stories found on Bringmethenews-com have caused me to take action. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, A. P. Olson 1552 Albany Ave St Paul, MN 55108

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aaron Bouchard

41969

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Aaron Bouchard 43 Clermont Cres Dartmouth, NS B2W 4N9

Aaron Brasket

16895

Feb 18, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Aaron Brasket 3060 Lake Sarah Rd Independence, MN 55359 Sincerely, Mr Aaron Brasket 3060 Lake Sarah Rd Independence, MN 55359-9743 (763) 291-3748

Aaron Camacho

28831

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, No mine . We need to think of our futures, not in a financial way, but one that considers all living things and the value they hAve This value may not be conducive with the cooperate world. However, this value is relevant to our ecosystems, our life. Being that I live just off the Mississippi River and down stream from this potential mine is disturbing knowledge. Any water affected by this mine will eventually make its way down stream to this area where I live. I am a concerned citizen of Wisconsin and Native American who feels this continual TAKING from the land for financial gain, will be our undoing. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Again, I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest, not in the leaSt Sincerely, Aaron Camacho S2861 Mustang Rd Fountain City, WI 54629-7533

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aaron L. Wittnebel

47268

To Whom It May Concern: As a resident of Northwest Minnesota, it may seem that I shouldn't have an opinion on PolyMet, but I feel compelled to share my concerns about this proposal as it will eventually impact the state of Minnesota as a whole. There are three main concerns that I have as a Minnesota resident: 1-) Instability of the industry; if the business collapses or goes bankrupt, won't it be the taxpayers left covering the costs of cleanup, unemployment, and reemployment. And what is the life expectancy of this mining operation 10, 20 or 40 years total. 2-) No health impact study has been conducted, and this industry has a propensity to be very dangerous to not just the health of employees, but to the general public in the surrounding area. If people become ill, (even much later, as what typically happens with other health conditions brought on by other environmental hazards), again, the state as a whole will be left to care for those that become ill. (It's not the caring for the ill that bothers me, it's the fact that it could have been avoided all together to begin with.) 3-) The proximity of the mining operations are very close to pristine and natural lands, that our state pride's itself on. They are natural wonders that draw people to come to Minnesota for our great tourism industry. What will happen to our state's branding, once mining is expanded and we destroy these attractions. As of now, I'm adamantly opposed to PolyMet. In all good concious, I don't know how the people (other than those in need of employment in the small region) could be expected to support such a proposal without all the answers and assurances. I also suspect that none can be given, and we are expected to proceed on blind faith. In that case, we can't, for the future of Minnesota, we just simply cannot allow PolyMet to happen. Respectfully, Aaron Lee Wittnebel Mayor City of Lake Park - Aaron L. Wittnebel P.O. Box 287 4011 Fourth Street Lake Park, MN 56554 C: (218) 270-0457 O: (218) 209-2320 LEGAL NOTICE: The information in this e-mail is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this e-mail, including attachments, by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this communication is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Aaron McLeod

44470

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a lifetime resident of Minnesota, I strongly oppose sulfide mining. I'm often told by advocates for this project that if I'm going to be opposed to it, I should give up cell phones and computers. Fair enough. I can be reached through the information provided below. Feel free to come pick up all of my electronics in exchange for a guarantee that I will continue to have clean drinking water and one of the most beautiful places in the world to live for the rest of my life. Thank you for your time, and I look forward to meeting you in person. Aaron McLeod 212 Piedmont Duluth, MN 55806

44472

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a lifetime resident of Minnesota, I strongly oppose sulfide mining. I'm often told by advocates for this project that if I'm going to be opposed to it, I should give up cell phones and computers. Fair enough. I can be reached through the information provided below. Feel free to come pick up all of my electronics in exchange for a guarantee that I will continue to have clean drinking water and one of the most beautiful places in the world to live for the rest of my life. Thank you for your time, and I look forward to meeting you in person. Aaron McLeod 212 Piedmont Duluth, MN 55806

Aaron Poznanovic

54686

See attachment

Aaron Vail

3039

To whom it may concern: I am writing in full and complete support of the PolyMet Mining project. The economic impact of this project to the State of Minnesota is significant and necessary. Not only are they creating hundreds of jobs in a downtrodden and economically suffocated area of our great state, they are doing so in a moral, ethical, and responsible way. Best regards, Aaron S. Vail Cell: 651-214-0950 Email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:coacharonvail@gmail-com"coacharonvail@gmail-com](mailto:HYPERLINK) Twitter: CoachVail9 "Sports Do Not Build Character, They Reveal It." - John Wooden

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Abbi Evans

54337

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St. Paul, MN 55155-4025
10 February 2014
Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager PolyMet Mining Inc. project
I don't think the Poly Met Mining Inc. project is a good idea. With all the harmful effects that could come into play.
1. The water could be contaminated with sulphate, metals, and mercury.
2. The project will affect the Indian reservations.
3. It will be moving the earth, and will have visual obstructions, noise, and dust.
4. It can affect the following around it: bodies of water, wetlands, vegetation, wildlife, and many other environmental features.
5. If there are buildings on the land would either result in closure and/or demolition.
a. This would result in people losing their jobs/businesses.
There can be some positive effects though too.
1. To make everything run smoothly they will need to hire people, so then there will be jobs for people.
2. The new resources: iron, copper and nickel.
3. It will boost the economy.
With that, I understand there are some positive effects, but with the negative ones I don't think they should be able to mine. Wildlife can be harmed, that includes animals on the threatened and endangered species list. There are too many things that can affect us and everything around us. I don't think it will be safe. I truly hope you can understand my thoughts, and will take my idea in consideration.
Sincerely, Abbi Evans
South West Junior High 8th grader

Abby Andresen

45784

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Abby Andresen
3615 35th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Abby Huset

54340

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager
MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources
Environmental Review Unit
500 Lafayette Road, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155-4025
10 February 2014
Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager
I do think that you guys have a good plan about what you are going to do, it is very exact and gives all the information you need to know about this process. But you always have to look at what the pros and cons to this situation are, and what they are going to affect. I think that Minnesota can benefit from this mining process because of all the jobs it will provide and all of the money that it will bring in. Some advantages to this process are ...
1. make a lot of new jobs
2. once we get the minerals then we can make more electronics and stuff we use in our everyday life
3. it will make a lot of money
4. they will grow the vegetation back
Some disadvantages of this process are ...
1. cut down forest area
2. it may pollute the water
3. it might affect some different cultural resources
Some cultural resources could be affected during construction and operations. The things that this could affect are, the sugarbush, a piece of sacred land of the Mesa be Widjiu, part of beaver bay, and a couple other things. I do agree with the Land Exchange offers because if they don't do it here where will they do it. They have to do it somewhere why not here where we know how to make it safer and not pollute as much. All these products (copper, nickel, platinum) are used in our everyday lives. Another thing is that even though they are going to cut down all this forest and vegetation, as soon as they are done mining they have to try and put it back so it is almost like what it was before. A reason why a lot of people say that it would be a bad idea to mine is because they think it is going to pollute the surface water. What they might not know is that you guys do so much to make sure that it doesn't, and if it does somehow then you guys have an emergency backup to either stop it or make sure the pollution isn't more than just a little. Another thing to think about is how this will affect everyone else. A way this could affect us is if you don't mine we might start running low in those few minerals and they won't be able to make all of those things that we use everyday such as: electronics, batteries watch bands etc. Thank you for taking your time to read this and I really hope that you take all of this into consideration before you make your decision, thank you again.
Sincerely, Abby A. Huset
South West Junior High 8th grader

Abby Young

38717

Mar 11, 2014
EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay
500 Lafayette Road, Box 25
St Paul, MN 55155
Dear EIS Project Manager Fay,
I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. If you have children and grandchildren, this mine will impact their future. Please reject this mine. Sincerely, Mrs Abby Young
5878 Prairie Ridge Dr
Shoreview, MN 55126-5004
(651) 249-4519

Abdullah Ali

54169

Dear DNR I don't like the idea of drilling to happen. Because after the mine is over the environment will be affected for a long time. The mine isn't worth disturbing the peace. There is so much copper you can drill from other locations. The copper isn't worth destroying our environment. It can affect the water. I can also affect the animals who live near the area.

aboges1@gmail.com

44547

As a student attending high school in our beautiful state, I have had to sit by and watch as those older than me ran this state and this country with policies of denying global climate change, putting economic gain above environmental preservation and sustainability, and assuming that it won't affect anyone. Well, I am commenting to say that it does and it will affect me, my children, and so on, assuming that the planet is still liveable by then. This mine is just one more offense to the natural and beautiful world that I want to live in and share with generations to come, and regardless of what Glencore claims, mining companies have never given anyone a reason to believe for a second that they will clean up after themselves. Acres upon acres of our land and gallons upon gallons of our water all over this country are polluted because of mines that made the same promise and declared bankruptcy or used some other method to shirk responsibility, and letting them move into our beautiful northern regions and closer and closer to the Boundary Waters Area WILL have negative effects on our environment, and it is not worth it for a little extra money and a handful of jobs. Minnesota is strong, and we can survive not having a small economic gain, but we can't recover if we set this precedence of allowing big corporations to come into our state and destroy our pristine nature. Thank you for your consideration.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aby Wolf

38776

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adaline Shinkle

17065

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Adaline Shinkle 4708 Eastwood Circle Minnetonka, MN 55345

50336

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Adaline Shinkle 4708 Eastwood Circle Minnetonka, MN 55345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam

6273

Greetings, This message is in response to your January 13, 2013 opinion article, "Our View: Insist on civility at PolyMet hearings" <http://www.duluthnewstribune.com/event/article/id/288499/group/Opinion/> Thank you for anticipating and alerting readers regarding the "coming chaos" associated with the PolyMet Public Hearings. Surely this debate will mark a very historic event for the state of Minnesota and the Great Lakes region. I was, however, very perplexed why in this article you would include a very crucial piece of misinformation. You state: "An example of misinformation is a charge that PolyMet will produce polluting acid mine drainage. But 70 percent of the rock being mined is low in sulfate, Landwehr said, and can't produce the pollution. And the rest of the rock will be placed on a lined area where anything that runs off it can be collected and treated. This rock then will be dumped back into the mine and covered by water. Underwater, without air to mix with the water and sulfate, acid can't be produced." Emphasis on this sentence: "the rest of the rock will be placed on a lined area where anything that runs off it can be collected and treated" Had you actually read the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prior to penning this article, you would have learned that on page ES-36, it is acknowledged: "Nearly all contact or process water at the NorthMet Project area would be treated at the Mine Site WWTF or Plant Site WWTP before release to the environment. At the Mine Site, about 10 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to groundwater seepage), which represents less than 5 percent of total Mine Site water releases. At the Tailings Basin, about 21 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to Tailings Basin seepage that bypasses the groundwater containment system), which represents less than 1 percent of total Tailings Basin water releases." The key points here being "NEARLY all." The DSEIS recognizes and acknowledges that not all untreated water can be collected and treated. In fact, 10 and 21 gallons per minutes, respectively, of untreated water are anticipated to bypass the groundwater containment system during closure. So, why would you make the statement that "ANYTHING that runs off it can be collected and treated". This is simply not true. I am very ashamed in you, and the Duluth News Tribune. I demand a public response to this misinformation immediately. Adam Wilke

6274

Greetings, This message is in response to your January 13, 2013 opinion article, "Our View: Insist on civility at PolyMet hearings" <http://www.duluthnewstribune.com/event/article/id/288499/group/Opinion/> Thank you for anticipating and alerting readers regarding the "coming chaos" associated with the PolyMet Public Hearings. Surely this debate will mark a very historic event for the state of Minnesota and the Great Lakes region. I was, however, very perplexed why in this article you would include a very crucial piece of misinformation. You state: "An example of misinformation is a charge that PolyMet will produce polluting acid mine drainage. But 70 percent of the rock being mined is low in sulfate, Landwehr said, and can't produce the pollution. And the rest of the rock will be placed on a lined area where anything that runs off it can be collected and treated. This rock then will be dumped back into the mine and covered by water. Underwater, without air to mix with the water and sulfate, acid can't be produced." Emphasis on this sentence: "the rest of the rock will be placed on a lined area where anything that runs off it can be collected and treated" Had you actually read the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prior to penning this article, you would have learned that on page ES-36, it is acknowledged: "Nearly all contact or process water at the NorthMet Project area would be treated at the Mine Site WWTF or Plant Site WWTP before release to the environment. At the Mine Site, about 10 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to groundwater seepage), which represents less than 5 percent of total Mine Site water releases. At the Tailings Basin, about 21 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to Tailings Basin seepage that bypasses the groundwater containment system), which represents less than 1 percent of total Tailings Basin water releases." The key points here being "NEARLY all." The DSEIS recognizes and acknowledges that not all untreated water can be collected and treated. In fact, 10 and 21 gallons per minutes, respectively, of untreated water are anticipated to bypass the groundwater containment system during closure. So, why would you make the statement that "ANYTHING that runs off it can be collected and treated". This is simply not true. I am very ashamed in you, and the Duluth News Tribune. I demand a public response to this misinformation immediately. Adam Wilke

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam Benson

39720

Dear Ms Fay, I have done my best to research the Polymet mine proposal and come away with a number of serious concerns. Based on what I have read this mine is highly likely to damage the Arrowhead regions' ecology. I sincerely hope that your agency thinks long and hard about the tradeoff between 20 years of mining jobs versus up to 500 years of needed pollution control. Not to mention it now appears only half the jobs will go to locals and this project could get canceled as soon as copper prices fall below the needed threshold to make it economic. Polymet has a "plan" but no proof they can do this without polluting the regions' watersheds. I see they claim they will treat the tailings to take out the sulfuric acid content and use reverse osmosis water treatment. Yet it's clear this has never been proven on an industrial scale. This is especially concerning when one considers the fact that this is a low grade deposit that will produce 99% waste rock. The recent episode of "Almanac" on public TV highlighted pollution from tailings at the Minnesota DNR's very own test facility in the region. In my research I did my best to get the key points of view from both sides. It was interesting that after visiting the websites for Polymet and Minnesota Mining (the lobbying organization) they both cited the Flambeau Mine in Wisconsin as evidence this can be done. Yet a simple Google search on this mine revealed numerous reports of its runoff pollution in nearby streams. Furthermore the Flambeau Mine was tiny in scale to what is being proposed by Polymet. So once again there is simply no proof or strong evidence this mine can be done without polluting the area for decades to come. It appears there is no proposed trial run on a smaller scale for Polymet to prove this can work in a variety of conditions (I may have missed it given the volume of materials in the EIS). In the next 200 to 500 years we can be assured of some extreme weather including periods of flooding. How will their reverse osmosis treatment handle this. I hope your agency is looking critically at these issues. Also, are any alternate plans being considered that would utilize an underground mine where the tailings are kept well below the water tables. It is my understanding that determining the financial assurance needed is not part of this initial EIS and comment period. But let's consider some simple math that should bring the magnitude of the issue to light. Polymet says the ongoing treatment could cost \$3-5 to \$6 million per year and last 500 years. Using the midpoint of these estimates produces a liability of over \$2 billion not even accounting for inflation. The more important point is there is no way your organization can claim to know what the assurance should be. I do appreciate your agency has been given a very hard task in determining the right course for this very divisive issue. Yet we have one chance to do it right or we shouldn't do it at all. Since it's clear this project will result in decades of pollution risk versus a 20 year limited benefit I propose not doing it at all. Sincerely, Adam Benson Minneapolis, MN

Adam Ferris

7180

The comment I would like to make is that allowing this mine to proceed will only benefit all parties involved. Many would like to argue the impact this project will make over the next 500 years is enough to stop any progress, to this I can only say open your eyes and realize that when we as a people are faced with opposition we always work together to solve the issue at hand. How many disasters have we come together and found solutions for. There is nothing that can happen in this world that we have not been able to fix. As far as I can see the major issue that we have today is a lack of opportunity for many persons who are not only qualified to handle the jobs that may be created but also are highly educated persons who are problem solvers. To squander this opportunity would sadden me terribly.

Adam Fesenmaier

54124

I do NOT support Polymet Mining. Do not harm our watershed!! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam Flett

19928

Feb 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Additionally, I have experience in the HIA process, and am involved in the MPCA's current HIA surrounding Emerald Ash Borer. Despite the differences between these two environmentally based issues, the HIA process can effectively address any public health concerns from activities involved in sulfide mining for non-ferrous metals. There are direct public health affects that can be strongly correlated and modeled through the HIA process, and I fully believe in the HIA process because it addresses any secondary or tertiary risks as well. I understand the DNR has conflicting motives, both set to make a profit and protect the environment, though I think the presumption that the PolyMet project, or any sulfide mining project can be done without public health issues is a dangerous one, and one that surely has a greater cost than what will come out in profits and tax revenue for the State of Minnesota. Sincerely, Mr Adam Flett 360 Robert St N Saint Paul, MN 55101-1503

adam hozempa

41905

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, adam hozempa minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam Sippola

57350

My name is Adam Sippola. A-D-A-M S-I-P-P-O-L-A. Alright. I grew up here and have lived in Minnesota for most of my life, enjoying swimming and fishing in our lakes, rivers and streams, and enjoying our high quality of drinking water. I am against the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine in northern Minnesota for several reasons. The potential for acid mined drainage alone is reason enough to say no to this proposal. If not, we risk long-term pollution of the surrounding wetlands, lakes and rivers, including the St. Louis River that flows into Lake Superior. And by "long-term," I mean that the water cleanup following the mine's closure is estimated to last up to or beyond 500 years. It is hard to imagine PolyMet still existing by then, paying for continued cleanup of the water that will be polluted and poisoned if this mining project is approved. No. Instead, that responsibility will fall to the citizens. 20 years of jobs, only 25 percent of which are estimated by PolyMet to be local jobs, cannot justify centuries of cleanup and billions of dollars in cleanup costs. As it is, Minnesota law calls for mines to be maintenance free after closure. And this proposed mine site is located in the Superior National Forest, where open pit mines aren't allowed anyway. We cannot begin making these kinds of exceptions for corporations at the expense of our natural environment and at the expense of pure, fresh water for generations to come. We must employ a longer view. The destruction of more than a thousand acres of wetlands at the PolyMet mine site would be the single largest loss of wetlands ever permitted in Minnesota. The sulfide mines have a horrible track record of bankruptcy and pollution. The EPA has identified hard rock mining as the nation's top toxic producing industry and mining companies are unable to point to a sulfide mine that hasn't polluted. Corporations don't have a conscience; therefore, it is our responsibility as human beings to begin a trend away from catering to corporations and toward catering to our environment, including the wildlife, plants, land, water and human beings that are a part of it. The PolyMet sulfide mine proposal should not be approved. Thanks. Let me include my address in there also. My name is Adam Sippola, 805 E. 13th Street, Duluth, Minnesota 55805. Thank you.

Adam Sirvinskaskas

16268

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam Southam

40136

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Adam Southam 5051 Highway Seven Suite 260 Minneapolis, MN 55416

Adam Swansom

7721

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: First, opening the PolyMet mine seems like a bad business deal: We loan PolyMet our land for 20 years, less than one generation's time, and they will leave it polluted for 500 years. That means over 16 generations of future Minnesotans would be affected by pollution caused by the PolyMet Mine. If I tried to get a business loan and said I'd have it paid back in a speedy 500 years, I'd be laughed out of the loan office. Why are we even considering this mine as a plausible business idea. And that is if everything goes RIGHT. What if something goes wrong and we end up facing much more pollution than we were told to expect. I just can't trust a for-profit company to honestly have the environment's best interest in mind; ultimately it's about the bottom line, it has to be. So even if PolyMet tells me that this mine will have the newest safeguards in place, creating minimal damage to the environment, I still hesitate to believe them. And it appears to be for good reason: For example, one study found that, among modern mines in the US that predicted that no acid mine drainage would occur, 89% of those mines DID have acid mine drainage during operations or after closure. And just in case it's not clear, there are many reasons to fear acid mine drainage: acid mine drainage kills fish, wildlife and plants, leaving contaminated waterways devoid of most living creatures. Mining by-products such as arsenic, manganese and thallium, have been shown to increase the risk of cancer and other illnesses in humans. Make no mistake, there WILL be disease created by this mine. Are profits really worth anything if they're at the expense of human life. And, if 500 years of pollution somehow doesn't bother you, maybe the costs to the taxpayers will: Experts who have studied other mining projects across the country said even those that start with financial safeguards can end up costing taxpayers millions of dollars. In Montana, they underestimated the volume of water needing treatment after a gold mine had closed, and state taxpayers had to create a \$34 million trust fund to pay for it. Northern Minnesota cannot afford a miscalculation of that magnitude. Another study says that water treatment would cost between \$3-5 and \$6 million per year after the mine closes. Northern Minnesota cannot afford to foot that bill. Not for one year, not for 500 years. There are other, safer, better ways to grow our economy. For example, Maurices is soon expanding its corporate office, and they're slotted to create 600 jobs right here in Duluth. PolyMet will only create 360 full-time jobs, with HUGE liabilities attached. Let's focus on industries with less risk and more jobs. I vote as conscientiously as I can, I live as conscientiously as I can. My household, and my friends, regularly take actions to preserve the earth and our own health. And now a FOR-PROFIT company is hoping to come in and risk my health and the planet's vital water supply all for money I will never see. Where is the political, social, or moral justice in that. Will no one fight to protect our rights to live as healthily as we can. Well, I will fight for a healthier tomorrow, and I hope that all citizens of Minnesota, especially those with the most power, will stand up and oppose this dangerous, damaging operation. The risks are just too high to bring Sulfide Mining to Minnesota. Sincerely Adam Swanson Adam Swansom 617 N 11th ave E Duluth, MN 55805 218 343 4304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adam Theis 45635

I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. The Boundary Waters is a place outside of the realm of day to day modern living in the western world. In much of the BWCA there are no motors allowed. The visitors have to follow strict guidelines to preserve this place. All these things combined with the peace, beauty, simplicity, purity make the BWCA a destination for people from across the country. These mines that are only miles away, are in complete opposition to the ideals that make the BWCA what it is. These mines threaten the purity and integrity of the BWCA. People visit the BWCA to experience PURE Nature, not a natural setting with a mine next door. The priority with a gem like the BWCA should be preservation. Please reject any and all proposals for any mining projects that endanger the BWCA. It is one of the greatest human resources we have in Minnesota. Sincerely, Adam Theis 203 Creekview DR Cold Spring, MN 56320

Adam Waxler 34014

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest (Hi my name is Adam R Waxler.) (i am an illinois Democrat voter.) (i already voted for the Democrats in General.) Thank you for your support. Adam R Waxler (P.S. i say Climate Change and Global Warming is real.) (i say Democrats Forever.) (i care about the Great Lakes since i live in illinois.) (my Drinking water is Lake Michigan and Lake Michigan is connected to Lake Superior so my Drinking water does matter.) Sincerely, Adam Waxler 7615 Church St Morton Grove, IL 60053-1618

Adam Wilke 42981

Attached. Please confirm receipt. Thank you, Adam K. Wilke

adam wright 38312

My name is Adam Wright and I live in northern MN (Hibbing to be exact). I have been following Polymet for years from an independent standpoint. After reviewing the SDEIS and hearing experts on the topic, it is very clear that this company will be responsible not just in the present, but in the future. There is a way to mine these materials safely and Polymet has show that they can do it. To be honest, I have many family and friends not just in the northern part of the state but also the twin cities who support Polymet. I have yet to talk to anyone against the proposed mine. We in northern MN live and depend on mines and without them, we are a ghost towns. Thanks for everything you have done Polymet and I look forward to the future mine. Adam Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

adam youngblood

41980

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, adam youngblood Litchfield, Minnesota

Addie Welch

57181

My name is Addie and I am a youth activist and student in Minneapolis. I've had the privilege of visiting the BWCA and like anyone else who has been in the wilderness of this country, I can tell you how much that experience and the future of that experience means to me. Combined with other factors environmentally, economically, and socially, Polymet Mining is a dangerous idea that should not be executed in Minnesota. Addie Welch 2315 31st Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55406

Adele Martin

42723

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adi Grudem

14616

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aditya K Chalakode

16239

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Adriana Grudem

14614

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Adrienne Beck

57226

The proposed mine is in a very sensitive watershed area. The polluted water can enter ground water effecting rivers, ponds and Lake Superior. The people proposing this mine do not have a good track record for cleanup. They get the ore we get stuck with the mess. Adrienne Beck 1045 Larpenteur Ave W #325 Roseville, MN 55113

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aidan Resh

44527

Hello, My name is Aidan Resh and I am currently a Junior at Prior Lake High School, in Minnesota. I am a chairmen of our Eco Team, and work alongside many members of our district in hopes to keep Minnesota and our world for that matter intact for not only my future but also yours and your children's future. In opening this mine, you would essentially be going against everything that Minnesota strives to protect. I would like to bring up a few points that came to mind while I was reading your proposal First off, as I understand it, this mining company Poly Net is brand new with little to no experience. As being financially backed by the company Glen Core, (chaired by Tony Hayward the man responsible for the BP oil spill) I have concerns about your track record in maintaining ecological standards. In another point, I appreciate your commitment to a five hundred year clean up plan, yet I have no assurance your company will even be around for that long How many companies do you know of that were established when Christopher Columbus landed in America. Your location is remarkably close to our nature preserve also known as the boundary waters. I understand you have hopes and aspirations of containing your runoff, but that is not the sole environmental degrader. Deforestation and the rampant use of fossil fuels have their own obvious adverse effects. I get that there could potentially be some reforestation attempts assuming you hold yourselves to your proposed plan. What do you plan to do about the displacement of native species. Because once they are gone, good luck getting them back. I believe it is the DNR's obligation to prevent companies such as this from destroying our nations largest investment. We must set an example for the rest of the world, by holding ourselves to a higher standaRd This decision weighs on your shoulders my friends. I hope for the sake of our future you make the right one. Sincerely, Aidan Resh

Aileen Erler

40039

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Aitkin County, MN 21209

Attached is a copy of the TEP/LGU comments regarding the proposed wetland mitigation site in Aitkin County for Polymet. Becky Sovde Wetland Specialist/Compliance Officer Aitkin County Planning and Zoning 218-927-7342

Akilah Sanders-Reed 58090

The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. The water contamination potential written between the lines is unacceptable. No details are provided on how five centuries of water treatment will be financed. The operation, maintenance, monitoring, and reconstruction of these facilities for over five hundred years is massive liability and financial investment. The plan readily admits that in addition to the five hundred years of water treatment necessary, millions of gallons of polluted water will seep off site, uncaptured and untreated. This is irresponsible natural resource management, as well as a serious human health threat. Further underlining the proposal's ecological incompetence is the U.S. Forest Service land exchange. Natural resources are not purely a tree-hugger hobby; those plants provide ecosystem services estimated to be worth significant amounts of money, performing tasks such as water filtration and retention, and soil protection. These resources are necessary for human occupation of connected ecosystems across the state of Minnesota. We are not immune to the damage of our environments. Finally, the Tribal Governments have shown that the water models used by PolyMet contain errors which may have vastly underestimated the hydrological damage that will be incurred by the mine. The disastrous impacts are unknown, and it would be irresponsible to pass such a proposal. There are sustainable alternatives that, when externalities are factored in, would be financially beneficial: increased recycling rates, or an underground mine, have both been proposed. The SDEIS is insufficient and irresponsible. Our natural resources are not trivial niceties but necessities. Please decline the Poly Met SDEIS and avert the ecological and economic toll it would take on Minnesota's future.

Al Conard 21881

I am very excited that the north area will be getting a new jump start in the economy. All the lives they will be helping with employment opportunities will be incredible. The area is used of mining so there will not be any major surprises. And Polymet's concern for safety and the environment seems 2nd to none. I totally support what they are planning for Minnesota. Al Conard Coldwell Banker Burnet 612-759-2338alconard@comcaStnet

Al DeJuliannie 5979

I attended the meeting in Duluth last night and was very pleased and impressed with all the information available. One problem was that I could see was the stuffing of the box by anti Mining people to get there speakers more time give there reasons against the mine. Idea for next meetings so it is fair is to have a box for people that want a chance to speak, one for Anti Mining and one for Pro Mining. Then pick speakers evenly from each box to give there comments. Also person picked should have to give there comments not like what I seen last night where the Anti Mining Group stuffed the Box and then would give there spot to one of there experts and we had to listen to the same lies over an over and I felt it ruined a good meeting. Over half the people exited early because like me we got tired of hearing there same information over an over. Like one person I talked to said I never knew there were so many Scientist in our area. We want a meeting that is Fair and People from both sides have an opportunity to say whats on there minds. This projects puts a lot of pressure on all of you involved in the Environmental Review Process to get it right because if not it will effect every ones lives. Like one speaker said last night we have to trust science. We need these good paying jobs on the Iron Range and whole country and world needs the metals. Thanks Al DeJuliannie

Alphabetical by sender's first name

al eisentrager

41739

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Of all the stupid ideas that have been tossed at MN, this is one of the worst, if not the very worst At a time when MN is starting to take a lead in preventing more pollution, this is just plain wrong. It doesn't matter how many jobs it creates, how much in revenue MN will get from it. Why don't we just ruin every damn lake, river, and stream we have in this state, strip mine the whole damn thing and become the blight of the world. We don't because the people in this state have respect for what we have and want to see it become a leader in clean energy. This mine crap is the one thing that will ruin our standing in this country, in the world. We don't need it. What we need is to work on becoming the model environment that is the envy of the country, the world. The people of this state work hard at not only cleaning up the messes we already have, but in preventing new ones. This mine would destroy everything the people have come to stand for. It's a disaster in the making and everyone knows it. The people in this state deserve to be respected for all the work we have done already to achieve just that. We are proud of the progress we have made and what we will be doing in the future. There isn't a person in this state that wants more pollution at a time when we are struggling to get rid of what we already have This mine is just plain stupid and wrong for the people of this state. It's time to shut it down, permanently. Sincerely, Mr al eisentrager 11355 Kramer Ave NW Annandale, MN 55302-2967

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Al Gedicks

40045

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Al Martin

43449

A. J. Martin 27518 County Road 3 Merrifield, MN 56465 218-765-4321 Mar. 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MN-DNR St Paul, MN RE: Polymet mining comments Dear Ms Fay, I am writing about concerns I have over the Polymet mining project, proposed for northeastern Minnesota. I attended the informational meeting that was held a few weeks ago in Brainerd at the Central Lakes Community College. Some of the concerns I have could not be adequately addressed at the meeting, There is no way this project should move ahead until these concerns can be solved. The problems are too complex to include here in detail, but I would be happy to provide this information. In general, we have a foreign company, with a less than stellar record of following required procedures, wanting to extract the wealth that belongs to all Minnesotans. Being a for-profit company, they will naturally want to take every shortcut possible. It wasn't clear what measures could be in place to force this (or any other) company to comply with rules Minnesota sets up. There was no provisions to prevent Polymet from simply selling off their company's mining to other companies that may not have to follow the same rules. There will be environmental impacts immediately, and long term environment and pollution problems, possibly lasting hundreds of years, requiring cleanup and maintenance. A huge "damage deposit" must be required: cash in hand for Minnesota. It would be foolish to think that 50 or 100 years from now, if Polymet didn't return to address the problems, that Minnesota residents and taxpayers could simply send them a bill for any cleanup costs incurred by the people. Besides, at that point it would be highly unlikely that Polymet would still exist in a legal, solvent form, with sufficient cash reserves to pay for any such damages. Minnesota isn't new at this sort of thing. As George Bush tried to say, "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." We went through all this with the taconite mining years ago. We can't trust to luck having a concerned and strong-standing judge in any future matters. I'm sure Polymet has studied this, and structured ways to get around any future 'environmental judges'. Try to imagine the huge cesspool Lake Superior would've become, had it not been for the force and determination of one man, Miles LoRd I used to drive up the North Shore for work in those days; the lake looked terrible, with streaks of mining pollution from Two Harbors almost to Duluth. These resources belong to the people of Minnesota, and if we leave them in the ground, they'll still be there later should we change our minds, or find more protective ways of mining. Any jobs from these mining activities, would soon dry up and be gone, just like the iron mining cycles. Once we mine it, the resources will be gone and we'll be back at square one. The May-June 2013 issue of "Minnesota Conservation Volunteer" had an article addressing some of the concerns of effect of Polymet mining on the Native wild rice crop, page 9- I submitted a response to it, which DNR asked if they could publish. It appeared in the July-August 2013 issue, page 4- I copied it here below: "Wait, now. "Wild Rice under the Microscope" (May-June) says lake sulfite levels have been under 10 ppm, and that even so, rice beds and production declined dramatically. But mining companies want to allow even more sulfite. More copper and iron mining will "generate millions of dollars". For who. A bunch of already wealthy investors. Let's nationalize mining, so any profits got to the people. Private pockets are already overflowing. It's nice to have copper and iron. But it's more important to have food to eat, and to preserve the means for food production. No one I know can eat copper or iron. Food, air, and water are basic necessities. Smartphones, DVD players, or cars are not. Mike Robertson, a consultant for the Chamber of Commerce, wants to "create jobs". That's not true.

Al Ringer

54690

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Al Rudeck

18079

Good evening. I am Al Rudeck, R-U-D-E-C-K, and I am pleased to share my perspectives about PolyMet's land mine process and facility restart and associated land exchange and I thank and have full confidence in the abilities of our state and federal agencies who are experts in their field and well-qualified in how to apply sound science in the development of the SDEIS. See, I'm a professional chemical engineer licensed here in the State of Minnesota. I've taken the oath as an engineer to duly protect public health and welfare. I wear this stainless steel ring on my pinky of my working hand to remind me, daily, of the service oath. I use the science to serve humanity and by using the best of earth's precious wealth and I've reviewed the SDEIS and I believe it's fully formed, and well defines the current, and proposed developments. It's sophisticated modeling and engineered solutions proposed by the agencies and the company, in my professional judgment, will be enable PolyMet to perform at or beyond the stringent state and federal requirements to protect water quality on all fronts. In fact, the overall project will reduce background concentrations in sulfates and not increase them, as well as reducing mercury, and not increase them. Each of the proposed technologies, from advanced liners to reverse-osmosis systems are proven and reliable. No one can deny their applicability to perform as they're used countless applications in our region landfills, sustained county landfills, as reverse osmosis for the water treatments, used in water treatment facilities in many cities and also in many home drinking-water systems. And in terms of the water quality involved in the SDEIS, it is very robust in my view. Groundwater and surface water modeling was run into 2,400 and 6,000 time periods of simulated productions using a wide range of assumptions in order to stress the analysis. Because of the effectiveness of these engineering proposed plan and expected permit limits, I anticipate the real lifetime periods of water treatment will be a mere fraction of the two or 500 years noted. This company, this project, will always meet our stringent water standards, always. See, my family and I have called Aurora White Lakes its home for nearly a decade. While we currently resides in Esco, we own and enjoy property on White Water Reservoir right here on the Partridge River watershed. And as the former two-term Hoyt Lakes City Councilor around the time when LTV closed, I know firsthand how critical quality mining, maintenance and spinoff jobs are to the East Range. They provide basic living essentials for hundreds of families and I look forward to the prospect of job creation the PolyMet Project brings, and moreover, the high-quality metals to be produced representing important new and domestic sources of essential clean copper-nickel and other precious metals that fuel modern life, including wind turbines, hybrid vehicles and other modern necessities. Through the SDEIS's science and downstream permitting, we can have vital employment for our families, while having open access to the cultural, scientific and recreational charges of our area. Thank you.

Alaina Kelley

58116

I have reviewed the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review of the SDEIS. As a Minnesota taxpayer I request that the SDEIS be rejected because it lacks accurate estimates of the economic costs of the proposed NorthMet sulfide mine. I see three potentially expensive side effects of the proposed NorthMet sulfide mine: 1. Active treatment of polluted water and other annual maintenance of the mine site and waste site for at least 500 years. 2. Known pollution resulting from untreated water that will be costly to Minnesota to clean up, or costly to leave polluted (loss of natural capital and health costs). 3. Expected pollution from the accidents that are most likely to occur in and around sulfide mines. SDEIS does not give a comprehensive estimate of how much these three side effects of the proposed NorthMet sulfide mine would cost. As a Minnesota taxpayer, I want to know if the potential benefits of the proposed NorthMet sulfide mine outweigh the potential costs. The SDEIS does not give a detailed, comprehensive and secure plan for how PolyMet or its financial backers will provide full coverage these three side effects, over a period of at least 500 years. Without such a plan, multiple generations of Minnesotans are at risk of being left to pay for the three side effects stated above. The SDEIS does not analyze the risk not fully pay for water treatment, site maintenance, pollution, or accidents. I request that the SDEIS be rejected and specific revisions be solicited: 1) Estimate of economic costs of the mining side effects stated above. 2) Analysis of the risk that PolyMet not fully pay for the costs of mining side effects stated above. Only with an SDEIS that includes these two revisions can the Minnesota state government and Minnesotan taxpayers make an informed decision based on cost-benefit analysis of the proposed NorthMet sulfide mine. Thank you for considering my request.

Alan Andreae

40380

From Alan Andreae 644 E James St Ely, MN 55731 I believe after reading the SDEIS that Polymet should be granted mining permits. The research done by the governmental agencies should be adequate to allow this project to move forward. The jobs are disparately needed in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota and with the scientific research that has been done I see no reason permits shouldn't be granted. After mining starts there will be sufficient monitoring by both the company and governmental agencies to guarantee the process will not affect the quality of the Arrowhead region.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Engebretson

30200

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest the boundary Waters Canoe area of northern Minnesota, And Lake Superior, are too important to our environment to risk a mining of any sorts in that area. This area has been used for generations for people to enjoy the great outdoors and have clean water and beautiful forests. Mining in this area would destroy something that cannot be replaced and pollute a beautiful Lake superior and its watershed. Please, do not even consider allowing this mining to happen, it is too important to even think about. Sincerely, Alan Engebretson 1008 Frontenac Ave Stevens Point, WI 54481-3233

Alan Hughes

11434

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Lisa, it isn't rocket science Sincerely, Mr Alan Hughes 111 1st St Excelsior, MN 55331-1713

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Hughes

43554

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Glencore Xstrata plc is an AngloSwiss multinational commodity trading and mining company headquartered in Baar, Switzerland and with its registered office in Saint Helier, Jersey. The company was created through a merger of Glencore with Xstrata on 2 May 2013-[3] As of 2013, it ranked twelfth in the Fortune Global 500 list of the world's largest companies.[4] As Glencore, the company was already one of the world's leading integrated producers and marketers of commodities. It was the largest company in Switzerland and the world's largest commodities trading company, with a 2010 global market share of 60 percent in the internationally tradeable zinc market, 50 percent in the internationally tradeable copper market, 9 percent in the internationally tradeable grain market and 3 percent in the internationally tradeable oil market.[5][6][7] Glencore had a number of production facilities all around the world and supplied metals, minerals, crude oil, oil products, coal, natural gas and agricultural products to international customers in the automotive, power generation, steel production and food processing industries.[6] The company was formed in 1994 by a management buyout of Marc Rich + Co AG (itself founded in 1974).[6] It was listed on the London Stock Exchange in May 2011 and was a constituent of the FTSE 100 Index.[8][9] It had a secondary listing on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange.[10] History 1974 to 2000 According to an Australian Public Radio report, "Glencore's history reads like a spy novel".[11] The company was founded as Marc Rich and Co. AG in 1974 by billionaire commodity trader Marc Rich, who was charged with tax evasion and illegal business dealings with Iran in the US, but pardoned by President Bill Clinton in 2001-[12] He was never brought before US courts before his pardoning, therefore there was never a verdict on these charges. In 1993, commodity trading and marketing company Trafigura was "split off from" Marc Rich's group of companies.[13] As physical commodities traders, along with Tr

Alan Janetka

27503

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sulfides mix with air and water to form dangerous sulfur acids like sulfuric and Hydro-sulfides. When are we going to leave virgin areas ALWAYS undeveloped. HOW WOULD THESE COMPANIES KNOW ABOUT SULFIDE DEPOSITES UNLESS THEY WERE GIVEN THE GREEN LIGHT TO EXPLORE ..Stop this erosion of our natural habitat which effects all of us and most importantly the wildlife which dies off because of contaminated water and foliage . Can we not leave someland untouched for future generation .. Save the land - Al Sincerely, Alan Janetka 5460 Ridge Xing Hanover Park, IL 60133-5379 (630) 628-6654

Alphabetical by sender's first name

alan johnson

40821

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr alan johnson 129 pavilion hill somers, MT 59932 (406) 857-3343

Alan Knaeble

45114

Alan Knaeble 311 Warwick St St Paul, MN 55105 HYPERLINK "mailto:hallermoses@gmail-com" "mailto:knaeb001@umn-edu" Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 March 12, 2014 Re: Public Comment submittal: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Polymet Mining, Inc.-NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. E-mail directed to HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" Dear Ms Fay, Please consider the following comments with regard to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement on PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet Project (SDEIS). I am a lifelong Minnesota citizen, age 64, and have worked in Minnesota for 31 years as a geologist, 8 years at an environmental engineering/consulting firm, and then for the last 23 years as glacial geologist for the Minnesota Geological Survey. My work as a glacial geologist entails mapping Minnesota's surface and subsurface glacial deposits to provide basic geologic information to citizens, community and government agencies, and businesses to assist them in understanding the geologic conditions for making decisions in regard to such issues as surface water and ground water use and protection. The following comments reflect only my personal perspective, not that of the Minnesota Geological Survey. Comments on the SDEIS 1- (addressing section 4-2-2-2-1) Surficial glacial deposits in the vicinity of the mine site and in the region are primarily composed of sand and gravel outwash and stony coarse-grained till deposited by the Rainy lobe, an ice advance during the most recent glacial period. The permeability of these deposits tends to be high. As stated in SDEIS they are relatively thin over bedrock. These conditions suggest that in this region ground water exchange between bedrock and glacial deposits is the norm. Lakes and streams are the surface exposures of the ground water, therefore they are interconnected with groundwater in the bedrock. I have two major concerns: First, the former mine pits that will be used to store mined waste material will be over 600 feet deep into bedrock. Ground water that accumulates in these pits will be contaminated by waste rock and will move following the regional flow through bedrock fractures and will have the potential to affect the entire water system down gradient. Second, since the hydrologic system (groundwater in the bedrock, ground water in the glacial deposits, and the surface lakes and streams) is interconnected, the potential for contamination and spread of the contamination, is very high. If the PolyMet project is permitted as outlined in the SDEIS I believe pollution problems will be inevitable. The only questions in my mind will be. How severe and how wide spread. 2- The public comment period for reviewing a document of this complexity and size, over 2000 pages, is inadequate. I would suggest extending the public comment period for an additional 90 days to allow more time for reading through the document and formulating comments. 3- The history of sulfide mining shows that environmental problems are pervasive and wide spread. There has been no acknowledgement of these facts or discussion about them in this document. Without addressing how PolyMet will avoid these problems for this mine, what assurance do the citizens of Minnesota have that these same problems will not occur again. 4- There is no Financial Assurance Plan. It is imperative that a comprehensive plan be presented to the public before the public comment period is over and before a permit is issued. As tax payers each Minnesotan may have to foot the bill if expenses due to remediation of mining problems are not adequately covered by a detailed Financial Assurance Plan. Thank you for listening to my comments, Sincerely, Alan Knaeble

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Muller

47778

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney: I have read much but not all of the 2165 page SDEIS for this project, as well as some of the previous iterations of draft EIS documents for this project. I have formed some impressions, described in a posting entitled "The unending PolyMess ." which is posted here: <http://www.alanmuller-com/the-unending-polymess/>. This posting or document is incorporated by reference into these comments. The essence of my conclusions are that, in spite of revisions to the original scoping documents, the present SDEIS fails to conform to the letter or the intent of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. The SDEIS fails to accurately describe the impacts of the NorthMet project as described by the applicant. Numerous deficiencies have been identified by Water Legacy and other commentors. The SDEIS lacks a meaningful evaluation of alternatives. The SDEIS fails to consider the impacts of, for example, electricity generation on the scale required to extract and process the volumes of ores projected-240 million tons over a period of twenty years. How many megawatt hours are involved and what would be the source. The impacts of generation .. Further, the SDEIS fails to recognize the probability that the NorthMet project would expand in size and duration subsequent to permitting. I address this in my "Polymess" posting by comparing the project description provided by PolyMet-and apparently accepted at face value in the SDEIS-with the projections by Edison Investment Research Limited. Edison notes: "We look for management to create additional value through expanding capacity or consolidating the Duluth Complex. In addition, we believe PolyMet might be able to optimise NorthMet's ore processing rate while staying within the permitted emissions level." Further, it is clear that several other copper-nickel mining projects are projected in the area. "The NorthMet Deposit is one of 10 known significant mineral deposits that have been identified within the 30-mile length of the Duluth Complex and just south of the eastern end of the Mesabi Iron Range." Thus, it is clear that looking at the NorthMet project in isolation violates basic principles of environmental review and cannot give us a trustworthy indication of cumulative impacts. The most recent comments by the US Environmental Protection Agency rate the present SDEIS as "Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information (EC-2)" In my opinion EPA understates the deficiencies in the SDEIS, but clearly the agency does agree that the present document is unsatisfactory. It appears that the EIS process for this project began in 2005- At least 23 million dollars have been expended so far, by the Minnesota DNR and it's contractor, alone, yet environmental review issues with this project are no closer to satisfactory resolution in 2014 than they were in 2005- The closer people look, the more problems are seen. The time has come to make an "evidence based" decision, to recognize reality, and to shut this project down. These comments are submitted on behalf of myself and no other organization or party. Respectfully submitted, Alan Muller Alan Muller Energy and Environmental Consulting 1110 West Avenue Red Wing, MN, 55066 Box 69 One Stewart Street Port Penn, DE, 19731 302-299-6783 alan@greendel-org

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Petri

43452

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Alan Petri 12700 Dorchester Trl Apple Valley, MN 55124

43453

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Alan Petri 12700 Dorchester Trl Apple Valley, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Robinson

48175

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alan Robinson 35 Calle Aragon Unit Q Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Alan Septoff

43518

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alan Septoff 301 Mountain View Dr Cumberland, MD 21502

48488

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alan Septoff 301 Mountain View Dr Cumberland, MD 21502

Alan Sutton

39702

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Alan Sutton 4390 44th St NW Hackensack, MN 56452-2435 (612) 703-1396

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alan Tharaldson

17311

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Albert R. Anderson

39377

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Albert van Daalen

21127

Dear Governor Dayton and Lt Governor Prettner Solon After graduating with a master's degree in Civil Engineering from Delft University in 1953 I continued in 1954 at Harvard Business School to graduate with a MBA in 1956- After a first start on Wall Street since 1958, I have been in the investment advisory business, first in New York and later since 1967 in Geneva. One of my best professors at Harvard, General Doriot, Founder in the 1930's of American Research and Development and Digital Equipment inspired my interest in start-up ventures, and in my career I have on several occasions participated in interesting ones. Some of those have worked out in pharmacy and in the oil industry and now a "breakthrough" in Mapper Lithography in Delft. Since its foundation I have had an interest in Polymet Mining while following the painstaking efforts management made over a long period to obtain the permitting procedure; which now seems close at hand. Let me send you some observations. First from my investment experience, I learned that the most important thing is the management team Minnesota should be GRATEFUL to have an excellent team in charge.. Only highly experienced people can succeed in such a complex industry and as I have confidence in the PLM team all of whom joined from important positions because they believe in it I remain a long-term investor. My son is also in the investment business and understands the value of long-term investment. In view of my age (87) I leave my shares to my son and his children, who are already shareholders. For those who oppose Polymet operations they should consider that mining of copper is vital and that instead of importing from countries that do not have environmental standards equal to those in the US that mining is better done in the US. I find the reasons for obstructing the mining operations hypocritical. Those who oppose should realize that they need copper in their houses, cars etcetera. This approach is somewhat similar to CO2- Everything is concentrated on CO2 and no attention is given on the real dangers of pollution.. Trees cannot live without CO2-. So plant more trees. Stop pollution as they attack oceans, algae and reefs. The USA, India and Indonesia are among the most polluted countries. The Polymet project will create at least 1,000 jobs. Which is a conservative estimate in my opinion. The State of Minnesota will get substantial revenue. The surrounding communities will also benefit as PLM Management shows clear interest of community projects. With regards to environmental concerns, Polymet is committed to providing adequate financial assurance. All of us know that if you give a cookie to a dog he wags his tail for more. This looks to me comparable to some people asking constantly for more information in order to keep obstructing the permitting. With my best wishes, Albert van Daalen Champs d'Oisel Petit Sionnet 30 CH-1254 Jussy GE Tél.: +41 22 7591869 mob.: +41 79 6064772 HYPERLINK "mailto:avandaalen@bluewin.ch"avandaalen@bluewin.ch

21280

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. ----- Albert van Daalen Champs d'Oisel Petit Sionnet 30 CH-1254 Jussy GE Tél.: +41 22 7591869 mob.: +41 79 6064772 HYPERLINK "mailto:avandaalen@bluewin.ch"avandaalen@bluewin.ch

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alec Hendrickson

16820

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Alec Hendrickson 3219 west 44th street Minneapolis, MN 55410

50160

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Alec Hendrickson 3219 west 44th street Minneapolis, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

alek roslík

17200

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, alek roslík 26 Jeff Minneapolis, MN 55418

42043

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, alek roslík Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

alek roslík

50466

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, alek roslík 26 Jeff Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alex Andrea

45471

TO: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, and the Good Folks at DNR Dear Ms Fay: I write to point out deficiencies in the SDEIS prepared by the DNR. I am not part of any "Astroturf" campaign or organization. I am a MN citizen and extremely concerned by the proposed PolyMet mining. I outline my concerns. **THE SDEIS DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE WATER POLLUTION THAT WILL RESULT IN POLLUTION OF RIVERS:** PolyMet states its mine will operate for 20 years, but will result in millions of gallons of polluted water, and this water may need to be treated for hundreds of years. The United States itself is just over 200 years old. PolyMet's own plan shows that millions of gallons of water will seep "offsite," untreated, during usual operations. There is no way it can adequately guard against toxic pollution of the St Louis River watershed, and Lake Superior itself, from pollutants such as copper, lead and sulfates. **THE SDEIS DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT SEEPAGE INTO THE GROUNDWATER:** Polymet proposes some membrane liners and geosynthetic covers, but neither PolyMet nor the SDEIS notes that such liners will leak eventually. Additionally, PolyMet doesn't propose that such liners even be under all the tailings. The SDEIS evidently assumes the bedrock under the mine and plant sites is solid and will permit no seepage. This is nuts. **THE SDEIS DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT AIR POLLUTION:** Extraction of copper and other minerals will require the waste rock to be ground into a fine powder. To the extent there are any mercury particulates, the pollution is a neurotoxin. Per the SDEIS, the waste rock will leach mercury at more than 4X the water quality standard This is per PolyMet's humidity cell testing. **THERE IS INSUFFICIENT FINANCIAL ASSURANCE:** The SDEIS is inadequate with regard to the financial assurance required of the company to protect the state of Minnesota and its taxpayers. You have asked for citizens to propose an amount. I will. \$100,000,000- Up front. One earlier draft in the newspaper suggested \$54,000,000- Those numbers are pulled out of the air, but will prove woefully insufficient once the pollution hits. Once the pollution occurs, Minnesotans can only engage in "reclamation"-a poor substitute for not polluting in the first place. **CONCLUSION:** I can only ask the DNR and other agencies take another look. I personally am very appreciative of the hard work done in preparing what turned out to be a 2200 page document. But these are critical defects. I am unaware of any other instance where large-scale, sulfide mining has been done without great damage to the environment. I want to say thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I know you will be conscientious, and as hard as it is to re-think what one has already done as an agency, we need to take a second look, and appropriately consider the costs and potential damage to the environment that are not accurately reflected in the SDEIS. Thank you again. Alex Andrea 2624 Windsor Lane Woodbury, MN 55125 [HYPERLINK "mailto:alexandrea@earthlink-net"](mailto:alexandrea@earthlink-net)alexandrea@earthlink-net _____
[HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"](http://www.avast-com/) This email is free from viruses and malware because [HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"](http://www.avast-com/)avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Alex Barbeau

15744

See attachment

Alex Christensen

41568

Hello Lisa, I am writing to you to express my concern over the proposed sulfide mine near Ely, MN. The proposed project poses significant, unpredictable, and functionally indefinite environmental health risks to both the humans and other biota of the area. I understand that proponents of the mine routinely cite the influx of jobs and taxable income that would boost the area's economy. I think that is a naive assessment of what this mine would accomplish over time. For starters, the mine, if all goes exactly to plan, will not be around forever. What happens when it must close. Additionally, I have not heard a satisfactory explanation of how polluted water, earth, and air might be treated in a fiscally responsible and ethical. I hope you will avoid advancing this dangerous and short-sighted proposal. Respectfully, Alex Christensen

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alex Comb

6075

I think it would be great to see the LTV site back in operation and a boon to the economy that the construction and operation of the proposed NorthMet mining operation would bring. I have been trying to understand the details of how this mine and processing plant will operate to better understand the issues involved with deciding whether this proposal should go forward or not. The benefits seem pretty straight forward. The possible hazards do not. From what I can understand the mines are three open pits that are up to 697 feet deep. This is obviously well into the aquifers that supply drinking water to the surrounding community and is connected to the series of aquifers throughout the area. I fail to see how during the mining process these aquifers are protected from contamination of the sulfides exposed in the mining process. The rock is obviously exposed to the air, which makes it reactive and the addition of water when it rains makes it seem likely to lead to contamination of the aquifer. The proposal of returning the waste rock, which is still reactive, to the pit also seems poorly determined. I do not see where a fool proof membrane is created whereby the reactive ores will not leach into the water table. Stock piling of some of the waste is at least above the water table, but of course allows the potential of runoff finding a way to the surface water ways. The plan seems to be saying it is allowing in surface water to help with the processing and then returning the wash water to the pit. This would seem to be putting highly acidic water into the unlined pit, allowing for an even greater chance of contaminating the water table. I don't want to pretend to be an expert in these fields, but I have some experience as a former septic inspector for Lake County where by I was charged with seeing that there was at least a three foot separation to the water table from any portion of a septic drain field. It seems this mine plan does not offer even as much protection from effluent that is far more caustic. The details of the plan seem troubling that, even if working properly, it will protect our water from contamination and even admits that both lead and aluminum will be discharged to a level higher than allowed. The plan seems to rely also on using reverse osmosis to treat the effluent. There is a good track record with some of these treatments, though mechanical difficulties can obviously lead to over-flows that would need to be addressed. I did not see adequate redundancies built into the plan for such mishaps or for the unforeseen weather events that are appearing to be the norm in modern times. What is most troubling is that there is an implied admittance that sulfides are a long-term contaminate. I see nowhere it is suggested that the wastes are ever to be rendered neutralized. I noted that the Flambeau River copper mine had used limestone mixed with the waste rock in an attempt to neutralize it. Apparently that has not worked adequately as the seepage now is above that allowed for sulfides and heavy metals. I won't pretend to know the chemistry here. I gather since limestone is not factored into this mining proposal that it is not considered a good solution, yet the fact there is nothing proposed to neutralize these contaminants suggests there is no known way to do so. The results of the Formosa copper and zinc mine in Riddle, Oregon suggests that the harm to the environment from the acid mine drainage is significant and not something we would want to see repeated. This PolyMet proposal does not ease my fears that something similar would not happen here. This anticipated long term contamination is dealt with by this plan by treating and/or monitoring the waste water for up to 200 years at the mine and 500 years at the processing plant using both mechanical (reverse osmosis) and non-mechanical means – which I would believe to mean simple containment. It is suggested that monitoring will dictate

6445

I would like to see that the decision on whether to allow the copper/nickle mining in the area near Ely be made within the context of a long range view. From what I have gathered the proposal is offering what may become 20 years of employment and profit from this mining venture while it is suggested monitoring of the mining may be necessary for up to 500 years. This alone does not suggest a favorable balance. Yet, also at risk is the altering of a sensitive, highly valuable eco-system that now supports the tourism industry for visitors to the BWCA and also visitors to the areas adjacent to the BWCA which caters to snow mobilers, motor boater, fishermen, hunters, berry pickers, etc Should sulfur pollution occur it could greatly impact this economy as well as possibly impacting the forest products economy of the area. Both areas of economic use are vibrantly alive today and are sustainable for the future. Mining is not sustainable. If the mining could be done with no chance of harming the other environments or economies I could support it, but from what I have seen I do not believe this is the case. Thank you, - Alex Comb Stewart River Boatworks P.O. Box 297 Knife River, MN 55609 218-834-2506 HYPERLINK "<http://www.woodandcanvascanoes-com>"www.woodandcanvascanoes-com HYPERLINK "<http://www.stewartriver-com>"www.stewartriver-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ALEX FELDMAN

40203

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alex Gillie

42026

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Alex Gillie Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alex Heegaard-LeGros

47036

I am extremely concerned about the Polymet Mine EIS, especially the long term water pollution risks- There is not a realistic long term storage plan for the mine tailings; the the current plan has huge ground water seepage risks due to inadequate computer modeling based on optimistic best case scenarios. Minnesota has a tremendous resource in our water supply, we cannot let a single company's lack of planning ruin our economy of the future. We are talking about at least 500 years of waste storage so we should be talking about containment systems based on worst case scenarios. The current models are based on lower than usual water levels; a unusually wet year (which seems likely when we consider our changing weather due to climate change) could overwhelm the containment systems and lead to incredibly expensive and possibly irreversible groundwater and surface water contamination. In addition, these problems are likely to occur after Polymet has moved on/been turned into another company to protect the owners from financial liability. There are too many problems with the Polymet EIS to put them all in this email, in addition to what I said above, the Polymet Mine EIS allows risk to our fragile moose population, unique wild rice supply, local long-term tourism economies, local tribal economies and communities, and in general the Minnesota that we are leaving to Minnesotans hundreds of years into the future. Minnesotans 300 hundred years from now will curse our names if we let this company ravage our state. I was born in Minnesota, and i'll die here. I love this state, and what we are considering allowing is not in the long term interest of any Minnesotan, only the wallets of the multinational companies in control of Polymet. -Leo Alex Heegaard-LeGros 3451 18th ave S Minneapolis, Mn 55407 612 251 0663

Alex Reich

43206

Dear Lisa Fay and the MN DNR, I have a comment relating to health and the proposed NorthMet Mine, and a comment related to mining in the region in general. Thank you for hearing and responding to my comments. I believe that the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. For other projects here in Minnesota, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities, HIAs have been conducted as part of the environmental review. With 1 in 10 MN newborns in the Lake Superior basin born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood (according to the MDH), we must make sure that the proposed mine and the associated energy production facilities that will be the source of energy to the mine and processing plant do not cause health harm to the population. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. We must make sure that the mine does not negatively impact the health of locals (especially tribal communities whose psychological wellbeing depends on wild rice and other water-related phenomena), or of others in the state. If Alaska can do it, so can we. We owe it to our people, especially vulnerable and tribal populations. The PolyMet NorthMet mine could serve as a precedent that will tell other mining companies whether Minnesota cares about its natural environment, or whether it is open for development. I understand that development in general is necessary, but I question whether we as a state (or as a DNR) will ultimately (especially in the 500+ year timeline) want to promote a new and much higher-risk form of mining (copper nickel sulfide mining) in a the Arrowhead/Superior/BWCAW region, an area central to our economy (with \$1-6B of nature-based tourism annually) and to our state identity. These are important factors that have not been addressed by the current EIS process, even in the cumulative impacts sections. Therefore please take the following action: Whether through a programmatic environmental impact statement review process, a state-wide voter referendum, or another method, please determine whether sulfide mining in the Duluth Complex will be beneficial to the long-term interests of the state, and whether the majority of Minnesotans support it. The unprecedented public involvement in this EIS process indicates that it is important to the people of Minnesota. Improved though the public involvement process for this EIS was over others in the past, I know that not all Minnesotans who wanted to be involved were able to participate. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet (SD)EIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above (does not include a health impact assessment, does not sufficiently consider the area-wide cumulative effects of this and other potential mines as would be recorded under a programmatic environmental impact statement), I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Alex Reich PO Box 145 Marine on Saint Croix, MN, 55047

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alex Swingley 43716

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. This is our home. We have nowhere else to live. Do not ruin our earth for a man-made concept known as currency. This would be a mistake without repair. ""Only after the last tree has been cut down. Only after the last river has been poisoned. Only after the last fish has been caught. Only then will you find that money cannot be eaten." Sincerely, Ms Alex Swingley 704 W Ash St Saint Joseph, MN 56374-9427

Alex Ventrelli 54212

I don't think you should mine near the boundary waters because it kills aquatic life and the water gets polluted and the ecosystem will be destroyed. The boundary water is the only place left to experience true nature. That's why I think you shouldn't mine.

Alex Witte 54141

I Don't Support! Needs proof that it will be done right and actually works!!! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alexa Mcdowell 27966

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Although I respect the position presented by residents of the Iron Range whose livelihood has, for generations relied on mining, I have serious concerns about the plan to develop sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. The threat to the state's natural resources is very real and the specifics of the plan for a longterm response to potential contamination are vague at beSt Too many questions remain unanswered. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Alexa Mcdowell 103 Island Ave W Minneapolis, MN 55401-1509

Alexander Gaya 41867

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Alexander Gaya Northfield, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alexander Rosen

27564

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, As a native of the Great Lakes basin, I oppose this project. I will always consider this vast resource my home, and I feel moving forward with this mine will greatly affect my home in the most negative ways possible. Please do not allow the destruction of the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior to take place. The loss of the health of these great places is NOT worth the dollar amount that will be gained from this sulfide mine. So please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Alexander Rosen 2355 Glendale Blvd Apt 3 Los Angeles, CA 90039-3258

Alexandr Yantselovskiy

40403

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Alexandr Yantselovskiy Svyatoshyn'ska vulytsya Vyshneve, ot 08132 UA

Alexandra Cooke

39912

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Alexandra Cooke 8001 Wyoming Ave S Bloomington, MN 55438-1043 (612) 965-5861

Alexandra Jane Vagac

57140

PolyMet's Mining proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four common sense clean water principles: keeping MN's water safe and clean, putting safeguards in place for when things go wrong, leaving the site clean and maintenance free, and protecting MN taxpayers. Furthermore, NO sulfide mine has ever operated without polluting its nearby waters. As a student, I urge the DNR not to allow the development of this open pit sulfide mine. Alexandra Jane Vagac 5309 S. Cant Rd Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alexey Zinger 39885

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Alexey Zinger 927 Winter St NE Minneapolis, MN 55413-2539

Alexis Berke 42587

See attachment

Alfred Gramstedt 43451

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alfred Gramstedt 108 E 5 St Northfield, MN 55057

Alice Duggan 50929

Please see the attached document.

Alicha Greenlee 18348

My name is Alicha Greenlee and I am so excited to be here to speak to the population that is under 25. All right. I grew up in St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin, which is right next to Taylor Falls, and this area here (phonetic) is very beautiful scenery, and you know it. So, naturally, I grew up with a deep appreciation of nature and its riverways. Also, I am representing myself, as well as an organization called CEPAC (phonetic), which stands for Clean Construction For Tomorrow (phonetic). I will get to that later. Okay. I am the president of an environmentally conscious organization and as well am an involved member of the community, and I think that the PolyMet project is a great asset to our community. Their safe technologies and their (inaudible) processes, they will be providing (inaudible) services, as well as, even more importantly, jobs for our state. I forgot to mention that I am a UMD student. I major in biology. All right. Because we all believe (phonetic) in conservation, specifically that our lands and forests should be managed responsibly, so that they can be enjoyed by future generations. The proposed mining project meets many of CEPAC's (phonetic) criteria. The first being, the elements being mined in Minnesota by PolyMet are in high demand and are presently being extracted in all the world by much less conscious operators in Russia and in China. We need these resources, and the more we can get responsible operators, the better off we can be. Secondly, clearly for prosperity and environmental protection, prosperous countries and regions can afford to protect their natural habitats. And this project will undeniably improve the economic conditions in northern Minnesota. I believe myself that my peers will create safe technology in the future to protect watershed issues that have come up in this debate. I also want to state that – excuse me, technology. So great. I also wanted to say that a lot of the copper and precious metals that are being mined, they are needed for technology, especially green technology that is so important to our society today. I think that we need to come to a compromise. I think that that is a balance between conservation and in providing economic opportunities for our state. That's all I wanted to say. So, thank you for the opportunity.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alicia Aubart

43231

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alicia Aubart 2320 Lower Afton Rd E Maplewood, MN 55119

Alicia Newell

40703

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. I understand that this is a tough issue but we are at a major crossroads. We have to make a major shift and stop this path of destruction. Please think about your children and their children. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Please dig into your heart and do what you know deep down is right. Stop this from ever happening. Sincerely, Mrs Alicia Newell 826 N 9th St Saint Peter, MN 56082-1264 (612) 229-0034

Alison Aune

44879

March 13, 2014 Dr Alison Judith Aune-Hinkel 5409 London Road Duluth, MN 55804 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to say NO to the proposed Polymet's sulfide copper/nickel mining in Minnesota. I have followed the reports, televised meetings, TV commercials, and newspaper editorials and it is clear: Sulfide mining pollution would forever change Minnesota. We cannot allow our natural wilderness, the animals that live there, the wild rice harvest, the Boundary Waters, Lake Superior, and other waterways, our air, and the health of our citizens to be put in danger. The Animals: I have read about the dangerous impact on moose habitat, but that analysis is lacking. We cannot allow thousands of acres of moose habitat to be destroyed; The Canada Lynx is listed as a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act. Lynx have been tracked on land adjacent to, and on, the PolyMet mine site. It is very serious if the PolyMet mine is built; it would destroy 1,450 acres of designated critical habitat for the Canada Lynx, habitat essential to the conservation of a threatened species. We must not allow the fragmentation and loss of habitat for moose, Canadian Lynx, and other wildlife. Wild Rice: Wild rice is sacred to the Ojibwe people, and is a symbol of our state. Wild rice beds downstream of PolyMet would become polluted with toxic sulfates. Millions of gallons of untreated polluted water will escape every year, and the mine plan predicts an increased chance that water exceeding the sulfate standard will be released at times, years after closure. Dirty Water: Minnesota is the Land of over ten thousand lakes. How can we risk the need for extensive water treatment of our waterways for hundreds of years. Who would pay for the cleanup. Taxpayers would have to pay for this and I do not support the huge cleanup bills when sulfide mining companies have declared bankruptcy or walked away from closed. Dirty Energy: PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, using some of the dirtiest coal power plants in Minnesota. PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every year. This must not be allowed; it would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. What about The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Scientists have already stressed that Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. Human Health: Exposure to air and water pollutants like mercury, asbestos-like fibers, and arsenic would have a significant impact on local communities. I have listened to the physicians who have spoken out against this mine to the very real health dangers it poses. Please carefully consider these dangers. Sincerely, Alison Aune-Hinkel - Alison Aune, Phd Professor and Area Chair Art Education/Museum Education University of Minnesota Department of Art and Design School of Fine Arts 317 Humanities 1201 Ordean Court Duluth, Minnesota 55812-3041 218-726-6216 <http://www.alisonaune-com/> (password aaune) HYPERLINK "<http://www.d.umn-edu/art>"www.d.umn-edu/art

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Allan Blais 54161

Who will pay for the hundred year cleanup after this company is long gone? Our grandchildren? I have lived on the iron range. Some people are very short sighted whne a buck could be made. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Allan Bostelmann 43498

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Allan Bostelmann 3655 45th Ave South Minneapolis, MN 55406

48484

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Allan Bostelmann 3655 45th Ave South Minneapolis, MN 55406

Allan D. Henden 57882

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Allan Frink

18303

Allan Frink. The current system you have is being gamed mathematically by people bussing in large numbers of people. When they bus them in, they make sure everybody fills out a card. You have random people that arrive that aren't busted in. Only a small percentage of them put cards in. They all go into one pool. You have people who had their cards drawn, they use their entire time talking about nothing about these issues. Yet, other people that, apparently, when their name was called, can't do a filibuster during their time up there like other people. They say, "Oh, I want to defer it to the specialist, so and so," who is in the back of the room, and that person has to walk up to the front to use the time. So you have people that aren't doing productive comments during the meeting, consuming time, so that you can't have additional ones coming And it is all mathematics. And so what you really need is two bins for putting in things; pro and con. I realize that even though they are there, some people will put in the other one, so that you can improve your hit rate anyway. So pretend I'm for it, but I'm against, but so that it gets picked up. So then what you do is you take the same number out of both of these, you put them in the hopper and you mix them. You only draw a small percentage out of that hopper. You can either empty the hopper and do this again and then reply -- and then start over again by mixing parts of the ones together, or you can just add to it and take a small percentage. You will get a better distribution between the bussed in people and the people that came individually. What's happening out there is somebody who says, "I want to sell a gold field and I want to make my money as quick as possible, so I'm going to throw a few pieces of gold around places and salt it. They essentially salted the dialogue. Because they're gaming it mathematically. And I can see it. But I see math. I see everything. I read everything. I read people. I read books. In high school I even read one guy that always had to be white when we played chess and he would mix it up behind his hand, and I'd go, "I'll be black today," and "I'll be white today," and I was always right. He could never figure it out. He always squeezed the white one tighter, so he had white knuckles on the white. And I found it more fun than instead of always picking white, to mess with his mind. But he was -- he was ceding (phonetic), and I was able to observe it. I observed it in this meeting. I don't know what the ones were like up in Duluth or Aurora, but this being the third one, they've had one try, two tries, and they are very good at getting down here. And so you can't -- you can't -- you can't do this the way it is because it doesn't work mathematically. Any time that people bring a large group together, it doesn't work. Also, the paper here, this really should be a scientific study. That paper should have a summary. It should have what we did, how we did it, and 98 percent of it should be raw data. And the what we did and how we did it is telling you how we are using the raw data. What we have is incorrect data because one gauge was wrong. We have massaged data. We have no idea how it was massaged. And yet, we are supposed to use this as fact and make comments on it. We also aren't supposed to look at other things, like the fact that MinnTac is just a taconite mine, which has tailings ponds, which is just normal, and they're producing sulfite leakage into two different watersheds, and have been since 2004. That was in the paper today only because they were talking about they want to expand another 480 to 90 acres of mining and they are trying to say, well, they shouldn't have to do an EPA study for this because they have done two other ones already and they're working with state agencies attempting to reduce the pollution going out of their tailings. It's the same rock that this is. They can't handle it over here, where they've been in operation since '67? I think that's '67 when the construction was done. Because I think that's when my dad had friends that moved to Arkansas and worked construction. They left MinnTac construction for that. And they haven't solved the problem in ten years. And there was nothing in there about how much they actually reduced or trying to reduce, making an effort. That doesn't tell you anything in the paper. I don't expect that in the paper. But in a scientific study here, or whatever this is, that kind of stuff should have been there. And in the paper this week, there was the thing saying, oh, well, a different mine has a thing in the Partridge River and they're showing the water is running three times as fast as the one that was used here, before they massaged the data. Computer models just manipulate things. They want to put the rock in a hole where the groundwater runs into it, I mean from the ground, not running in. That will happen, too. But the water comes in from the old pits, from the bottom. It has for decades. They wanted to put the rock in there and cover it with water, so it doesn't have oxygen, but there is oxygen in the water. The water fluctuates through the ground, depending on how the aquifer moves. Stuff is going to go into the aquifer. They're not even looking at that. They're saying the water can't do that. If water can flow one direction, it can flow the other way. I used to live out by Biwabik. Biwabik had open air lagoons for their septic. We were -- we were across the road from the second lake downstream. Every time it rained, we could smell sewage in the lake. So, you can't even handle sewage, how are we going to handle sulfuric acid? I haven't seen anybody talking about how they are going to have the mercury that is in that rock and all of the other stuff, because there is all of the hard metals in it, too. That's why there is gold and the platinum, because there is lots of them. The problem is because it is low volume. But when you start crushing it all up, to powder like for makeup, which is what they crush that at, that's what they did for the taconite, too, all of that stuff is released. That is also the exact same rock that Silver Bay's reserve mining processed, and they dumped their tailings into Lake Superior. And then in 1970 Duluth had to put in a new water treatment plant because of asbestos like fibers, and we had to drink carton water, which the civil defense provided for a long time, and then dairies provided water free of charge because they were getting paid from the government somewhere to provide water that we could drink. So, once I saw what happened in West Virginia, I already knew that. I lived in Duluth when that happened. I still have my blue carton that says, "Civil defense," that I drank water out of. The first one. I kept it. And nobody is correlating stuff. And when they bring people in to talk

Alphabetical by sender's first name

about something, they talk in this little, tiny, narrow vein. It is like saying, "Yes, blue eyes, all babies are born with blue eyes mostly." And yet the discussion was on what the vision is. But, no, we just – because if you -- if you -- if you talk too wide, it is hard to lie. But if you talk narrow, it is easier to lie and still sound like you're telling the truth. And that's what I've seen out here. I've seen wasting. I've seen the gold field salted. I know it is the first time that you guys are doing this, it is actually the third time, but people are organized. Don't have one like this and prove it. I guess so. Unless you want me to talk about the Buell (phonetic) mine that is south of it. And when it was filling and everybody said, "Oh, we can't pump the water out of that and put it in the stream because it would go into the Mississippi and pollute it," even though they were afraid the water was going to run up and flood the town of Buell (phonetic), or Boguee (phonetic) rather. And of course it leveled off beforehand, so everybody was like, "Oh," and that. We already know the mines don't do anything because every mine, as part of their thing to do is that they have to put the bumps back into the holes. And I can count the number of holes that were filled in the mining industry over the entire time on my fingers, on my foot, which is zero. So, and I've seen -- I saw LTV go broke because they created a brand-new company. They shipped equipment to a different spot, sent that equipment back and said, "Oh, well, we're now broke." So, that's exactly what will happen here if they are not getting enough of this stuff out. The Swiss company is going to say, "We're not giving you any more money." And of course they won't have nothing. There won't be anything there to do any treatment or any repair. It will be as bad as when the reserve closed and we wound up with that mega toxic dump up in Silver Bay. You got to look at practices and know they repeat. Everything repeats. So I'm done.

Allan King

16918

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Allan King 4109 Robinson St Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Allan King

50221

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Allan King 4109 Robinson St Duluth, MN 55804

Allen Doran

40170

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Allen Doran 210 College Dr Melbourne, IA 50162-1008 (641) 485-6992

Allen Frechette

40015

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Allen Frechette 1511 6th Ave W Shakopee, MN 55379-2075 (952) 496-3244

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Allen Killian-Moore 18386

Hello. I am Allen Killian-Moore. I would like to call for a 500-year comment period instead of 500 years of downwater pollution. I think the SDEIS inadequately addresses workers safety and inadequately addresses ground water pollution issues. And I think we need more time to look at those things. I would like to quote Jurassic Park. "Your scientists were so busy thinking about whether or not they should that they didn't stop to think" -- or "whether or not they could that they didn't stop to think whether or not they should." I'm a tenth generation working class Minnesota. I've been involved in three labor unions. And I will say as a working class union person I do not support the PolyMet. I do not trust them to have the rights of the workers in mind. And you should not trust them either. Thank you.

42635

See attachment

57332

Hello. I am Allen Killian-Moore. I would like to call for a 500-year comment period instead of 500 years of downwater pollution. I think the SDEIS inadequately addresses workers safety and inadequately addresses ground water pollution issues. And I think we need more time to look at those things. I would like to quote Jurassic Park. "Your scientists were so busy thinking about whether or not they should that they didn't stop to think" -- or "whether or not they could that they didn't stop to think whether or not they should." I'm a tenth generation working class Minnesota. I've been involved in three labor unions. And I will say as a working class union person I do not support the PolyMet. I do not trust them to have the rights of the workers in mind. And you should not trust them either. Thank you.

Allen Oberg 47195

Polymet should go ahead with providing upfront evidence of complete insurance coverage in event of a pollution incident with their mining operation since they are so sure the high-tech methods they use will not cause groundwater contamination. Allen Oberg

Allen Richardson 18342

I am Allen Richardson from Duluth, R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S-O-N, with an organization called Obard (phonetic). This is a matter that speaks to me personally. Of the many inadequacies and deficiencies in PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I am going to focus on PolyMet's greenhouse gas potential. The potential of greenhouse gas emissions from the PolyMet mine, sulfide mine and processing facility are staggering, including the fossil fuels burned on site to run the plant. And the potential carbon dioxide emissions would be 707,342 metric tons per year according to SDEIS Page 5-405. So, to put this into perspective, I looked at the Co2 emissions for the entire City of Duluth from 2011. The whole city, commercial, industrial, and potential transported waste emitted 2.7 million tons of Co2 equivalent greenhouse gasses. PolyMet alone would emit more than one-fourth of the Co2 equivalent of the pollution of all Co2 levels (phonetic). Over a 20-year life plan, PolyMet would emit 15,790,752 tons of Co2 equivalent pollution, more than ten million tons from burning coal and running the processing. That's on Page 5-406. With that in mind, I request that the PolyMet project not be permitted without more studies, comparatives and standards changes to reduce Co2 emissions. The SDEIS should be done with more comparatives and alternatives that would reduce Co2 emissions, starting with changes in vehicle fuel and to reduce our reliance on coal power. Thank you.

42669

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

allene burns 40088

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. This is too hazardous to consider drafting the MpolyMet Mine in northern Minnesota. We have too many fragile natural plants and animals to say nothing for the environment as well, to consider this risky endeavor. Please do the right thing and look for those minerals elsewhere. We have too much at stake in Minnesota. It is imperative that a Health Impact Study be done to prove the reasons for my concern. Sincerely, Allene Burns Sincerely, Mrs allene burns 5708 Warden Ave Edina, MN 55436-2245

Allete 54719

See attachment

Alliance for the Great Lakes 22327

Attached please find comments from the Alliance for the Great Lakes on the NorthMet Mining Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I would appreciate confirmation that these comments were timely received. Lyman C. Welch | Water Quality Program Director | [HYPERLINK "mailto:lwelch@greatlakes-org"lwelch@greatlakes-org](mailto:lwelch@greatlakes-org) Alliance for the Great Lakes | www.greatlakes-org 150 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 700 | Chicago, IL 60601 | 312-445-9739 Protect Your Lakes at <http://takeaction.greatlakes-org/subscribe> [HYPERLINK "http://www.facebook-com/allianceforthegreatlakes"](http://www.facebook-com/allianceforthegreatlakes)Facebook icon[HYPERLINK "http://www.twitter-com/a4gl"](http://www.twitter-com/a4gl)Twitter icon

Allison Engel 42830

See attachment

Allison Fischer 38957

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Allison Fischer 3240 Fremont Ave S Apt 103 Minneapolis, MN 55408-3570 (612) 401-4218

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Allison Foy 42084

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Allison Foy Minnetonka, Minnesota

Allison Herreid 42986

Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I have attached my comment about the proposed mine and the SDEIS. Please take the time to read through what I have to say. Thanks for your time, Allison Herreid [HYPERLINK "mailto:allisonherreid@gmail-com"](mailto:allisonherreid@gmail-com)allisonherreid@gmail-com 11619 Edison St NE Blaine, MN 55449

Allison LaBonne 45521

Dear Sirs and Madams, Please protect our most important natural resource: fresh water. Surrounding water would be contaminated by the NorthMet Mine, and though it creates a few jobs and a some tax revenue, the bulk of the profits go to foreign countries. The risks for environmental degradation are too high. The risk that taxpayers will end up footing the bill for long term clean up is too high. The increased risk of chronic illness is too high. When it comes to acid mine drainage, a little goes a very very long way. Please protect our state. Thanks, Allison LaBonne

Allison Plathe 44324

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, I am sending this email to let you know that we do not support the PolyMet mine and we do not think that the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is adequate. In fact, we want you to reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. The PolyMet SDEIS is an inadequate assessment of human health impacts and the PolyMet sulfide mine and mine wastes proposal poses an unacceptable risk to the health of fetuses, infants, children and adults in Minnesota. Please reject both the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet mine. We have a great environmental state here in Minnesota. I know that you are weighing the 200 jobs that this mine will bring to the area, but it is not worth it to destroy our natural resources. We need to find another way to help those 200 folks get work. Thank you for your consideration. Allison Plathe Allison Plathe 1905 Portland Avenue St Paul, MN 55104 651-491-1441

Allison Spoelhof 52297

Hello, I live in Duluth, MN, and am opposed to the Polymet mining project. I have a 2 year old daughter and another on the way, and for their sake and for generations to come, please do not allow this mine to happen. No mine like this has ever had a good environmental track record, and short term profits are not worth long term environmental and health costs. This would be an environmental and health disaster for northern Minnesota. Please do not let this happen. Allison Spoelhof 2118 Abbotsford Ave Duluth, MN 55803

Alvin Halfaker 42614

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Alyssa Caralla

42242

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Alyssa Caralla 1706 Murphy Ln Dublin, GA 31021-3539 (478) 275-3095

Alyssa Evenstad

41837

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Alyssa Evenstad Saint Michael, Minnesota

Alyssa Hoppe

18119

The SDEIS artificially denies the effects of water pollution on the St. Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environment justice effects of pollutants such as metal mercury and (inaudible) found in fish, game, and wild rice as well as water. And cause particular harm to tribal members and low-income families who rely on fish, game, and wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect the impacts of the PolyMet project: Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and loading release directly or indirectly into the surface waters from all PolyMet sources. Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impact without unreasonable assumptions, like the off-site or Embarrass mercury increases, or the claim that 99 percent of mercury is never released from tailings. Redo the SDEIS to evaluate the metal mercury bioaccumulation from air emissions of mercury and sulfide, water discharge of mercury, an sulfate and hydrological changes resulting from the PolyMet project. Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear health risk assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impact of all sulfide mines and plant emission releases and accumulations on health, including a description of the known human health impact of PolyMet's emissions and discharges in language understandable to the public; assessment of potential impact on residential wells from tailings basin seepage; health risk assessment for onsite workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant; assessment of cumulative mercury risk including actual (inaudible) in lakes already impaired; assessment of cumulative cancer and non-cancer risks from existing and additional sources of manganese, arsenic, lead, nickel, and other toxic chemicals, (inaudible) health risk limit and federal profile health analysis; assessment of all risks using a 70-year lifetime for exposure; assessment of cumulative risks of multiple chemicals in exposure wells, drinking water, fish, wild rice, on infants, children, and the elderly; assessment of cumulative risk of mercury contamination of the fish in the St. Louis River (inaudible); complete a measure TMDL study for the St. Louis River before finalizing the PolyMet SDEIS; reject unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on family and tribal members who fish and hunt and gather.

Alyssa McGillivray

10719

Ms Lisa Fay I am writing in support of the PolyMet project and the SDEIS. My family and I live on Sabin Lake (the 1st of the chain of lakes on the Embarrass River). We have been following the project for 9 years. I support the project. The SDEIS is comprehensive, informative, complete. It's time to move on to the Permitting process. Alyssa McGillivray 6525 Voyageur Trail P.O. Box 351 Biwabik, MN 55708

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amanda

39252

To whom it may concern: The proposal to bring Polymet into the pristine land of Northeastern Minnesota is a dangerous one, filled with short term as well as long term risks. As the granddaughter of a man who worked in the Iron Ore mines in Hoyt Lakes, I fully understand that this area desperately needs jobs to bring back a struggling economy. But I also know, as a passionate environmentalist, that this is a short term fix to a long term problem. PolyMet is promising things that have the potential to fail, and the pristine wetlands and unique Minnesota wildlife can't take that risk. Even more importantly, the health of the people who live up there as well as the health of fresh water sources is in danger if PolyMet is able to proceed with their plans. PLEASE, do whatever can be done to stop this unnecessary risk from entering such a beautiful and wild part of Minnesota, not only for us, but for our children, grandchildren, and the generations that follow. Thank you, Amanda Heuring 2168 Cleveland Lane South Cambridge, MN 55008

54170

My name is Amanda. I am from St. Paul MN. I am against the sulfide mining because they're owners and tourists that cares and are fighting against it too. It will affect the lakes and rivers that are around the areas. And also [ILLEGIBLE].The lakes has been untouched ever since 1978 Wilderness in MN. Another thing that the sulfide mining will also affect the living things under the water.

Amanda Goettig

42085

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Amanda Goettig Luverne, Minnesota

Amanda Johnson

38423

Lisa Fay, I am writing to submit a comment on the SDEIS for the PolyMet mining project. I have been to all the meetings and I am for this project 100%. I trust that the DNR has done a thorough job and our water will be safe. This project will help our local businesses and schools which are both in desperate need and have been since LTV shut down. It will have hundreds of full time employees and also millions of construction hours. Our local people need good paying jobs or we will loose more of our communities to other places if they cannot make a living here. We have been mining in this area for many years and I trust that it will be done safely. From the meetings I noticed that a majority of people against this project don't even live in the area or maybe just come a few times in the summer to stay. The people who live here want to work and have their children be able to stay in the area instead of moving away because of a lack in jobs. Thank you for your time in reading my comment. Amanda Johnson 6441 E Barker Road Gilbert, MN 55741 (218) 750-1807 Amanda Johnson Office Manager Office (218) 229-0100 Mobile: (218) 750-1807 Email [HYPERLINK](mailto:amandaj@amptekcontractors-com) "mailto:amandaj@amptekcontractors-com"amandaj@amptekcontractors-com Amptek, Inc. 112 Main Street North Suite 106 Aurora, MN 55705

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amanda Kelly

44211

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. The Boundary Waters is my home away from home, and the truest form of escape that I can imagine. It is a wonderful and serene area where I have made my most cherished memories, and I simply cannot fathom not being able to experience it with my unborn children. In a world where technology is expanding exponentially and nature is becoming less relevant, oases like the Boundary Waters are absolutely necessary for many who still grasp the overwhelming importance of the Earth itself. Of all things for there to be less of in this world, areas like the Boundary Waters wilderness should not be one of them. Sincerely, Miss Amanda Kelly 1509 Waverly Ave Duluth, MN 55803-2618

Amanda Lingwall

16157

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amanda Mohler

41872

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Amanda Mohler Stacy, Minnesota

Amber Arntz

47239

Good Morning, My name is Amber Arntz 58 N Yukon Drive Ely, Minnesota 55731 I support the PolyMet Project because PolyMet will have dramatic, positive socioeconomic impacts to a region that exists merely because of mining. This project is located in an area that supports mining and the jobs it will bring. Looking into a future without mining advancements, having only an economy based on the current prospects and tourism has a grim and bleak future for our youth and the area itself. Thank you for your time, Amber Arntz

Amber Bastian

43839

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Amber Bastian 3848 Nicollet Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amber Bastian

43841

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Amber Bastian 3848 Nicollet Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

Amber Garlan

3002

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining releases toxic metals and can create Acid Mine Drainage (AMD), polluting our rivers and groundwater for hundred of years - long after the profits are spent and the products buried in landfills. PolyMet's own study says that the water from the mine side would need at least 500 years to treatment. 500 years of cleaning up toxic, hazardous waste is not in the public interest. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Amber Garlan 9 7th Pl W Apt 346 Saint Paul, MN 55102-1184 (651) 249-7286

7050

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. The SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Amber Garlan 9 West 7th Place, apt# 346 St Paul, MN 55102 651 249-7286

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amber Garlan

11420

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this test PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untreated every year. In fact, the SDEIS predicts that many years after closure this could violate the sulfate standard to protect wild rice, requiring additional measures (5-142). The SDEIS is contradictory, on the one hand relying on mechanical water treatment for hundreds of years in order to seemingly meet the sulfate standard, but also describing possible passive treatments that may be developed that would seasonally violate the protective sulfate standards. The EIS should eliminate that contradiction. Lastly, the SDEIS inadequately characterizes wild rice waters downstream of the PolyMet sites. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Council has provided additional wild rice sites other than those included in the SDEIS. The EIS should be revised to include these additional wild rice waters. Keep rice free from pollution. Sincerely, Ms Amber Garlan 9 7th Pl W Apt 346 Saint Paul, MN 55102-1184 (651) 249-7286

19412

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. The plan for Minnesota's first ever proposed copper-sulfide mine is over 2,100 pages long and has more than 730 references. A thorough, independent scientific review by the experts and the public will take more time than the current 90 day public comment period. Sincerely yours, Amber Garlan 9 West 7th Place, apt# 346 St Paul, MN 55102 651 249-7286

52166

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining releases toxic metals and can create Acid Mine Drainage (AMD), polluting our rivers and groundwater for hundred of years - long after the profits are spent and the products buried in landfills. PolyMet's own study says that the water from the mine side would need at least 500 years to treatment. 500 years of cleaning up toxic, hazardous waste is not in the public interest The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Amber Garlan 9 7th Pl W Apt 346 Saint Paul, MN 55102-1184 (651) 249-7286

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amber Garlan

52302

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amber Maslonkowski

17154

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Amber Maslonkowski 506 E 47th St Minneapolis, MN 55419

50422

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Amber Maslonkowski 506 E 47th St Minneapolis, MN 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amelia George 37817

Dear Ms Fay, To Whom it may concern, I am writing to comment on the SDEIS for Polymet's copper-sulfide mine. I don't think that the environmental damage to the area is worth the jobs that would be created by Polymet's mine. I am definitely against Polymet's proposal to swap 6,650 acres of good land in the Partridge river headwaters. I came to northeastern Minnesota 5 years ago in order to live in one of the last unspoiled wilderness areas of the country. There are a lot of Minnesotan's who come here to hunt and fish and harvest wild rice and just generally enjoy the clean wilderness areas of this part of the state, and I think that this mine could be really bad for the tourist industry. Not only that, but the pollution that this mine will generate will definitely be bad for the health of the people, animals and plants that will be downstream of this plant. Also, I heard that Polymet's SDEIS water model is not accurate; that the actual rate of groundwater base flow is 200-300% higher than the rate used in the SDEIS. It needs to be redone. PLEASE REJECT POLYMET'S PLAN. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comment, Sincerely, Amelia George 5970 Blesner lake Rd PO Box 535 Finland, MN 55603 Amelia George po box 535 5970 Blesner Lake Rd Finland, MN 55603 2182268261

American Exploration & Mining Associ 42890

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Rd, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms Fay, Attached are the comments of the American Exploration and Mining Association on the NorthMet DEIS. Please acknowledge receipt of these comments. Thank you Laura Skaer Executive Director American Exploration and Mining Association (formerly Northwest Mining Association) 10 N Post St Ste 305 Spokane WA 99201 509-624-1158 x 16 HYPERLINK "http://www.miningamerica-org/"www.miningamerica-org HYPERLINK "http://www.themoreyoudig-com/"www.themoreyoudig-com IT ALL STARTS WITH MINING AEMA_EST_logo_3rgb_h

Amethyst Hare-Heim 57173

Don't put in any more mines. We need more resourceful answers that will not hurt our future generations. Amethyst Hare-Heim 1702 North 24th Street Superior, WI 54880

Amie Stone 54204

This mine project proposal for Northern Minnesota will in no way be beneficial to the people of this state of the BWCA. As an avid canoer and camper, the BWCA is the perfect place to do so. The watershed is 100% pure, I can dip my canteen in the certain areas directly into a lake or stream and just drink. There has been undeniable evidence regarding the pollution associated with sulfide mining. It releases sulfuric acid into the water, lowering the pH and therefore harming critters. The "economic benefits" will not at all influence the area surrounding the mine, other than the few, short-term jobs it will provide. The negative aspects completely outweigh the "benefits." This project proposal is bogus.

Amy Barankovich 39365

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Amy Barankovich 3219 18th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-4803 (612) 722-3370

Alphabetical by sender's first name

amy clauson 41847

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, amy clauson Scandia, Minnesota

Amy Donlin 40169

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Dabney and Mr Bruner, Attached, please find my comments on the Polymet/Northmet SDEIS. Sincerely, Amy Hawkins Donlin 6100 Centerville Road Hugo, MN 55038 (651-426-6356

Amy Ellis 40865

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Amy Ellis 2226 Cocquina Dr Reston, VA 20191-1139 (703) 880-1619

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Farland

39906

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Amy Farland 15111 Greenhaven Dr Apt D41 Burnsville, MN 55306-6141 (952) 435-5676

Amy Freeman

43088

Dear Lisa Fay- I think an open pit approach is particularly problematic and the feasibility of continuing necessary water treatment for at least 500 years is quite questionable. The real issue in terms of long term environmental detriment is this (from page 988 of the SDEIS): With the addition of water pumped from the Plant Site, West Pit flooding is projected to be completed by approximately year 40- When the West Pit water level rises above the top of bedrock, there would be a release of pit lake water into the West Pit Surficial Flowpath. The affected groundwater in this flowpath would migrate slowly towards the Partridge River. Pg 989: The idea that this solution is sustainable on the long term seems unlikely: Surface runoff would be routed away from the mine pits using a combination of existing and new ditches. The WWTF would continue to operate during long-term closure, treating excess water from the West Pit and discharging the effluent to the small Partridge River tributary. A WWTP would be added at the Plant Site to treat Tailing Basin seepage through operations. The reality is that there would be for the long term a very polluted pit lake. Over and over the document says that the WWTP (wastewater treatment plant at the plant) and WWTF (water water treatment facility at the mine site) will remain active for long-term needs, but it is very vaguely stated. The reality is that there would be water that is significantly affected by sulfides and metal leachates associated with the exposed rock in the pit and the waste rock in the "stockpile" for a very long time. Pg 210: It is also hard to envision that the hydraluc barrier could really be that effective as is illustrated. Lots of things happen in soils--animal burrowing, roots that would make it very hard to maintain an impermeable hydraulic barrier. Pg 233: These long-term closure activities would be ongoing until the various facility features were deemed environmentally acceptable, in a self-sustaining and stable condition, and until it were shown that water quality standards were being met. The idea that the site would reach a self-sustaining stable condition by around year 40 doesn't pass the sniff teSt They are writing this as if somehow the WWTF that they present as being necessary to prevent long-term discharge of contaminants from the west pit could sustain itself a few decades out. How could this be possible. Pg 240: PolyMet has committed to conduct demonstration projects during the Life of Mine and reclamation phases to establish non-mechanical water treatment systems to be used at the Mine Site. The WWTF would remain operational until water quality monitoring results demonstrate that a non-mechanical system could produce an effluent water quality, which is shown by pilot-testing and modeling, to achieve future water quality criteria at evaluation locations without the need for mechanical treatment. I read this to mean that Polymet really doesn't know how they can come up with a water treatment strategy that is sustainable for the long term. And this next statement from the same page doesn't mean much given the timescale over which we are talking and the reality that resources companies come and go, go bankrupt, etc: PolyMet would be held accountable to maintenance and monitoring required under permit and would not be released until all conditions have been met. What I don't understand in looking through the documents is how they both state the need for the WWTF to keep operating long-term at the mine-site, but then also say that they plan to be able to do this: Pg 233: When all reclamation activities required by the Permit to Mine are completed, a Request for Release per Minnesota Rules, part 6132-1400, would be submitted. This request would provide the Commissioner of the MDNR with detailed information on the final reclamation status of the NorthMet Project area. Who then

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Gardner

44524

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: As a resident of Northern Minnesota, a fisherman and a wild rice harvester I am greatly concerned with the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine plan. Trading two decades of benefits for polluting this water rich environment with potential contaminants like arsenic, sulfate, manganese and heavy metals for at least 500 years just doesn't make sense. I ask that a better job be done in studying the impact of mercury contamination of fish and the impact of untreated pit releases to surface groundwater on wild rice before the EIS is finalized. The SDEIS does not address who will perform the indefinite monitoring of the on-site constructed wetlands. The SDEIS must reveal wastewater volumes, pollutant levels and it must explore options if something goes wrong(fails) during long term water treatment. I feel that the SDEIS is flawed because the models for the amount of pollutants to be released are based on data from other sites and not on the current water data from the project site or it's surrounding area. The company did not study the type of rock or the structure beneath the wetlands. I ask that you reject the SDEIS as inadequate and please do not allow PolyMet a State permit to mine. Thank you, Marc Smith 6977 Cramer Rd Box 446 Finland, MN 55603

Amy Goetzman

44457

Hello, I'm a lifelong Minnesotan and have enjoyed year-round outdoor recreation throughout the state since my parents took me camping as a child. Our natural resources and opportunity for public enjoyment of them set this state apart, and people come from all over the country and beyond to visit the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and Lake Superior. There is nothing like it anywhere in the world, and when I visit the natural highlights of other states, I am reminded of how lucky Minnesotans are to have such relatively unspoiled wilderness areas and clean water. It appears that the DNR is so focused on allowing mineral extraction that the agency has forgotten that clean water is our most vital resource, and an increasing rarity here and beyond. In order to let an outside corporation access one resource, copper, for 20 years, the DNR appears ready to throw away a much more important resource, water, for a much longer period of time. How it is possible that we are even talking about poisoning our water for 500 years, in two of the state's most environmentally sensitive and important areas. This is beyond short-sighted, it's criminal. Polymet has not demonstrated that they will mine responsibly, nor have they communicated any feasible plan for cleaning up the site. They may not even be in business in 50 years, much less 500- Why are they being allowed to come in and destroy our natural areas, contaminate our water supply, and ultimately leave the taxpayers with a mess that will never truly be cleaned up. I do feel sympathy for the unemployed mine workers, but it is long past time for them to move on. They cannot sit around for generations waiting for the old days to come back. PolyMet has indicated that many of the jobs will go to outsiders. Even the local jobs that are generated are temp jobs. In 20 years, those people will be unemployed once again. Minnesota has a very strong economy. Those workers need to retrain, relocate, and move on. We can't subsidize their romantic visions of the past with 500 years of poisoned water. It is the DNR's job to protect Minnesota's resources, not give them away to outside interests. In this era of climate change, habitat destruction, and species decline, we need to focus on preservation, not corporate giveaways. This project will leave nothing of any lasting good for Minnesota. If PolyMet wants our resources so badly, don't give them away — at the very least, make the company work hard to come up with a better plan. No one will create a clean method of mining if they aren't forced to. PolyMet has the money to innovate better, cleaner, safer methods, but if we don't ask them to do so, they won't. Make them try harder, for the sake of Minnesotans today and 500 years from now. Or better, turn down their request to destroy our precious wilderness and waters. When it's gone, it's gone forever. Amy Goetzman Maplewood, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Grace

41708

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Hart

3223

Dec 17, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Amy Levin

26455

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Many, many sulfur compounds have a TERRIBLE ODOR. This is another reason I oppose sulfide mining. Winds could move the terrible smell over several states and in to Canada, hurting international relations. I grew up in Minnesota and go back every year. I have talked friends into visiting the state. I love the pristine wilderness of the BWCA. Superior National Forest should be left alone. It is a national treasure. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Amy Levin 916 20th St S Arlington, VA 22202-2616

Amy Okaya

42862

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Schmidtbauer

4377

Dec 28, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Schmidtbauer

6016

Jan 16, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Amy Stevens

41956

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Amy Stevens Burnsville, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Amy Strydom 40186

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Amy Strydom 1160 Dellwood st s Apt Cambridge, MN 55008

Amy Wilfahrt 54656

See attachment

Amy Wilson 43608

Dear People, I am adamantly apposed to the proposed PolMmet mine because it will endanger our collective watershed and ultimately it will harm Lake Superior. There is a grievous lack of responsibility to allow a sulfide mine to be built for the profits of a few when the long-term effects will harm the many. Human wants for monetary gain cannot and should not take precedence of environmental health. Sulfide mines have proven to be disastrous for living ecosystem. This mine will cause harm. It is impossible to monitor the tailings ponds for 500 years even if it were a safe option. Please do not accept this proposal to let PolyMet build this mine. Sincerely, Amy Wilson 77480 Evergreen Rd Port Wing WI 54865

Alphabetical by sender's first name

AmyLeo Barankovich

17038

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, AmyLeo Barankovich 3219 18th Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55407

50311

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, AmyLeo Barankovich 3219 18th Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ana perez

40371

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, ana perez avenida de valencia valencia, AB 46130 ES

Anders Lindquist

54533

I am writing to put in my comment on the EIS for the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. After weighing the pros and cons of having such a mine in Minnesota, I fully believe that the proposed mine does not sufficiently make its point that the mine is in the best interest of Minnesota. Keeping my comments more specifically aimed at the EIS—I see a general lack of accountability for PolyMet and its investors for the environmental issues that are sure to follow a mining project that produces such large quantities of waste. Who will be held responsible for the environmental impacts 200 years from now. Also is there any contingency planning in case the new technology for controlling the inevitable pollution fails? I would like to see a revision that makes proposed plans for how to deal with every conceivable contingency plan.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andre Bell

16961

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andre Bell 3400 Lyndale Av S Mpls, MN 55408

50252

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andre Bell 3400 Lyndale Av S Mpls, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andre Leavitt 18248

Andre, A-N-D-R-E, Leavitt, L-E-A-V-I-T T. It's hard for me growing up when I did in this state that we're even considering letting this mine open, jeopardizing the watershed of Lake Superior. That is just madness for 20 years of jobs. I'm sorry, you got to move and find work elsewhere, start a business. Figure it out. But it's just -- I grew up in a different time. I'm just appalled by this, that the short-sightedness of 20 years could be looked at, and they never -- when companies come in it never works out the way they say. All we have to do is look at Delta Airlines and Northwest before them and see the jobs that came. It'll be -- anyway, it's madness, I'm against it, and I think if it comes to it, put it to the state and they will lose because a vast majority of people do not want this. Enough.

andre lima 42

Please do not let this highly risky mining operation potentially devastate our water and air. The only way to guarantee the safety and cleanliness of our water and air is to not allow mining. The EIS cannot account for all scenarios that could occur in real life, for example power outages, major winter storms or tornadoes that could damage the waste water treatment facilities leading to potential environmental contamination. For this reason I urge you to not permit this project especially being so close to our national treasures known as the BWCA and Voyageurs Park. Sincerely, Andre Lima 4140 Lakewood Ave St Paul, MN 55110 651-592-6321

Andrea Childs 42060

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Andrea Childs 2240 Devin Ln Long Lake, MN 55356-9475 (952) 476-1595

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrea Girtz

20660

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable we

Andrea Hillis

41951

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Andrea Hillis Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrea Mousel

41986

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Andrea Mousel Duluth, Minnesota

Andrea Sather

41771

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Andrea Sather 420 1st St Apt 4 Two Harbors, MN 55616 218-724-4355

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrea Sreiber

39195

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Miss Andrea Sreiber 5 Nassau Ave Schenectady, NY 12304-1819

Andrea Thompsom

39785

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. There is only one Lake Superior and wilderness area. Sulfide mining can ruin it for all times. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Andrea Thompsom 7717 Penn Ave N # No2 Minneapolis, MN 55444-1848 (763) 560-9090

Andrea Unga-Smith

54153

Do Not! I do not support this. Mining repercussions cannot be reversed & we need to work in better ways to care for our children's future. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Andrea Vail

3126

I support PolyMet because, I believe they will generate millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support the MN communities and educational system. PolyMet will also create hundreds of jobs that will support families and I believe that they can produce these metals in an environmentally sound manner. ~Andrea Vail 651-208-3171

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andres Moreno

44311

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andres Moreno 4015 Standish Ave Minneapolis, MI 55407

44320

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andres Moreno 4015 Standish Ave Minneapolis, MI 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Carson

38786

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Comfort

42944

Attention: Lisa Fay, DNR: OVERVIEW The following comment has four core arguments summarized here and provided in detail below: 1) Interpretation: the SDEIS is inadequate because it too narrowly interprets “cumulative effects” and “reasonably foreseeable,” thus inappropriately categorizing numerous proposed mines as “speculative.” Both CEQ and Minnesota Rules suggest a broader interpretation. 2) Polymet and the BWCAW: Polymet is currently south of the Laurentian Divide, but post-closure Polymet will be a part of the BWCAW watershed. The broader interpretation of “cumulative effects” will allow a revised SDEIS to more accurately present how mining operations will change the geography and shift the Laurentian Divide southward. 3) Scenarios: in the revised SDEIS one scenario of the cumulative effects analysis should include all proposed mining operations from Polymet to Spruce Road and a further scenario should include the assumption of mining operations along the entire basal contact zone from Polymet to Tuscarora Lake. 4) Full Information: the revised SDEIS will provide the opportunity to take a broad view of mining on the Duluth Complex, now, before it commences, based on full information available today of what the area will look like in 150 years or 500 years if/when Polymet to Spruce Road or Polymet to Tuscarora Lake is fully mined and closed, with water treatment either ongoing or prematurely ceased – and to allow Minnesotans to consider if this is their vision for the state and if the reward justifies the risk, or if a permanent moratorium is the better choice. And since this impacts the border lakes, the Canadians should have a voice in this as well. NOTE: This comment makes reference to the 2004 Bedrock Geology Map (Figures 1 and 2). Various explanatory illustration overlays of this map (Figures 1-14) are attached to this email submission as a single pdf. An attempt has also been made to write the comment so that it can be understood without the figures. But for a close technical reading, please refer to both Figures 1-14 and an actual copy of the 2004 Bedrock Geology Map. A printed copy of the map can be obtained through MNGS: Bedrock Geology of the Ely and Basswood Lake 30' x 60' Quadrangles, Northeast Minnesota, by Mark A. Jirsa and James D. Miller Jr., 2004, Minnesota Geological Survey (MNGS), prepared and published with the support of the US Geological Survey as part of the 2003 State Geologic Mapping Program Element (Statemap) of the National Geologic Mapping Program. INTERPRETATION SDEIS and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Guidance The SDEIS states (page 1623): “Resource-specific spatial and temporal boundaries are used to identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that would likely affect the same environmental resources as the NorthMet Project Proposed Action. MEQB, CEQ, and USEPA guidance allow for a fairly broad interpretation of “reasonably foreseeable” to accommodate project-specific conditions, but indicate that actions that would be considered “speculative” should be excluded.” So the SDEIS, therefore, excludes Teck American, Twin Metals and others from the cumulative effects analysis by labeling them as “Speculative Actions.” The document Considering Cumulative Effects under NEPA by CEQ, January 1997, page 19, however, states: “Whenever speculative projections of future development are used, the analyst should provide explicit description of the assumptions involved. If the analyst is uncertain whether to include future actions, it may be appropriate to bound the problem by developing several scenarios with different assumptions about future actions.” “In general, future actions can be excluded from the analysis of cumulative effects if · the action is outside the geographic boundaries or time frame established for the cumulative effects analysis; · the action will not affect resources t

43315

Attention: Lisa Fay, DNR: The December 2013 Polymet SDEIS is inadequate because it suggests that there could ever be a cessation of financial assurance as it does under section 3-2-2-4-3: MDNR would release PolyMet from the responsibility to maintain financial assurance when the MDNR determines, through inspection of the mining area, that: all reclamation activities have been completed in accordance with the Permit to Mine, conditions necessitating post-reclamation monitoring and maintenance no longer exist and are not likely to recur, and corrective actions have been successfully completed and monitoring of those corrective action is no longer needed. By saying that MDNR will somehow make a determination on what could be cast in court as subjective measures is inappropriate. A burden of proof has been put on the state to prove that a risk remains. The risk of some problem developing lasts for all time. For example, the idea with subaqueous containment is that the process of creating sulfuric acid is shut down (or significantly slowed down) by limiting air contact. If a subaqueous containment strategy fails in 2000 years, then the water level will drop and the creation of sulfuric acid will begin with the exposure to air. And as another example, the need to cut woody material off of the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility will last for all time – during any time frame in which trees can grow in Minnesota. Solution: Rephrase the financial assurance section in the SDEIS so that there is clearly no cessation of financial assurance under any circumstance. Further, state that Polymet and its parent, assigns, successors etc remain responsible for the financial assurance for all time. Otherwise there is a risk that a legal maneuver could be taken to force the cessation of financial assurance – which would then place the burden onto Minnesota taxpayers instead. Submitted by: Andrew Comfort Legal Address: 1788 Hennepin Ave S. #41, Minneapolis, MN 55403 Preferred Mailing Address: PO Box 583154, Minneapolis, MN 55458

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Comfort

43342

Attention: Lisa Fay, DNR: The December 2013 Polymet SDEIS is inadequate because it does not include analysis of uranium in the waste rock, tailings etc The Eagle Mine in Michigan had trouble with uranium contamination of drinking water. So it is reasonably foreseeable that the Polymet mine could as well. Rock with up to 7 ppm of U was one potential cause of the uranium problems at Eagle Mine. See this study of the Dunka Road area by Theriault, Barnes and Severson: The influence of country-rock assimilation and silicate to sulfide ratios (R factor) on the genesis of the Dunka Road Cu-Ni-platinum-group element deposit, Duluth Complex, Minnesota. Robert D. Thériault, Sarah-Jane Barnes Département des Sciences Appliquées, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, Québec, G7H2B1, Canada and Mark J. Severson, Natural Resources Research Institute, Duluth, MN 55811, USA. The Theriault Severson study (page 170) shows uranium levels in core samples as high as 7 to 23 ppm. In some cases the higher U levels correlate with higher Cu levels. Solution: This issue should be studied and if necessary discussed in a revised SDEIS regarding how to protect ground water and what needs to be done for proper disposal of any uranium collected. Submitted by: Andrew Comfort Legal Address: 1788 Hennepin Ave S. #41, Minneapolis, MN 55403 Preferred Mailng Address: PO Box 583154, Minneapolis, MN 55458

andrew froehle

16138

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Hernandez

41964

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Andrew Hernandez Hopkins, Minnesota

Andrew Hill

41621

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Andrew Hill Minneapolis, Minnesota

Andrew Jansen

38797

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Andrew Jansen 1155 Menke Cir Shakopee, MN 55379-3225

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Johnson

16203

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Kuncel

10000

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andrew Kuncel 4227 Harriet Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

18746

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andrew Kuncel 4227 Harriet Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Kuncel

50819

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Andrew Kuncel 4227 Harriet Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

Andrew Mutchler

40275

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Andrew Mutchler W10892 Blackhawk Trail Fox Lake, WI 53933 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Pankaw 58038

I am opposed to Sulfide Mining in Minnesota. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Andrew Papale 42467

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Andrew Papale 1715 Roselawn Ave W Roseville, MN 55113-5757

Andrew Paul 58135

My name is Andrew Paul and I'm from Grand Rapids, Minnesota. I'm a representative of Minnesota Power and our parent company ALLETE. I care about the environment. I have a Bachelor's degree in Biology and I am employed as an Environmental Compliance Specialist with Minnesota Power. I live in the Northland, I have many co-workers and friends that are from the East Range area and I hunt, fish, and camp in and around the Iron Range. SKIP. Two of my Great Grandfather's left their agricultural roots in South Dakota and Southern Minnesota to move North and work in the mines. After World War II mining allowed my Grandfather to return home and earn an honest and good living that led to all four of his children and six of his grandchildren having the opportunity to attend college. I support the Polymet project for many reasons, one of those being the potential economic impact this mine could provide. An impact of nearly 1,000 sustained good paying wages! To me that equates to at least 1,000 families being better suited to provide themselves and their future generations the same opportunities to pursue their goals and ambitions as mining has provided my family. Secondly, with my professional background in Environmental Compliance I am well aware of the science and technology committed to mitigating the water quality impacts from the Polymet site. We as Minnesotans have always pushed for stringent water quality standards to ensure we protect our valuable freshwater resource. With that in mind, one of the key topics of water quality concerns with Polymet has been the sulfate standard and impacts the project may have on Wild Rice. Polymet has committed to the proven and effective technology of a Reverse Osmosis Treatment System which will allow them to meet and exceed the sulfate standard. I commend the Environmental Stewardship Polymet is showing by implementing this technology and eliminating the sulfate issue as a concern for their process moving forward. Lastly, from hockey games, to softball tournaments, to camping trips, to work commitments I have spent a lot of time in the Eveleth, Gilbert, Biwabik, Aurora, and Hoyt Lakes communities. These small town citizens have been waiting almost ten years for the opportunities that a project like Polymet will provide. From a health and environmental protection standpoint I can see no reason that Polymet will not protect the citizens and natural resources of the area. Polymet and the people from the East Range should be able to move forward with this project. It is their livelihood they are trying to enhance, there will be no impact to the BWCA, and there will be no acid rock drainage. Thank you to the DNR, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Forest Service, for doing such a thorough job on the Supplemental Draft EIS and thank you for allowing these comments to be heard. I urge you to view this from a scientific and ecological standpoint and ask that the agencies find the supplemental Draft EIS acceptable and move forward with the permitting process.

Andrew Phelan 19873

From: Andrew Phelan, Minneapolis Given the risks and long term liability, I support not granting approval to the Polymet mining project. Sent from my iPhone

Andrew Samela 42558

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Slade

18130

Hi. Good evening. My name is Andrew Slade. I live in Duluth, Minnesota. As we have been waiting for the last, really, two years for this SDEIS to come out, I was really hoping that this would be a good project; that it would be something that I could rally behind, but unfortunately, for a lot of reasons, the project, as proposed, has some real problems. I'm not going to go into that right now, though. I would like to talk about some structural problems with the EIS document, itself. First of all, we've seen some proof tonight that the 90-day comment period is really too short. There's been lots of folks coming up to these microphones and saying, "I don't understand this. I can't understand this. It's too long." And what that's meant for them and this is what they've said, "I'm going to rely on the agencies to have done this correctly." And I appreciate that sentiment, but I think that flies right in the face of what this whole process is set up for. This was not set up so people could not read it and just trust the people who did it, if that makes sense. The other thing I would like to talk about, and I think this is more important, is that the project, fundamentally, the EIS document does not present -- presents very few alternatives. The only alternative is the size of the land exchange from the forest service. There was, buried in EIS, the rejection of an alternative which I really think should have been considered more seriously and that was the alternative of an underground mine and here's why I think that should have been considered. For one thing, it would have reduced the impact on wetlands of 900 acres, 900 acres less of high-quality wetlands impacted, but it also would have made for a more complex project; a project which would have led to more employment. Now, we all want jobs. An underground mine would have provided more jobs. However, the reason that it was rejected out of EIS as an alternative was pretty simple; it was too expensive. Based on copper prices of today, it would have been "too expensive," and I put that in quotes, to do the underground mine. Which means that the company has said it's too -- we don't want to have that complex of a project where we need to hire more people to do it. We're going to do it cheaper and quicker and not wait, for example, until copper prices go up, which raises another bigger question. I'm sorry but what -- what will happen to this project if and when copper prices go back down again? I think we're setting ourselves up to do a poor project and we're doing it too soon. So I just want -- I feel that the EIS is missing a very important alternative that should have been included. Thank you.

Andrew Smith

18938

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Andrew Smith 2220 Ridge Dr Apt. 31 St Louis Park, MN 55416 612-790-0681

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Sterioff 39988

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Andrew Sterioff 4800 Pleasant Ave Minneapolis, MN 55419-5441 (612) 827-2527

Andrew Thorsen 38652

i support polymet being issued a permit. I believe the sdeis addresses all the concerns about the environment and that they have a solid plan in place to mitigate any issues that may arise. Andrew thorsen 232 Guilford rd Hoyt lakes mn 55750

Andrew Turke 18291

My name is Andrew Turke, T-U-R-K-E, from Ely, Minnesota. I just want to voice my opposition to the mining proposal, so, based upon the 500-year projection of that water filtration requirement. It is just a very high risk. I just wanted to make myself heard.

Andrew Urban 18103

Hi. My name is Andrew Urban from Eagles Nest Township near Ely. I am opposed to the current PolyMet SDEIS as it is a highly flawed document. It serves as a wonderful public relations tool, but does little to protect the areas' wetlands, lakes, rivers and watersheds. The SDEIS learns nothing from past problems. It pays little heed to the concern of other agencies and is based on a best-case scenario, rather than on hard historical data. This is a "business as usual" and PolyMet will build in the expected costs of fines and lawsuits that will result from expected contamination. According to Patricia Engelking (phonetic) of the MPCA, since 2010 there have been 12 water quality enforcement actions against eight metallic mining operations, which we know how to do. The settled cases resulted in fines of over \$113,000. The companies paid the money, but the pollutants remained. In 1999 Herzog Engineering Company prepared a report of well and groundwater contamination for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The easy cleanup of the old Air Force station in Finland, Minnesota proved not so easy, as frequent fracturing had allowed groundwater and well contamination. Contaminants polluted private wells, the municipal well in Finland. The SDEIS says little about the problems posed by fractures. Pollution of groundwater and wells doesn't happen under a best-case scenario, but in July of 2012, after a record-breaking rainstorm, Duluth learned that nature doesn't always follow best-case scenarios. The Minnesota Department of Health in August 2009 pointed out that mining activities in this area puts at risk private and public wells because, and I'm quoting, "Wells in this area are a public health concern because the aquifer exhibits sensitive geologic conditions. Here there are no protective layers of fine grain materials, such as clay or shale, to prevent the movement of contaminants into the aquifer. The SDEIS gives a best-case scenario for a double osmosis system that has never been tested with these particular contaminants and at this proposed volume. The SDEIS is built on best-case scenarios, with skewed data to support them. The SDEIS promises robust economic benefits, with little or no environmental damage. History tells us otherwise. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andrew Urban

40049

Comment on North Met SDEIS Help the struggling Northeast Minnesota moose population. Help protect the habitat of the Canada Lynx. Refrain from fracturing contiguous forest to promote healthy habitat for nesting warblers and insure unimpeded corridors for wildlife. Plant native species and trees to create an ecosystem where invasive plants do not thrive. Offer the public low cost seedlings of native trees and shrubs to increase proper habitat for wildlife. Maintain the public trust of public lands. All of the above are worthwhile objectives of the National Forest Service. I have read about each of these things in various publications. Yet, all are to be thrown out to allow a foreign company to spoil a beautiful and important segment of the Superior National Forest Besides being contrary to much of the mission of the Forest Service, such an act would be foolish, immoral, short-sighted, and grossly betray the public trust A land swap of this kind is supposed to be land of equal value. But where has this been established in this case. What is the criteria. Does the proposed swap have equal value for the wildlife. Does the proposed swap help the Forest Service achieve its environmental goals. The reason this swap is necessary is the proposed site for the open pit mining is on land that is protected from open pit mining. It is transparently immoral and a breach of public trust to now swap that land so that a mining company can make a profit off it. You ask me as a property owner to do things to protect the life of the forest But you allow your actions to be sold to the highest bidder. Andrew Urban 1347 Walsh Rd Ely, MN 55731

Andrew Van Hauer

45550

To whom it may concern; My name is Andrew Van Hauer, 2101 24th Ave S., #1, Minneapolis MN 55406, and I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the northmet mining proposal by PolyMet. First, I am deeply concerned that neither EIS nor the SDEIS accurately portray the drainage, watershed, or borders of the 100 mile swamp. This area is of critical concern for migratory birds, and there is no land that exists that would be able to replace this ecologically unique piece of land. Further, the amount of wetlands in the swamp do not even come close to totaling the benefit of this one wetland. This wetland is designated as an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey. Another concern I have is that this company has NEVER operated a mine before at all. The fact is, no open pit copper nickel mining project in the world has been successfully completed without significant environmental harm. Often, the nearby waters are polluted with high concentrations of sulfuric acid, requiring hundreds of years of water treatment. What waters would be affected. Lake Superior is downstream from the St Louis, Embarrass, and Partridge Rivers, all of which would be affected, as well as the 100 mile swamp draining into the BWCA. Since Lake Superior drains into the other great lakes, so this project has the potential to contaminate over 20% of the entire WORLD'S above-ground fresh water supply. This is not a risk we should be willing to take, especially with the fact that the trailing basin they are proposing to use at the abandoned taconite facility is already leaking contaminated water, is unlined, and there is no plan to repair, replace, or line it. We have a rich deposit of precious metals, copper, nickel, and rare earth minerals in Minnesota. We should wait until a company has proven that it is capable of operating a mine elsewhere in the world, without significant environmental impact, before allowing them to operate here. We are lucky enough to have some of the most beautiful and pristine wilderness areas in the country, and we have a duty to preserve these for future generations. What is the point of even having protected wilderness area if we allow mining companies to destroy them. Another concern I have are the companies involved. PolyMet's only interest is in this mining project. As I mentioned, they have never operated a mine before. They are not owned by Minnesotans, or even by Americans, but based in Canada and the majority ownership is in the hands of Glencore Xstrada, possibly the world's worst international mining conglomerate. This company has been found to have violated the UN trade embargo in Iraq, traded with the Ayatollahs in Iran including buying their oil and supplying them with material crucial to their nuclear program, and skirted US embargoes in Cuba and Libya. Not to mention employing children as young as 10 years old in the mining industry, as well as rampant fraud and tax evasion. This company should not only be denied permits to operate in Minnesota, but should be banned from operating a mine ANYWHERE. Finally, Glencore Xstrada has a whopping 76% chance of bankruptcy in the next two years. This is not a company we want doing business in Minnesota. This project should not be approved. Thank you for your time. Andrew Van Hauer Sources: <http://www.nwf.org/What-We-Do/Energy-and-Climate/Drilling-and-Mining/Mining-Loopholes/PolyMet-Mine-MN.aspx> <https://secure2-convio-net/mnlcv/site/Advocacy.cmd=displayandpage=UserActionandid=372> <http://www.miningtruth-org/sulfide-mining-minnesota/polymet-mine-proposal/#.UyEAjzko5dl> <http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/news/2014/03/12/community-voices-it-s-whopper-polymet-s-myth-9938-tailings-seepage-collection> <http://www.aljazeera-com/indepth/features/2011/05/20115723149852120-html> <http://www.samachar-com/Glencore-lists-fraud-criminal-case-among-IPO-risks-lfevLadgedj.html> <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/glencore-traded->

Andrew Wyffels

42744

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

andrew young

41888

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, andrew young ***, Minnesota

Andy Boyum

16572

I say go ahead with the mine as long as the Mine is ran properly to ensure the minimum environmental impact and there is proper oversight on the project by the DNR. Thanks Andy Boyum Field Service Manager | Ziegler CAT 3502 St Hwy 210 West | Fergus Falls, MN 56537 218-736-2680 Office 218-770-0085 Mobile 800-346-7649 Toll Free 218-736-2625 Fax HYPERLINK "http://www.zieglercat-com/"www.zieglercat-com ZieglerCATFinal1 HYPERLINK "http://www.zieglercat-com/email"Sign up here for our e-newsletters

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andy Chesla

38938

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Andy Johnson

48602

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Only after the last tree has been cut down, the last river has been poisoned, and the last fish has been caught. Only then will you find that money cannot be eaten. This quote sums it all up. Yes we need to mine metals, elements and other natural resources for humans to survive, work, play, invest in the future, and enjoy activities in the past couple of centuries. But only because most people think that everything on this planet is endless, expendable and have the greed for money and quick profits. But what happens when after the mining, and the chemicals, and the refining, and the advertising to sell he product. It usually gets used sparsely for a few years or days and dumped in the landfills or burned. Nobody thinks about where it came from, or how it got their. Or hey i can recycle this. What damaged it caused to their planet or their future grandchildren. The irreversible effects for a quick want, or got to have it hot item. This mine will effect generations forever and the only REALL return will be for the very few who will make a lot of money and move on. Not giving a crap, lying, bribing, and buying there way out of whatever trouble may come. Long before 1858 we did not need this mine why do we need it now. And why do we need to destroy such a pristine, rare, and beloved area for it. Oh yea I forget, we were talking about money, business, and politics again. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Andy Johnson 22 4th Ave N Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-1706 (715) 338-8686

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Andy Kell 54866

See attachment

Andy Wamstad 5948

From what I've read, I believe PolyMet should be allowed to proceed with their mining operation. New jobs have a trickle down affect and it appears this company has done it's homework. I support PolyMet and believe they will follow all established rules and regulations. Andy Wamstad

angela christensen 15920

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, angela christensen 4613 cedar ave s minneapolis, MN 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

angela christensen

49900

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, angela christensen 4613 cedar ave s minneapolis, MN 55407

Angela Livieri

47366

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, This is a step in the wrong direction. Economy is not more important than the environment. The only mining we should be doing, is digging in recycling bins. I want a state and country that consumes less, and requires less. In return, we can have a simple and healthy population. Prestine, clean, untouched wilderness and less garbage and construction. Where will the destructive cycle end. This generation is not stuck in the Industrial Age. Please do what you can to keep the mining out of Minnesota. Thank you. Sincerely, Dr Angela Livieri 3233 48th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2337 (612) 703-8909

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Angela Schweiberger

10089

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Angela Schweiberger Atschweiby@yahoo-com Angela Schweiberger 1620 E 37th St Hibbing, MN 55746

18831

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Angela Schweiberger Atschweiby@yahoo-com Angela Schweiberger 1620 E 37th St Hibbing, MN 55746

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Angela Schweiberger

50905

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Angela Schweiberger Atschweiby@yahoo-com Angela Schweiberger 1620 E 37th St Hibbing, MN 55746

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Angela Silberberger

52403

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. I'm not willing to gain a few short term jobs while destroying our water for this and future generations. Sincerely yours, Angela Silberberger
Angela Silberberger 4822 Hwy 3 Silver Bay, MN 55614

Angeline Dufner

39223

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We can learn from our neighbor Wisconsin and from Europeans: Ban all potentially toxic mining until each proposed mine has been proven safe. Do not sell our future for short-term profits. Let us not be recorded in history as the Land of 10,000 Toxic Lakes. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Angeline Dufner 29665 Island Lake Rd Saint Joseph, MN 56374-9640 (320) 363-8407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Angie Iverson

41979

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Angie Iverson Owatonna, Minnesota

angie nastrom

41802

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, angie nastrom Isanti, Minnesota

Angie Nichols

12057

From: Angie Nichols [mailto:nichols360@gmail-com] Sent: Friday, February 14, 2014 6:45 AM To: Dabney, Tim -FS Subject: Mining and Land Exchange Letter Hi Tim, I'm writing to you as a concerned private citizen about Polymet's proposal for mining and the proposed land exchange described in the attached letter. When I heard the presentation by Water Legacy's Legal Advocate, Paula Maccabee, it occurred to me that we as human beings have come to a place in time where economic interests of the state and the physical and spiritual health of our land must reach a compromise. To me, the fact that our water supply has needed a lawyer to protect its rights from monetary interests of corporations that claim a right to destroy the environment while staking a claim to it's resources seems like a crime to me. I'm not a lawyer, and I'm not enrolled in a tribe, but I do think that the people and animals inhabiting the state all have a right to a healthy environment and we have a right not to be forced into spatial "swaps" that compromise existing wildlife habitats. Why would we make such compromises. If you and I "are" the people who would hypothetically inhabit this land in 350 years wouldn't it be a blessing to know that our ancestors fought hard to protect our natural resources so that our hunting and fishing would be productive and our game would still thrive and our water would be healthy. We are those ancestors of future generations and I would like to ask you to consider not the immediacy of today's profiteers, but the responsibility to care for the environment and our duty to also uphold the rights of tribes so that the future is secure for the people and wildlife at the mercy of our advocacy today. Thank you for your time, Tim. Sincerely, Angie Nichols 925 N. 14th Ave East Duluth, MN 55805 This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Angie Pedersen

54350

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, My response to the Northmet Mining Project and Land Exchange is that they should go through with it. Having another mine up in the north would create more jobs for people. This will help people create better lives for their families and themselves. There are many advantages to going through and completing this project. One of the advantages I came up with is we will get more natural resources, like copper, nickel, and platinum deposits from mining in this area. These products will help fuel our economy by providing our economy with construction material, electrical equipment, and more. However, along with having advantages there come disadvantages. One disadvantage is we will have a lower air quality, water quantity and quality. This would cause slight problems with our ecosystem. Another disadvantage is with the land exchange, it will most likely cut off river flow and may kill some large black spruces, tamaracks, and cedar wetlands. Without this mining project, the land remains a part of the Superior National Forest. As one can see, by creating this mine there will be more jobs for unemployed people. They will be able to take better care of themselves and their families. They will be able to provide more things that their families want and not just what they need. Overall, I think that they should go through with the plan to mine this area. Sincerely, Angie Pedersen, Eighth Grader at Southwest Jr High

Angie Simonson

47273

Northern MN has a rich history of industry in mining and timber, yet we still have the most beautiful environment in the state. I believe we can continue that tradition, we can have both. The knowledge, technology and funds are in place to make this a successful venture for Polymet and the state of MN. Some people, many in the cities, would love to believe that the world turns by those sitting behind a desk, not realizing how insignificant their role in society is. The industry is what keeps us moving forward both economically and developmentally. Creating more industry based jobs will support not only those working directly for the mines but hundreds of supporting jobs. The need for precious metals is not going to decrease anytime soon, if we don't mine here, it'll be done elsewhere and likely with less regulation and concern for the environment. Our biggest concern should probably be that Polymet accidently digs all the way through to China (that's how ridiculous some of the concerns being addressed sound). Support this amazing opportunity for our state and our future. Stop drawing lines in the sand and start shaking hands, together we can do this right. Angela L. Simonson MAIN IDEA CREATIVE www.facebook.com/mainideacreative Angie@mainideacreative-com 218-427-2350 9669 Crooked Creek Rd Meadowlands, MN 55765

Anita Alcantara

35022

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is the most beautiful area our Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and countless campers of all ages have experienced. It is extremely important to preserve it from impact of mining. The precious clean water of the great lakes where Isle Royale National Park sits are also necessary to protect for continuation of life on earth. Sincerely, Anita Alcantara 6930 N Greenview Ave Apt 711 Chicago, IL 60626-3474 (773) 409-4678

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anita Gille

18317

I am Anita Gille from Duluth, Minnesota. I am concerned about water quality and especially tailings pilings that will be located on top of the old taconite tailings basin that was designed in the 1950's before there was environmental safeguards and on top of streams to allow drainage through the tailings. If you go back and look at the draft EIS in figure 4.1.9, you can see that there are at least three streams running under the old LTV tailings site. One of those streams runs right under cells 1E and 2E where they plan to dump the PolyMet tailings and then into Spring Mine Creek. Even when the stream is filled over, water is still flowing under the channel where it has been draining for thousands of years. And Spring Mine Creek is already impaired for aquatic life as a result of past mining and past excessive levels of sulfate and mercury. The SDEIS just assumes that all tailings wastewater will seep into the north side where PolyMet will have a row of pumps. But the SDEIS must specifically analyze impacts on water quality of seepage that would escape following historic stream drainage beneath the tailings basin. I also question the methodology used for creating the EIS and the summary document. I have attempted to read the summary and I found it very unclear. My husband is a soil scientist. He had a hard time with it. How is a layperson supposed to understand what this is? We know it's very complicated, however; and I can't understand the ultimate levels, such as mercury and sulfide. And I would like to recommend a performance bond be required of PolyMet to cover all damages to the environment.

36532

Dear Ms Fay, To: Lisa Fay Dear Miss Fay, Federal and State Agency Leaders: The US Environmental Protection Agency , in 2010, gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” I believe the PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. Claims are unsupported by facts. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Page 5-122 of the SDEIS states: “These untreated pit releases would include East Pit backfill pore water into the East Pit Category 2/3 Surficial Flowpath (beginning year 21) and West Pit lake water into the West Pit Surficial Flowpath (beginning year 33). These releases to surficial groundwater would continue into perpetuity. Groundwater in these flowpaths would flow downgradient and eventually reach the Partridge River.” The SDEIS should include a cost-benefit analysis of the PolyMet sulfide mine proposal over the long term, considering all of the potential long-term costs. I do not want to see the taxpayers of Minnesota stuck with clean-up costs for centuries into the future, all for promises of up to 360 jobs for only 20 years. This also assumes copper prices remain high and cheaper mining locations do not materialize. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Anita Gille 4117 West 8th Street Duluth MN 55807 Anita Gille 4117 W 8th St Duluth, MN 55807 (218)428-7232

Anita Kovacich

2916

I am sending this email in support of Polymet obtaining the permits they need to pursue precious metal mining in Northeastern Minnesota. I trust that Polymet can mine in an environmentally sound manner. Polymet will generate millions of dollars in state and local taxes to help support our economy and educational systems Polymet will keep jobs in Minnesota .. Polymet will keep our young and educated people from seeking jobs elsewhere. Polymet is needed in the State of Minnesota. Thank you Anita M. Kovacich Sent from my Kindle Fire HD

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anita Seeling

10437

Jan 25, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We must LEARN from our environmental mistakes, not perpetuate them. Let us learn from West Virginia is teaching us at this very moment. First, the rich run the country's economy into the ground. Then, bit by bit - they take advantage of our desperation by convincing the masses to help them to not only dismantle the labor force protections, but also the necessary environmental safeguards. Indeed, they portray these safeguards as responsible for the stagnant economy. Twenty or so extra jobs now are not worth 500 years of pollution. And, as West Virginia also illustrates - bankruptcy by the offending company is the usual "out" for them. This needs to stop, and it needs to stop NOW. We do not want to be in the headlines as is West Virginia. We Minnesotans are better than this. WE ARE NOT WEST VIRGINIA. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Anita Seeling 13126 Murdock Ter Eden Prairie, MN 55347-5264

15578

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anita Seeling 51501

Jan 25, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We must LEARN from our environmental mistakes, not perpetuate them. Let us learn from West Virginia is teaching us at this very moment. First, the rich run the country's economy into the ground. Then, bit by bit - they take advantage of our desperation by convincing the masses to help them to not only dismantle the labor force protections, but also the necessary environmental safeguards. Indeed, they portray these safeguards as responsible for the stagnant economy. Twenty or so extra jobs now are not worth 500 years of pollution. And, as West Virginia also illustrates - bankruptcy by the offending company is the usual "out" for them. This needs to stop, and it needs to stop NOW. We do not want to be in the headlines as is West Virginia. We Minnesotans are better than this. WE ARE NOT WEST VIRGINIA. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Anita Seeling 13126 Murdock Ter Eden Prairie, MN 55347-5264

Anita Suzanne Tillemans 42951

Included with this email, I am sending a digital copy (final pdf) of my comments sent by first class mail on March 7, 2014- Respectfully, Anita Suzanne Tillemans 4021 Chowen Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55410-1013

54773

See attachment

Anita Zager 6086

I am writing to ask the MN DNR to consider the consequences of pollution to the watersheds in NE Minnesota and to not approve the PolyMet project because of the following questions: As I look at the map of the mine site it is surrounded by wetlands and lakes. Would any other project requiring dangerous unproven chemical processes be approved by the state of MN if it sat in this location. How does the State of MN and PolyMet protect the water treatment for 500 years in any known or proven method both financially and chemically. If we can't agree on Yucca Mountain for storage and transport of nuclear waste treatment how can we do this correctly and perfectly. What is the financial value of the current clean watershed over 500 years. Have economists reviewed this contingency of 500 years of water treatment in weighing the value of the minerals, cost of the project for 500 years and the potential value of clean water in 500 years. When human beings are involved in any engineering processes there are always mistakes, unforeseen consequences, catastrophic accidents. Do the principle leadership of PolyMet and their contractors have a record of lax and ignored oversight of environmental risks and laws. This region is a porous, literally water permeable area where the seepage of toxic waste can not be allowed to happen. Please answer these questions as part of your deliberations and publish them in all the state newspapers. Anita Zager, 5369 N Shore Dr, Duluth MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Burns

15663

As a land owner in Itasca County, I appreciate the economic base and value that mining has brought to the region. That said, I also appreciate that the region's future will rely more and more upon sustainable resource management and an emphasis on the natural world that attracts tourism and retirement dollars to the area. I currently live in Monticello, MN, but own property in Itasca County and plan to move there in retirement. I am concerned about the long-term environmental impacts of the planned Polymet sulfide mine, and feel that the current plan does not do enough to protect our waters. PolyMet's models, used in their proposal, indicate that waste water will need to be actively treated for more than half a millennium. In particular, expecting the company and/or the state of Minnesota to have the economic resources and the political will to treat mining waste water for more than 500 years is utterly untenable. The time frames about which we are speaking make the average life expectancy of US corporations look transitory. It is highly unlikely that PolyMet, as a business, will be here to keep paying for and executing on any water treatment requirements. Rather, taxpayers will pick up the tab. This plan does not do enough to ensure that the necessary financial resources, to treat waste water and remove sulphur contaminants, will be secured and reliably sufficient. Failure of such mitigations would have far reaching and permanent impacts. Further, the current plan is already insufficient in its planned water treatment scope. At the mine site itself, each year more than 5 million gallons of untreated contaminated water will seep into our ground water. At the tailing basin, more than 11 million gallons of untreated contaminated water will seep into our ground water each year. Never in the history of mankind, has a successful environmental mitigation plan relied on the potential sustained commitment of future generations 500 hundreds of years into the future. The plan for waste water treatment is not based upon best practices; it is based upon hope and pretense, and should not be permitted. Ann Burns 1517 West River Street Monticello MN 55362

Ann Campbell

715

Hi, I would like to give my input on the proposed Polymet mine. I've lived in Bemidji for the past 37 years. It's just been (I am ashamed to say) the last 8 years that I have been visiting the BWCA area and Ely. In those 8 years I go up at least 3 times a year for a week at a time. Summer, winter it doesn't matter. The BWCA is the most beautiful place on this planet. It truly is the end of the road. My family lives in Wisconsin and I have brought them up to visit and they too have fallen in love with the area. I am extremely upset at even the thought of desecrating one of God's magnificent creations all in the name of money. I understand it will create jobs but at what cost 500 years of clean up.. For 20 years of employment. We are witnessing first hand in Bemidji the million dollar cleanup of Lake Bemidji due to Georgia Pacific polluting the lake and that is not even close to what the cleanup will cost never mind the destruction of one of the most incredibly beautiful land masses in our state and country. And then to top it all off we have Tony Hayward investing in the mining business, didn't learn anything from the gulf debacle. I just wanted to let you know how opposed I am to the construction of this mine. Thank you for your time. Ann Campbell 3420 Lake Ave NE Bemidji, MN 56601

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Cary

47256

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ann Cary 4309 28th Ave Minneapolis, MN 55406

Ann Diers

38802

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ann Diers 4807 Lake Ave White Bear Lake, MN 55110-2848 (651) 476-8145

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Dow

26131

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. As a former District Ranger in California's "gold country" (Nevada City RD, Tahoe NF), I know that mining is highly toxic, degrades soil, water and wildlife habitat, and it generally excludes other uses of an area. I also know that there are many competing and compelling demands on national forest resources. Exchanging land or allowing sulfide mining on Superior National Forest will be at the expense of too many of the other "multiple uses" the forest was established to provide. Please do not go forward with this proposal. Sincerely, Ann Dow 3401 Dee Hwy Hood River, OR 97031-8435

Ann Fritz

15960

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Galbraith Miller

41085

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. My personal statement: I attended the first comment session in Duluth. The DNR made it clear they wanted perspectives on the draft EIS, not "emotional" arguments. While proponents of both sides spoke, it was apparent to me that those who opposed the mine had actually read at least parts of the EIS, and were basing their comments on science - as directed. The pro-mining advocates were largely concerned about jobs. While jobs are certainly important, they are not a scientific argument based on the draft EIS. Those jobs will benefit a few, while the after effects of open-pit sulfide mining will potentially impair thousands of acres of watershed and the Lake Superior basin for HUNDREDS OF YEARS. Given mining's history of destruction and denial, I wouldn't bet on this mine operating benignly for 20 years and beyond. The decision to protect Minnesota's Lake Superior basin and the thousands of people who live here should favor science and the environment, not jobs that will benefit a few. Sincerely Ann Galbraith Miller
Ann Galbraith Miller
2921 E 1st St Duluth, MN 55812 218-728-1227

Ann Gaul

33144

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred-to say nothing of the acid rain experience in places like Sudbury, Ont. The Boundary Waters and Superior National Forest must be kept pristine for future generations. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining, which MN has had to deal with from the asbestos problems of taconite mining years ago. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Those of us who may wish to return to our home State in the future would be permanently deterred by such operations in the Arrowhead Region of MN. Why not do this in Eastern Wisconsin or Ohio. Sincerely, Ann Gaul 671 Lincolnshire Ln Hoffman Estates, IL 60169-2772

Ann Marie Sunderland

43509

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Ann Marie Sunderland 1 St Paul, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Marie Sunderland 48486

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ann Marie Sunderland 1 St Paul, MN 55124

Ann Meany 43351

Dear DNR: Back in 1970 I and my family spent a winter and spring at Holden Village an abandoned copper mining village located on Lake Chelan north of Wenatchee, Washington. The former mine site had been sold by the mining company to the Lutheran Church for one dollar and had been converted into a retreat center. Besides the camp buildings: cottages, dining hall and assorted living structures were the remains of the mining operation plus vast tailings piles, covered by snow in the winter but in the spring and summer left to blow in the wind. These tailings were huge three or four football-sized fields and absolutely devoid of vegetation. This is a toxic operation. There is no way that copper sulfide mining can be compared to taconite iron ore mining. To allow something as toxic as sulfide mining anywhere in Minnesota, let alone right next to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area is insane. Please, someone stop this madness. I believe that the Holden Village mining site has now been listed as a Super Fund Site. Philip Meany, 5672 North Shore Drive, Duluth, MN 55804 Janet Meany, 5672 North Shore Drive, Duluth, MN 55804 Ann Meany, 3006 W. 44th St, No. 1, Minneapolis, MN 55410

Ann Possis 10115

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing to express my concerns about the PolyMet project, and to urge you to deny the permits for this mine. It's not worth the risk and possible destruction of our precious natural resources in northeastern Minnesota. We must be able to come up with livable-wage jobs without trashing our natural environment. Twenty years of jobs, many of which would be filled with people brought in from outside our area, are not worth hundreds of years of pollution of an irreplaceable part of the world. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Ann Possis Ann Possis 4038 Cascade Beach Road Lutsen, MN 55612 218 387-9081

10116

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing to express my concerns about the PolyMet project, and to urge you to deny the permits for this mine. It's not worth the risk and possible destruction of our precious natural resources in northeastern Minnesota. We must be able to come up with livable-wage jobs without trashing our natural environment. Twenty years of jobs, many of which would be filled with people brought in from outside our area, are not worth hundreds of years of pollution of an irreplaceable part of the world. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Ann Possis Ann Possis 4038 Cascade Beach Road Lutsen, MN 55612 218 387-9081

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Redig

39194

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Ann Reed

16924

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. I know you are receiving many of these and may be simply putting them aside but please listen. The next crisis we are facing is one of adequate clean water. People who live in southwestern United States are experiencing drought conditions. We saw what happened in West Virginia with their water. I understand that we all walk a fine line – we want jobs for people but what good are the jobs if everyone's water is contaminated. Human beings can live without a lot of things but we must have water. We Minnesotans live upstream. We have a responsibility to protect the lakes and rivers we hold so dear. Please help us and reject PolyMet's plan. Sincerely, Ann Reed Minneapolis, MN Ann Reed 3432 35th Av S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Reed 50228

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. I know you are receiving many of these and may be simply putting them aside but please listen. The next crisis we are facing is one of adequate clean water. People who live in southwestern United States are experiencing drought conditions. We saw what happened in West Virginia with their water. I understand that we all walk a fine line – we want jobs for people but what good are the jobs if everyone's water is contaminated. Human beings can live without a lot of things but we must have water. We Minnesotans live upstream. We have a responsibility to protect the lakes and rivers we hold so dear. Please help us and reject PolyMet's plan Sincerely, Ann Reed Minneapolis, MN Ann Reed 3432 35th Av S minneapolis, MN 55406

Ann Sandler 39605

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ann Sandler 9833 West 101st Terr Overland Park, Ks. 66212 Sincerely, Ms Ann Sandler 9833 W 101st Ter Overland Park, KS 66212-5431

Ann Schley 41854

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As Minnesotans we are privileged live among beautiful wetlands and forests. As part of that privilege, I believe it is our responsibility to protect those resources for the future. As such, I urge you to reject PolyMet's request to mine. There is just too much risk that dangerous chemicals will be released now or in the future from the mining operations. Our resources are much more precious as natural recreation area, than as mines. Sincerely, Ms Ann Schley 1120 Winthrop St S Saint Paul, MN 55119-5609 (651) 398-7012

Ann Snodie 11044

Attention: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environment Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN. 55155-4025 I am writing to you to speak out against the NorthMet Mining proposal to let Polymet mine copper-nickel in Northeastern MN (on superior national forest land). A few things to consider is whether our future WATER quality is worth more to us in the long-run (some predict 100's of years of possible damage) then job creation in Northern MN. And this is coming from somebody who has been unemployed for a while. I don't think we should take that risk. Historically, mining reclamation, in the end, cost the tax payer money for clean-up, long after the corporation, who created the mess, is gone. The Office of surface Mining Reclamation and enforcement (OSM) has not been effective in other states where mining has been destructive (West Virginia, Kentucky, Wyoming, Pennsylvania. etc) I wonder if Kentucky was at a crossroad between job creation vs. water quality and protecting their natural resources. Why do they still have water quality issue in Kentucky after 20 years Initially, were they told the same thing as we are being told about the safety today. Let's keep Minnesota the beautiful state that it is and protect our precious water. We don't need this in Minnesota.. Sincerely, Ann Snodie

Ann Stangland 54899

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ann Vreeland 57337

My name is Ann Vreeland. That's "V," as in Victor, R-E-E-L-A-N-D. I live in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. I have lived -- I was born and raised in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota and I currently live there with my husband. I am a family nurse practitioner at the Aurora Hospital at Northern Pines Medical Center. And I have had an opportunity tonight to review the various information that has been put out by various government agencies about the permitting process for PolyMet mining. I feel very confident that they have done due diligence as far as their safety for the water and for the environment. We need the jobs up here and we need mining, and that has been our lifeblood for over 50 years, and I support it 100 percent.

Anna Blaine 54174

I believe this mining should not be introduced in MN. It's degrading to our land and water! The water and area around where this mine is supposed to be is too precious to our environment to be compromised for this mining project.

ANNA FRENCH 43064

Some effects of the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine plan are immediate and easy to predict. For example, it is known that the mine would impact our dwindling moose populations and the already endangered Canada Lynx by destroying their habitat. Other impacts, such as those to air and water quality, are still uncertain. The plan is incomplete and has not been carried out thoroughly. An example of this is the lack of a health impact study. For something that could have impacts 500 years into the future, it seems like we could take a little more time analyzing consequences. Anna French 16425 39th Pl N Plymouth, MN 55446

Anna Guldner 54527

If it threatens our lakes, rivers, streams, and groundwater, I will not support Poly Met Mining Co.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anna Hemphill

40411

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anna Hess

10352

To: HYPERLINK "mailto:info.dnr@state.mn.us"info.dnr@state.mn.us Cc: John and Debbie Woerheide Dear Minnesota State and Federal partner links for the preparation of this DEIS: Unfortunately we were not able to attend the public meetings for various reasons beyond our control, including the weather, and resulting road conditions. So our comments need to be expressed in this email. As residents of the Minnesota Arrowhead country, we certainly hope that these comments are considered. We are full time residents of the Minnesota north country, living at Lutsen for the past 26 years,at 5171 Highway 61, and 103 Caribou trail. The very things that attracted us to this gorgeous country include the beautiful boreal forest, clear streams and inland lakes, and of course the unequaled beauty of Lake Superior during all seasons of the year. We didn't come here enticed by new jobs being offered by any resource gobbling industries. We came here and created our own jobs, offering services that the people living here, or coming to visit needed. We have all lived in various parts of the country, such as south central Missouri, southern Illinois, the mountains of New Mexico, the mountains of Colorado, and the spectacular coast of Alaska, So we have seen other beautiful parts of the country, but none to top the Minnesota Arrowhead, Lake Superior country. The father/grand father of this family, John Woerheide served the US Forest Service for 35 years. Various jobs included preparing proposals for designating Wilderness Areas, lands and minerals management, timber management, silvicultural research, recreation resource management, and public affairs. The whole family has witnessed the results of metals mining for such metals as lead, zinc, copper, gold, silver, and many other metals as well. We lived on various National Forests, mostly in remote back country areas. When we lived in Southern Illinois on the Shawnee National Forest we often visited the fluorspar/lead/zinc mines of that area. such as Minerva Number One, and the Crystal mine. At many of these mines the fluorspar was the retained ore mineral, and the lead, zinc, and other metals often made it into the tailings of these operations. That was back in the late 1950s, and of course the people of the area could only see the benefit of the jobs the mines provided. As a result of the careless surface disposal of metal ores, there is now a great deal of water pollution at and around disposal sites, leading to health alerts for such areas as the Minerva No 1 site (see HYPERLINK "http://www.atsDradc-gov/"www.atsDradc-gov. Minerva Mine No1) When we lived on the Santa Fe National Forest at Pecos, New Mexico we used to make many trips up the Pecos River to the site of the old Terrero Min about 12 miles north of Pecos . This was an old deep mine under ground where zinc , copper, lead, gold and silver were mined in the past, There were about a dozen other trace minerals involved as well. Waste rock material was spread out in an area about 20 acres in size at the mine site. Higher grade ore was sent by tramway to the Alamitos Mill at Pecos, New Mexico, where the ore was processed, and waste tailings were fed into tailings ponds. Both of these sites have been discovered to be highly polluted. Unacceptable levels of pollutants present in surface areas, and extreme pollution of ground waters are present all the way as far south as Carlsbad on the Pecos River. Water at camp grounds along the Pecos River has been polluted. A person can not even go near the old mine site, or the mill site. There are chain link fences and keep out signs around the areas. As a reference see - New Mexico Geological Society guidebook, 52nd Field Conference, Geology of the Llano Estacato, 2001 = Long Term monitoring of the Geochemistry Of Surface Water, and Stream-Sediment Samples from the Southern Pecos Wilderness to Brantley Dam North Of Carlsbad. Eastern New Mexico - Year Nine. It is absolutely amazing how long this pollution has

Anna Louise E. Fontaine

42415

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Anna Louise E. Fontaine 102 Ch Du Lac-Cloutier Lantier, QC J0T 1V0

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anna Meyer

38743

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Anna Newton

52574

Protect our water. Hooded Mergansers swim in northeastern Minnesota's pristine marshes, ponds, and rivers, feeding on fish, crayfish, frogs, and insects. PolyMet Corporation is proposing to destroy thousands of acres of pristine habitat to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St Louis River - a major waterway that flows over 180 miles to Lake Superior. PolyMet's proposal calls for 20 years of mining, and they acknowledge that 500 years of toxic runoff will need to be collected and treated. Just like the Hooded Merganser, our children and grandchildren all deserve clean water. Let clean water be our legacy - not toxic pollution from mining. There are SERIOUS issues with this proposal.

Anna Peterson

43809

To whom it may concern, I believe the proposed Poly Met mine should not go forwaRd. The SDEIS has not shown that mining of precious metals in rocks with sulfide can be done safely in the watery environment of NE Minnesota without serious contamination and destruction to wetlands and habitat. Thank you for your consideration of my comment. Sincerely, Dr Anna Peterson - Anna C. Peterson, PhD Conservation Biology University of Minnesota 763-370-1639 Tell me what is it you plan to do with your one wild and precious life. -Mary Oliver

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anna Runestad 44598

I wake up every day knowing how I choose to live my life will affect my future and those around me. The long term effects of choosing to open the Superior National Forest to mining is a choice that I don't agree with. It has short term benefits that do not out weigh the long term cost our state and our natural water habitats will suffer for years. Anna Runestad

Anna Russel 58146

I am appalled that Minnesota would even consider putting in this mine so close to the boundary waters. The lives of countless plants and animals will be impacted, not to mention the entire ecosystem as a whole. The profits are not worth the risks involved. We are NOT dependent on copper! Throw away your cellphone and take a walk in the woods! We need to be putting minds together to figure out actually proven environmentally safe processes to achieve our goals. Create more jobs to plant new trees and wetlands on the proposed sites. I will be ashamed as a Minnesotan if this mine passes. Someone needs to give a voice to the creatures who cannot speak the trees, the water, the birds, the wolves. We need to learn to coexist, the water, the birds, the wolves. We need to learn to coexist, even give back positively to the environment. Now wouldn't that be crazy.

anna sherman 15282

Attached: To Mine, Or Not To Mine. Anna Sherman, 21123 Iverson Avenue North, Forest Lake, MN 55025 Google Drive: create, share, and keep all your stuff in one place. HYPERLINK "<https://drive.google-com>"Logo for Google Drive

Alphabetical by sender's first name

anna wagner

15648

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

anna zirkes

43205

I am opposed to this plan. I am concerned that the pollution created by this plan will forever change the Boundary waters. Anna Zirkes 1818 Rolling Green Curve Mendota Heights, MN 55118

Alphabetical by sender's first name

annamarta dostourian

40432

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, annamarta dostourian 1970 san pablo ave berkeley, CA 94702 US

Annamary Herther

42813

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anne

37917

Anne Calderwood PO Box 2244 Murphys, CA 95247 (also: 3496 N. Arm Road, Ely, MN 55731) March 7, 2014 Dear Ms Fay, I urge you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. I urge you to stand up for the interests of the public and the known facts about this type of copper sulfide mining and the destruction to human and environmental health that it leaves behind. The BWCA and the clean water that is its hallmark is a national treasure. My family owns property in the Ely area and spend time each summer enjoying the BWCA and surrounding lakes. Our drinking water comes directly from Burntside lake, and we eat the fish and wild rice from the local area. It seems ironic that the DNR is vigilant about rules for local homeowners living near the water, but a huge project with the potential to create longterm damage to the ecosystem of the area is being actively considered. I would encourage your agency to just say no to this potential disaster of scale. The BWCA is famous for its fishing opportunities. Mercury is an ongoing concern in the area. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. Why would a public agency allow a known source of mercury pollution to conduct such a business in such a interconnected water rich area right next to the BWCA. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. It is easy to make pronouncements but what are the facts related to this type of mining. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. How will they be captured without liners. What happens when there is episodic flooding. Was an alternative explored by Polymet that does not impact wetland areas. It is irresponsible to gamble with the health of the region. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. Even 30-40 years is too much of an impact to the area. The burden should be on Polymet to design mining plans with no risk to the drinking water in the area. I am confident that you would not allow a homeowner to conduct a business in the BWCA area that would jeopardize his/her neighbor's well water. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. Too much has already been taken from the n

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anne 42498

Anne Calderwood PO Box 2244 Murphys, CA 95247 (also: 3496 N. Arm Road, Ely, MN 55731) March 7, 2014 Dear Mr Bruner, I urge you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. I urge you to stand up for the interests of the public and the known facts about this type of copper sulfide mining and the destruction to human and environmental health that it leaves behind. The BWCA and the clean water that is it's hallmark is a national treasure. My family owns property in the Ely area and spend time each summer enjoying the BWCA and surrounding lakes. Our drinking water comes directly from Burntside lake, and we eat the fish and wild rice from the local area. It seems ironic that the DNR is vigilant about rules for local homeowners living near the water, but a huge project with the potential to create longterm damage to the ecosystem of the area is being actively considered. I would encourage your agency to just say no to this potential disaster of scale. The BWCA is famous for it's fishing opportunities. Mercury is an ongoing concern in the area. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. Why would a public agency allow a known source of mercury pollution to conduct such a business in such a interconnected water rich area right next to the BWCA. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. It is easy to make pronouncements but what are the facts related to this type of mining. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. How will they be captured without liners. What happens when there is episodic flooding. Was an alternative explored by Polymet that does not impact wetland areas. It is irresponsible to gamble with the health of the region. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. Even 30-40 years is too much of an impact to the area. The burden should be on Polymet to design mining plans with no risk to the drinking water in the area. I am confident that you would not allow a homeowner to conduct a business in the BWCA area that would jeopardize his/her neighbor's well water. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. Too much has already been take

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anne Clark

40660

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Clean ground water is essential. Please don't risk something that can't be recovered, except by extraordinary means and centuries of time for short term prosperity. Sincerely, Anne Clark 708 N 1st St Minneapolis, MN 55401-1133

Anne Elizabeth Haugan

45022

To whom it may concern at the DNR Office . . . I am very opposed to PolyMet's proposal for copper/nickel mining in Minnesota's Arrowhead Region. It's a NO – BRAINER. Do we provide several hundred construction and mining jobs for a few hundred people for twenty to thirty years and pollute the watershed basin flowing into our great Lake Superior for hundreds of years, as well as polluting the air. Or protect this valuable watershed environment for hundreds of years. Another great concern is dealing with Poly Met, a small new company, which has little accountability and the likelihood of the mining operation being turned over to Glencore Xstrata. This scares me as Glencore Xstrata has a poor environmental record, as well as treating their employees unjustly. Let's find alternatives that will provide jobs to better the Northeastern Minnesota economy, such as the solar panel industry on the Iron Range, tourism industry, or forest products industry. Thank you for taking my comment, Anne Elizabeth Haugan 1161 Oakcrest Ave Roseville, MN 55113-3219 Phone: 651-484-3856

45041

To whom it may concern at the DNR Office . . . I am very opposed to PolyMet's proposal for copper/nickel mining in Minnesota's arrowhead. It's a "no-brainer". Do we provide several hundred mining jobs and construction jobs for a few hundred people for 20 to 30 years and pollute the watershed basin into the great Lake Superior for hundreds of years. or protect this valuable watershed environment for hundreds of years. Another great concern is dealing with PolyMet, a small new company, which has little accountability and the likelihood of the mining operation being turned over to Glencore Xstrata. This scares me as Glencore Xstrata has a very poor environmental record, as well as treating their employees unjustly. Let's find alternatives that will provide jobs to better the Northeastern Minnesota economy, such as the solar panel industry on the Iron Range, tourism industry, or forest products.

54905

See attachment

Anne Macaulay

54699

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

anne morrison 42907

anne nelson 42052

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, anne nelson minneapolis, Minnesota

Anne Simpson 48305

FYI

Anne Stewart Uehling 54775

See attachment

Anne Wetteland 54882

See attachment

Annette Anderson 38646

I believe that the Polymet Project would be safe for the environment and would have huge positive economic benefits. I support this project. Annette Anderson 323 Aspen Court Brainerd, MN 56401

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annette Heiberg

16225

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Annette Jaros

57169

I oppose sulfide mining in NE Minnesota because of appalling and costly long-term impacts on irreplaceable natural resources. Science supports you in putting a stop to this potential desecration. Please say "NO." Annette Jaros 3108 Minnesota Ave Duluth, MN 55802

Annette Price

40007

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Annette Price 1817 Ford Pkwy Apt 101 Saint Paul, MN 55116-2170

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annette Strom

39349

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Living in Duluth, I am so fortunate to have the largest surface area of freshwater nearly outside my door. We would like to keep our wonderful freshwater resources in this area. After over 30 years of clean up, we are almost able to say that the St Louis River is not polluting our great lake. That time period compared with 500 years seems quite small, and yet that clean up has affected all of us in this area. I also grew up during the time when we needed to drink bottled water due to the tailings in Lake Superior. It seems we should be more careful into the future with our water resources, especially when we already know about some of the ramifications. Sincerely, Ms Annette Strom 1512 Boulevard Pl Duluth, MN 55811-2719

Annie Bien

40320

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Annie Bien 29 Tiffany Place Brooklyn, NY 11231 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Carlin

37600

To Whom It May Concern; Copper cobalt mining has proven itself to be filthy and I am highly skeptical that this will be the first clean copper mine ever. Do not pollute our Great Lakes for imperial greed. My full name is Anne Carlin and mailing address is 6901 Hillcrest Lane Edina, MN 55435- It was the governments job in WV to monitor and maintain safe water for their civilians but they didn't and they still haven't. I do not support this copper cobalt mining venture and its highly probable irrevocable damage by exposing toxic contaminants to our water. Please do not allow this venture to proceed any further. Sincerely, Annie Carlin Sent from my iPhone

Annie Gardner

40055

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Annie Gardner 1906 1st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55403

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Gardner

40056

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are there

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Gardner

40057

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Gardner

40058

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Gardner

40059

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

57978

Sulfide mining is a dangerous and risky proposition for the future health of Northern Minnesota's environment. PolyMet has not shown that they can adequately protect Minnesota's environmental resources, especially our invaluable water resources. Mining is not good for the future of Minnesota. PolyMet cannot be trusted to complete its cleanup and financial responsibilities. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Annie Kieffer 42025

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Annie Kieffer St Charles, Minnesota

Annie McMahon 48166

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Annie McMahon 421 Geary Hgts. Dr Clarkdale, AZ 86324

Anonymous 15728

See attachment

15729

See attachment

15730

See attachment

15731

See attachment

15732

See attachment

15733

See attachment

15734

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anonymous 15735

See attachment

15736

See attachment

15737

See attachment

15738

See attachment

15739

See attachment

42572

See attachment

42573

See attachment

42574

See attachment

42575

See attachment

54111

No Way! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54112

I do not support the mining! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54114

B.S. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anonymous 54115

Baloney. I believe in protecting our water supply. Greedy companys only need pay fines when things go wrong. Copper mining is not mining. It's destruction. I believe in iron ore mining. Please stop putting the two mining types in the same category. Such a shameless ploy. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54151

NO! NO! Red Flag--Devastation, result of Anaconda Copper in Montana! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54159

Bewildered--200 & 500 year models/water containment & treatment/closings & cappings/bodies of water flowing into Lake Superior. Most of all--lead & aluminum--toxic metals for the young and old. I wish I could sign this postcard in regard to jobs & revenues--but I am not qualified to assess and I don't know who would be! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54171

Destroyed the RiverBecause of the EnvironmentBig Whole in the Ground, PollutionIt's a wonderful ecosystems for [ILLEGIBLE] animalsSpecial part of who Minnesotans doneSecond [ILLEGIBLE]Dear DNR, I don't think you guys would bid a mine only for your benefit and there is other places you can find copper in [ILLEGIBLE] just because that whole is going to be in the ground for the next 20 years and we'll have to deal with these problems years after that after closed and I think it's a wonderful ecosystem for the animals and it's a quiet, sacred place for Minnesotans and I think the word would look bad without any preservatives in nature environment. Also I'm against the mine is because of the pollution. The affects are environment would be negative and you could put it somewhere else.

54332

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager,I am writing to you because I would like you to know my opinion on the possible PGE mine being created by the Boundary Waters. I think you should allow this mine, because it would be of great benefit to our economy. But ...Since this is the first PGE mine in Minnesota, I think that we should be extra cautious and be extremely aware of the environment around the site of both the mine and the facility. Now, I know that PolyMet Mining, Inc. has already said that they will continually monitor both the water and the surrounding area. I also know that I am probably going to bring up the same points that countless others have already. I also acknowledge that you and your peers have probably already addressed this. But, I'll still bring them up anyway.I am concerned about the possible damages that the facility and the mine could do to the environment. I am also worried about the land that the Native Americans are connected to. I understand that the land is important to them. I know that in the treaties and other documents on your website, the mining company has said certain things concerning all of the concerns mentioned above.So, to finish up, I can see it going either way with the allowing of the mine. I think that both answers to the question of whether or not to allow the mine are okay by me. I will support whatever decision that you make regarding the mine, and I hope that your decision is the right one.Thank you for reading this, and for being so thorough with your investigation.An anonymous commentor

54333

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager,I don't think the PolyMet Mining has a good idea. The mining will just harm the environment not help it. It will take twenty years to mine the area. That is just too long to be doing that to the environment. The area is around a beautiful place of nature. The mining will just ruin it by destroying trees and most likely some wildlife along with many other things.You need a lot of money to clean the water after you are done mining and that will be years and years from now when we are done with that. We won't have the money to continue cleaning the water so we will just stop cleaning the water so then it will get polluted. If the water gets polluted then the environment will have a counter effect. The water is very important and that's what we need to live.There are others ways to have the things we have without fossil fuels. Instead of spending the money on the mining project we can just use the money to research solar power and other environmentally safe fuels.Thank you for taking my opinion in and using it for your decision.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anonymous 54562

I do not believe that this is a good idea. This is all about money, not jobs. We have to protect our resources, water soil etc.

Anschel Burk 39355

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness, ultimately threatening human lives, the Minnesota tourism industry to natural wonders like the Boundary Waters, and any other industries that depend at all on clean water. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Anschel Burk 300 N College St Northfield, MN 55057-4000

Anthony B 44965

This mining project is a possible and potential disaster. Please don't compromise our clean water for pollution at any coSt Thank you for your time. Anthony Brandenburg
Anthony B 433 Thomas Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55405

45607

Dear Ms Fay, This mining project is a possible and potential disaster. Please don't compromise our clean water for pollution at any coSt Thank you for your time. Anthony
Brandenburg Anthony B 433 Thomas Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55405

45608

This mining project is a possible and potential disaster. Please don't compromise our clean water for pollution at any coSt Thank you for your time. Anthony Brandenburg
Anthony B 433 Thomas Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55405

Anthony Bonadio 39224

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Anthony Bonadio 116 Boulder Dr Berea, OH 44017-3119

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anthony Hicks

41993

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Anthony Hicks St Paul, Minnesota

Anthony Taylor

54206

A majority of us believe that building a mine next to the only preserved native area is not a good (or smart) idea. It is the HABITAT of animals. They need the boundary waters they have nowhere to go. It is also the paradise of humans you can build a mine pretty much anywhere. You can't create a natural habitat. There are also people like me, who want to take their children there one day. In this day of age, nature is becoming rare. It is a place where you can see and feel what earth would be like without human interference I am not only talking for myself, but on the behalf of a majority. You can build a mine anywhere, but not true nature.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anthony Wolf

16180

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Anthony Wolf

17050

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Anthony Wolf 19998 200th st N Ulen, MN 56585

50323

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Anthony Wolf 19998 200th st N Ulen, MN 56585

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Antoinette Moran 406

The potential for the state to be stuck with >100years of clean-up plus the potential to harm important state water resources is just too great to justify a few hundred jobs for 20 years. Such a short term gain for potentially generations of harm. I am strongly opposed to this. Antoinette Moran, M.D. Professor and Division Chief University of Minnesota Pediatric Endocrinology East Bldg Rm MB671 2450 Riverside Ave (Fed Ex/UPS--2414 South 7th St) Minneapolis, MN 55455 [HYPERLINK "mailto:moran001@umn.edu"](mailto:moran001@umn.edu) moran001@umn.edu phone 612-624-5409; FAX 612-626-5262

Antonia Cristofaro-hark 15752

See attachment

54851

See attachment

apeterson8083@yahoo.com 45146

You would be fools to even consider any further, the detrimental damage polymet and sulfide mining would have on our aquafor. There has never been a sulfide mine proven safe. We the people of Minnesota, want to protect our clean water. This project is too expensive in the long run, for clean up. Why sacrifice our water for a few temporary jobs. It doesn't make sense. Promote recycling for precious metals, quit mining.

April Hughes-Brauner 43726

Concerning the Polymet mining project in NE Minnesota: Given that the mine in question is in one of Minnesota's most scenic and pristine areas, where water is of such abundance and purity I would like to voice opinion to the mine, especially of the threat to native flora and fauna, wild rice in particular. -Sharon Campbell 2101 Island View Drive NE Bemidji, MN 56601

Archie K Benham 47364

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, FACTS: The ENVIRONMENT is ****not**** more important than the ECONOMY. Climate change and global warming are real issues. Pressing issues. The world does not need to farm Copper/Nickel anymore. Recycling can handle the demand. The CONS ****far**** outweigh the pros. I do not want to take away from Minnesota's healthy environment. WE WILL LOSE A PART OF OUR GREAT STATE. I SAY, NO, TO MINING.. Sincerely, Archie K Benham 3928 Abbott Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410 Sincerely, Mr Archie K Benham 3928 Abbott Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1037

Ariane Norrgard 57465

As a concerned citizen of Duluth and the surrounding area I am commenting on my position against PolyMet Mining. If citizens of this community allow companies to mine copper and nickel at the expense of clean water, we are setting the stage for years to come. Fresh water is a more valuable, precious resource that will provide more wealth to Minnesota in the far future. PolyMet mining hinders Minnesota's ability to use water resources because of the detrimental effects copper nickel mining has on water and wild rice. Please consider protecting the boundary waters area, Lake Superior, and water quality as a whole by not allowing PolyMet (or companies like PolyMet) to operate within our region. Thank you, Ariane Norrgard 1615 E 2nd St Duluth MN, 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Arlene Renshaw

16252

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Arlene Roth

16005

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Arlo Cristofaro-Hark

54852

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Arly Piri

40346

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Arly Piri 1027 16th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414 US

Armand Ball

41095

March 9, 2013 To: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Environmental Review Unit, 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the mining plan for Polymet's NorthMet Mine. I cannot fathom why the State of Minnesota would provide a permit for this mining plan. I lived in Minnesota for many years and directed a children's camp in Ely area and though retired now I return to the area to relive those years. This is an area of unique natural resources and belongs to all of the citizens of the USA for their pleasure. From my viewpoint it is apparent that such mining would: pose human health risks through contamination of drinking water and fish, seriously degrade the St Louis River, destroy wild rice and irreplaceable wetland habitat, and harm Lake Superior that holds 10 percent of the world's fresh water. The precedent set and the ramifications of this project transcend short-term economic concerns. provide a significant risk in the watersheds receiving the drainage from Polymet's waste rock and tailings complexes, given that two million tons of sulfur would be brought to the surface during mining, result in unacceptable and long-term water quality impacts, which exceed water quality standards All of this for a foreign corporation whose stated goal is to provide the first eight years of copper produced to China, without any plan to meet domestic needs in our country. How strange. How unnecessary when the promise of jobs constitutes non-union jobs that carry the possibility of unknown periods of layoffs and a terminal time period. Armand Ball 16502 Cypress Villa Lane Fort Myers Florida 33908

Armando Santos

54203

I am writing this letter to recommend not to do the mining. The reason for this are because it's going to destroy the beauty of the land, its going to slowly destroy the wilderness, and our water pH level will decrease. Our planet is damaged enough already and destroying the wilderness or turning the water into sulfuric acid just to mind copper and nickel is [ILLEGIBLE] have heart to think about the animals that are going to affected! Those animals also deserve to live peacefully. We humans have destroyed enough land and token away a lot of land that a lot of animals are forced to leave to find another home and many die! PLEASE DON'T DO THIS!

Arno A Kahn

54801

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Art Dale 42522

See attachment

Art Lind 18131

Good evening. My name is Art Lind. I'm a lifelong Iron Ranger, born and raised in Hibbing. I've been working in the mining industry for over 52 years already. I graduated from Hibbing High School in 1963; graduating class at that time was 325, about. Also in about 1963, happened to be the year that they passed the Taconite Tax Relief Act which spawned massive investments in this region to build six taconite plants. Jobs were everywhere by 1965 and people that had once moved away started to return. People with teaching degrees were taking jobs as laborers in the area of taconite plants because the jobs paid better. Our economy was vibrant and the young people were everywhere. Well, the world has changed. We have to -- we have to compete with many manufacturing and mining jobs that are now being done in third-world countries under some of the worst job conditions imaginable with little regard for human health or the environment. Graduating classes in Hibbing today are about 150. You have to have good-paying jobs to support young families. Tourism? Yeah, we like tourism. Tourism wouldn't make a pimple on a mining job's behind when you compare the economics each of those jobs produces. On the horizon is the next era of mining and the top-paying jobs that will come with the development of one of the world's largest deposits of precious metals. I guess I'm part of the silent majority, most of which have left now. Let's see. I lost my place. I guess I'm getting tired of listening to the anti-mining group whose main focus seems to be to stop any mining development. You keep talking about 200 to 500 years of water treatment. It doesn't say that. It doesn't say the treatment will be 500 years. It says, "Treatment will be determined using measured results," which is the way the law is designed to responsibly handle it. The 200- to 500-year timeframes used in the SDEIS model represents the durations that models were run, not to predict how long treatment would be needed. Read page 39 and then take a good look at your life. If you drive a car, have electricity, buy groceries, have a cell phone, a computer or go to the clinic or hospital; everything we do is touched in some way by these metals. If you can't grow it, you've got to dig it out of the ground. I would venture a guess that those against this project have just as big an environmental footprint as everyone else and they enjoy the quality of the life these metals help to provide. Does that make them hypocritical? In the news yesterday it was reported that 10 percent of the air pollution on the west coast of this country comes from China. We can do this project right. Our mining industries operate under the strictest environmental regulations anywhere in the world, and we have all these agencies to watch over them. We need this project.

Art W 43384

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Art W 830 S. Winthrop St StPaul, MN 55119

ARTHUR 5936

Most people do not realize the value that mining brings to their everyday life and the historical development of this country, especially those that are opposed to the development of this particular project as it is in "their back yard". They take for granted the conveniences as though they are picked from the sky when in fact most are derivatives of mining processes in one way or another. All mining has some risk. Since Polymet's inception 10 years ago, many tens of millions of dollars have been invested, not only by Polymet, but the State of Minnesota and the Federal Agencies to process the best environmental alternatives known in modern technology to be the best that we can be. Not to utilize this vast resource and the economic benefits they will provide and allow the metals to be mined somewhere in the world not as attentive as Minnesota is HYPOCRITICAL. I support Mining and Mining supports me. We need this project. This State needs this project. The Country needs this project. Art Lind 3904 5th Ave E. Hibbing, Mn 55746 Cell: 218-969-6169

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Arthur Dorman

2997

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. With unknown outcomes, it is essential for us to err on the side of caution, requiring total thoroughness in studying the matter, and total transparency in reports. Until that occurs, and unless the results of such study are that there is no danger to water quality, soil integrity, and wildlife populations, there should be not action. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Arthur Dorman 817 Orange Ave W Saint Paul, MN 55117-4028 (651) 487-3793

52162

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. With unknown outcomes, it is essential for us to err on the side of caution, requiring total thoroughness in studying the matter, and total transparency in reports. Until that occurs, and unless the results of such study are that there is no danger to water quality, soil integrity, and wildlife populations, there should be not action. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Arthur Dorman 817 Orange Ave W Saint Paul, MN 55117-4028 (651) 487-3793

Arthur Marble

41873

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Arthur Marble Edina, Minnesota

Asher

54721

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ashley Briscoe

14664

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ashley ferguson

43134

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

43135

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ashley ferguson

43137

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

47700

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ashley ferguson

47809

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

47811

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ashley ferguson

47812

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, ashley ferguson 12th st duluth, MN 55806

Ashley Williams

42000

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ashley Williams Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Astrid Yankosky

16556

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Astrid Yankosky 330 Marshall Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102

49973

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Astrid Yankosky 330 Marshall Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Atlas Lincoln 42549

See attachment

Audrey Burmeister 18935

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Audrey Burmeister 8708 41st Ave N. New Hope, MN 55427, MN 55427 612 280 5707

Audrey Cullen 18300

Audrey Cullen. My statement is I don't think this is a responsible project. There is too much inherent risk involved with polluting the best watershed in this country. There is a drought in the western part of this country that is going to soon be escalating to the point of a crisis, and if we really want to do a commodity depletion or removal, it should be our clean water. It shouldn't be destroying our environment to get things that we can get by recycling (phonetic). I am also asking the DNR, the Forest Service, and all governing agencies that are involved in this to think about the future generations. Who out of that governmental agency is going to be around in 500 years to make sure everything is good? Not one of us breathing at this moment is going to be here. Who is going to take care of the future generations? Also, I think that it is very arrogant just to think about our own species. There is frogs, birds, deer, fish, moose, lynx, cougars, skunk, raccoons, et cetera, et cetera, that all depend on land. Why are we able to go in and tear it apart for our inability to conserve anything as a people? I'm just asking them to be wise versus short-sighted, myopic. I think I have gone on long enough. Thank you so much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Audrey Fairchild-Ehm

15581

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Audrey Glassman

39568

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Audrey Glassman 2120 Aldrich Ave S Apt 202 Minneapolis, MN 55405-3099 (612) 870-7157

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Audrey Haynes

10337

Dear Lisa Fay, I am writing to you to inform you that I strongly oppose sulfide mining in Northern MN. I worked in Northern Minnesota for many years. I am very familiar with the area. In addition, I am a graduate student in Environmental Science. I have a lot of experience with the consequences of mining in natural areas and I know the damage that projects, such as this one, can have on natural resources. The Boundary Waters of Minnesota are a state treasure, which draw tourists not only from the Twin Cities but all over the country. I can personally attest to that, as I have travelled from California many times to paddle the Boundary Waters. Throwing away the natural beauty, a large source of income and state pride, in favor of the temporary income from mining is foolish and shortsighted. Moving forward with mining without a comprehensive and realistic Environmental Impact Assessment, and plan for what to do with the mining waste is, again, shortsighted. Sulfide mining could cost the state more in damages and waste removal than it is even worth. Letting the sulfide mining proposal go through is an irreversible decision- and not worth the unknown risks. Again, I urge you to consider this issue. Say no to sulfide mining. Audrey Haynes [HYPERLINK "mailto:audreyhaynes@berkeley-edu"](mailto:audreyhaynes@berkeley-edu)audreyhaynes@berkeley-edu 510-316-1334

audrey jiricko

44117

Dear Ms Fay, As as a frequent traveler to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, I have significant concerns about the proposed North Met SDEIS mining and land exchange project. Twice a year, I travel from Utah with my husband and children to Ely, MN to enjoy the unique beauty and wildlife of the area. When one looks at the history of sulfide mining, there is no reason to believe that there won't be serious negative environmental impacts that will last decades if not centuries to come. From an economic standpoint, any short term gain for Polymet and addition of some jobs in the immediate future will be negated by longterm negative environmental and economic impact when the environment including something as precious as water quality is damaged. What is the chance that decades from the mining of the desired material, the company will still be around to take responsibility and continue to try to clean up the surrounding area. History tells us not a chance. Additionally, as a obstetrician/gynecologist, I have even more concerns about the heavy metals and toxic chemicals which will certainly impact the reproductive health of women living in the area as well as the development of embryos/fetuses. More and more evidence is pointing towards significant negative impact of reproductive and developmental health from these toxins. A lack of information regarding the specific pollutants may lead to catastrophic outcomes for individual women in the area. Overall, the project appears to focus on short term gain while ignoring significant negative long term impacts. More time is needed to investigate fully the potential outcomes for Minnesotans and the citizens throughout the world who travel to visit your beautiful state. Thank you for considering all viewpoints. Sincerely, Audrey Jiricko, M.D.

audrey kramer

40083

Attention DNR: The company chosen to head this overwhelming project is not trustworthy. Tell them to look elsewhere for their mining projects. We need the untainted water, forests, environment of northern Minnesota to stay in tact. Think West Virginia. WE CAN DO BETTER .. Just say, "NO ." Audrey in Chanhassen

Audrey/Dennis M

39318

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit The North Met SDEIS should be rejected for a number of reasons. The computer model shows that the water seepage will pollute for at least 500 years and must be treated for the entire time. This is totally unrealistic to expect this to happen. PolyMet is asking to be allowed to run a 500 years experiment that has never been tried before. PolyMet is a company with no mining experience and no substantial financial backing. The financial assurances for hundreds of years ate not addressed in the SDEIS. This must be corrected. In addition the computer model is known to have been run with incorrect water flow information. The water flow was greatly underestimated requiring the analysis the be completely redone Dennis J. Peterson 3458 N Rangeline Rd Gheen, MN 55771 218-787-2302 [HYPERLINK "mailto:audrey.dennis@gmail-com"](mailto:audrey.dennis@gmail-com)audrey.dennis@gmail-com

Audubon Minnesota

42897

Dear Ms Fay, Please accept, attached, comments on behalf of 17,000 Audubon Minnesota members on the PolyMet NorthMet Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. Thank you for distributing them to the relevant agencies for consideration. Don Arnosti Policy Director Audubon Minnesota Mississippi River Flyway 612-718-3626 cell

Alphabetical by sender's first name

August W Haugan

57230

I am concerned that leaching from the sulfides in the pit, waste rock, and tailings from the proposed PolyMet copper-nickel mine cannot be effectively contained after the mine is decommissioned. I request that you not approve the required permits for this project. Furthermore, if permits are approved this could set a precedent for possible approvals of the Twin Metals projects and the leaching from those projects, could be disastrous for the BWCA watershed. August W. Haugan 1161 Oakcrest Ave Roseville, MN 55113

Avery Jorgenson

54343

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Polymet Mining seems to have a very set plan in place. I think that this plan is a good well thought plan because they are doing the best they can to not change to much of the surroundings. Personally I think the copper-sulfate mining will benefit MN. I think that it will benefit us by helping create a better environment and also finding better ways to get the resources we need. There are many advantages to the mining process. Some of these are getting some of the resources like copper, mixed nickel and copper, and PGE to be more abundant. As there are many advantages that also brings the disadvantages. Some of them being that wildlife will be affected by the mining process. Also, that some of the land open to public is going to turn private. This process will also affect the cultural resources greatly. Ways being, fish, plants, and animal species being affect either positive or negative. This project will also affect the people that are living in this area. I agree with the land exchange. I agree because I think that Polymet is trying their best to make it fair but still get the resources they need to continue with this project. The Net will gain or increase most of the needed land and material from this land exchange. This project will impact or affect a lot of people. However, I do not think that this project will end up being an impact on me. Sincerely, 8th grade student Avery Jorgenson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Avesa Rockwell

14847

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

B Erickson

38678

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed cooper nickel mining in north eastern Minnesota. I am frightened of the contamination. That beautiful region of our state generates 1-6 billion in tourism. Let's protect and preserve a national treasure. We had the good sense to preserve it in the paSt Let's not gouge away our future recreational areas. Betty Erickson 5500 164th Lane NW Ramsey MN 55303 [HYPERLINK "mailto:bjoe48@gmail-com"bjoe48@gmail-com](mailto:bjoe48@gmail-com)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

B Graves

43114

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River waters "would continue in perpetuity." One peer-reviewed study found that, while all projects that were reviewed predicted they would not pollute, at least 76 percent of the time they still did. The same study found that 89 percent of mines that have polluted said they would not. It is this history that is one of the biggest reasons for worry about proposals to bring the mining to Minnesota. The industry says they won't pollute our prized waters, but they've said that before, and they've been wrong more often than not. The Brohm Mine, mentioned above, is also a useful illustration of this problem. There, the mining company assured the state that the mine would not produce acid mine drainage because the ore was low in sulfides, around one percent average. The mine still created terrible pollution, killing all the fish in that stream turned acidic. This is an important point, because the mining industry in Minnesota frequently states that because the ore here is low sulfide, it won't cause acid mine drainage. Taxpayers left holding the bag Confronted with astronomical clean-up costs and battered by a volatile metals market with frequent boom-and-bust cycles, mining companies often abandon their polluted mines, walking away and leaving taxpayers holding the bag. Although Minnesota requires mining companies to provide financial assurances to fund cleanup if the company goes bankrupt or is otherwise unable to perform the work itself, it is very difficult to predict the extent of the pollution and resultant cleanup costs. Also, assets of bankrupt mining companies are often awarded to other creditors. The industry's track record of not paying to clean up its messes is long and shameful. A few examples include: Zortman-Landusky Mine, Montana – \$33 million and counting Summitville Mine, Colorado – \$185 million and \$1-5 million/year Grouse Creek Mine, Idaho – \$53 million Solution: The Minnesota legislature needs to first pass a bill similar to Wisconsin's "Prove It First" law that, before opening a mine, a company must be able to point to a similar mine to what it is proposing that a) has operated for 10 years without polluting and b) has been closed for 10 years without polluting. Major problems of the SDEIS Evaluation (1) Mercury is a huge concern. The Minnesota Health Department found 10% of infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS

B H Flora

45472

Hello DNR, Let's get to the core of the issue. Who stands to benefit monetarily far greater of all interested parties. It is the Chinese. Do we here in America want to sacrifice our natural resources and jeopardize our future human habitat in order to supply minerals to the Chinese. No. It is time that NE Minnesotans move toward a regional future that doesn't include this kind of eco-unfriendly, shortsighted enterprise. Did you know that: 1) PolyMet would require hundreds of years of expensive treatment of polluted water, 2) PolyMet would destroy thousands of acres of habitat used by threatened moose and lynx, 3) PolyMet's mine plan lacks analysis of human health impacts from mercury and asbestos-like fibers, and 4) PolyMet's studies contain inaccurate water data that need to be corrected. It's too risky and does not pass a Minnesota smell test Bert Flora ===== B H Flora 5336 26th Av S Minneapolis, MN 55417 612-210-1614 bert.flora@outlook-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

b mayler

40419

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, b mayler po box 1012 yelm, WA 98597 US

b wagner

39540

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. One idea if the mine does open: any and all profit from the mine goes into a trust fund to pay for any damages and clean up that is caused by the mine. Once the water and any other environmental damage(s) is fixed, then PolyMet can have what's left in the trust. B Wagner Sincerely, Ms b wagner 1471 Hague Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-6727

Alphabetical by sender's first name

B. J. Alexis

35452

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.- TOO DANGEROUS FOR THE GREAT LAKES. West Virginia, North Carolina, how many others have been damaged for years to come due to some form of mining or chemicals for mining. That should provide more than enough evidence to prevent any mining on or near the Great Lakes. Including but not limited to, they couldn't even figure out how to shut down the spill in North Carolina-it was shut down by pure accident when the platform they were to use to figure out how to shut down the pipe spilling chemicals collapsed by accident thereby collapsing the pipe and shutting down the flow. WE DO NOT WANT AND CANNOT AFFORD THESE KIND OF SPILLS ON THE GREAT LAKES. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, B. J. Alexis
2204 Oxford St Rockford, IL 61103-4163 (815) 968-7565

Backcountry Hunters & Anglers

50932

--- Forwarded Message --- From: David Lien <dlien2@yahoo-com> To: "NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 7:59 PM Subject: PolyMet SDEIS Comments Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Please accept these comments (attached) on the PolyMet Mining NorthMet Project SDEIS from the Minnesota Backcountry Hunters and Anglers (BHA). Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, David A. Lien Co-Chair, Minnesota Backcountry Hunters and Anglers The Sportsman's Voice for Our Wild Public Lands, Waters and Wildlife HYPERLINK "<http://www.backcountryhunters-org/>"www.backcountryhunters-org HYPERLINK "<http://www.facebook-com/backcountryhabitat>"www.facebook-com/backcountryhabitat HYPERLINK "<https://www.facebook-com/pages/Backcountry-Hunters-Anglers/148205145252473>"Like us on Facebook. HYPERLINK "https://twitter-com/#%21/Backcountry_H_A"Follow us on Twitter

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bailey Rehnberg

39376

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion on the SDEIS, as it has major flaws that must be addressed. Most importantly, the pollution of water sources is unacceptable. Drainage and toxic run-off into the St Louis River and ultimately Lake Superior is both a hazard to local inhabitants and a dangerous long-term decision. Water has become one of the most precious resources in the world and we must recognize both its crucial importance and its finite nature. We cannot afford, figuratively or financially, to pollute our healthy waters. The lack of financial assurances provided by Poly Met is also extremely concerning to me. After 20 years of mining, the taxpaying citizens of Minnesota deserve a detailed financial plan for how Poly Met will ensure 500+ years of water treatment. The fact that these assurances have not made it into the SDEIS scares me as a Minnesota resident and tells me that this company is not looking out for our best interest This issue is not a matter of the environment versus jobs in terms of economic interests, and I want to stress the overall financial stupidity of this project. Lastly, this mine would set a horrific precedent for both the health of Minnesota's wildlife and wilderness areas across the country. Please do not allow Minnesota to be part of this short-term economic project that will create pollution for hundreds of years to areas of beautiful and precious wilderness. Thank you for considering these changes that must be made to the SDEIS. These components of the Poly Met proposal, as well as countless others, should ultimately reveal the extreme negative effects that this mining would have on our waterways, our wilderness areas, and our pocketbooks. Sincerely, Ms Bailey Rehnberg 1600 Grand Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1801

Banny Lesar

42547

See attachment

Barb Cooper

52181

To whom it may concern, In my opinion, you should NOT approve the permit to start sulfide mining. Many factors need to be addressed. *The money for any potential cleanup after mining needs to be in a secure financial institution BEFORE the mining starts. *It wont hurt anything to wait until all the questions are answered *The "what ifs" on toxic effects to water are still unknown and cant be fixed quickly once it starts to happen Thanks for your time, Barb Cooper 10125 Bandana Lake Rd Isabella, MN 55607

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barb Landes 43239

To:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us I would like to respectfully register my opposition to the proposed Copper mining project. While my rationale stems from a sincere appreciation for the natural beauty of the area and a strong desire to see it protected, I also have substantive rationale for my objection to the project. 1- The Environmental Impact study has not adequately addressed the elevated levels of sulfate and metals such as copper, cobalt, and nickel. The potential presence of mercury is also a threat to water based organisms 2- The amount of wetlands at risk (913 acres) is too great to warrant the minimal benefits of the project. 3- The minimal number of jobs promised by this project is not worth the permanent damage likely to be done to the natural resources of this area. 4- The minimal compensation promised for the workers to be hired is not worth the damage likely to be done to the natural resources of this area. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Barb Landes landesbj@frontier-com 14398 Embassy Way Apple Valley, MN 55124

Barb LaVigne 39319

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders. I co-own the Angry Trout Cafe on the harbor in Grand Marais, MN. We employ over 60 people and cater primarily to tourists interested in wilderness and the pristine beauty of our area. I am very concerned about the PolyMet Mine Plan. We can not gamble our future for the promises of questionable environmental protection and short term jobs. This is just crazy. The reason many support PolyMet is that they were left jobless after iron mining's boom and bust Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS and deny them permits. Clean water is the basis of our economy in NE Minnesota. PolyMet's plan puts my business at risk. There is no room for error here. Sincerely, Barb LaVigne Owner, Angry Trout Cafe P.O. Box 973 Grand Marais, Mn 55604

Barb Manns 38950

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Barb Manns 15941 Ebony St NW Ramsey, MN 55303-6901

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barb Schilling

15969

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Barb Swanson

10762

Hello, Please hear my vote against any sulfide-ore mining in northeastern MN. It will have unacceptable environmental impacts and should not be allowed in the sulfide-bearing Duluth Complex from the Boundary Waters to beyond Lake Superior. Thank you for listening. Richard L. Swanson 308 Grove Place Hopkins, MN 55343 651-231-9682

11360

Please hear my voice against sulfide-ore mining in northeastern MN. It will have unacceptable environmental impacts and should not be allowed in the sulfide-bearing Duluth Complex from the Boundary Waters to beyond Lake Superior. Thank you for listening. Barbara E. Swanson 308 Grove Place Hopkins, MN 55343 952-938-5000

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barb VonBenken 29372

I will be out of the office Thursday (2/27/14) through Monday (3/3/14) and will not be checking emails during this time. I will respond to your email on Tuesday (3/4/14). If you need assistance before my return, please contact my assistant, Doris Ardo, at dardo@zarembagroup.com. ~ Thank you. _____

***** The information contained in this e-mail transmission is intended solely for the addressee and may be privileged or confidential. Therefore, any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by e-mail reply. Thank you.

Barb Wiklund 47376

As a person who was born in Virginia, MN and whose family owns lake property in Britt and a tree farm in Angora I urge you to approve the Polymet mining project. I am an avid outdoors person who enjoys fishing, hunting and other activities outside and appreciate the beauty of our area. However I also believe that we, who choose to live up north, also need industry. I believe that the SEIS had been thoroughly prepared and reviewed and demonstrates that industry and environment can co-exist and thrive. Please consider this a vote for Polymet for both of us. Respectfully submitted, Jeffrey and Barb Wiklund 6705 McQuade Rd Duluth, MN. 55804

Barbara A. Haack 21171

Dear DNR: It is with great concern that I am sending this email regarding Poly Met's proposed mining in northern Minnesota. After reading about the project the following information supported my decision that a email must be sent: 1) It appears foreign countries are the promoters (Canada and Swiss) and not the United States. 2) The main jobs are to be given not to Minnesotans but to imported professionals therefore providing only minimum income for the people of our state. 3) Poly Met mining experience of this type is limited therefore Poly Met could end up losing money and filing bankruptcy leaving the tax payers of Minnesota to pay the bill for all clean-ups (especially water pollution). 4) Permitting this type of mining operation opens the door to other companies who can use this permission to say, "You granted permission before, how can you refuse us." The treasure we have in our northern water, soil, and air should never be taken for granted. Once gone it cannot be restored. Please consider my sincere concerns for the future of Minnesota having been born and raised here. I am 78 years old. Thank you. Barbara A. Haack 36815 Country Road 15 St Peter, MN 56082

Barbara Adams 28242

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Any potential gain from jobs or what the industry provides must be offset by the cost and loss it could potentially cause. If only those PR-like proposals and income/jobs charts and graphs by companies were mandated to show costs for clean-up and recovery, there would be a very different presentation and bottom line. And a very different legacy that politicians would be asked to make by signing any approval this PolyMet project. The fate of the environment is in your hands. Sincerely, Barbara Adams 5100 Montebello Cir Richmond, VA 23231-3516 (804) 222-2955

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Bottger

14850

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Barbara Bower

40212

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Bower 8053 40th Ave Brainerd, MN 56401-1740

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Bridges

57942

Please do not accept mitigation as an answer to unknown future impact. Let's preserve our precious "Land of 10,000 Lakes." Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Barbara Brockway

39995

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Brockway 233 Nichols Ct Shoreview, MN 55126-2338 (999) 999-9999

Barbara Burkhart

48123

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: "PolyMet's water pollution from the permanent mines site waste rock pile would need treatment for at least 200 years and pollution from the tailings piles would require treatment for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping out of the mine pits would "continue in perpetuity." Forever." ~Water Legacy. So, in other words, for a couple decades of a small number of people having a job, we're willing to let this company saddle generations centuries into the future with the consequences. Classy. I can't even imagine what the people 500 years from now will think of us and our greedy, shortsighted generation. Will they starve because they can't eat the fish or the wild rice. Will they have birth defects due to the chemicals and toxins in the water. What about the people who are alive today, who depend on the fish, land, water, and wild rice as part of their livelihood. Are we saying that big business is more important than our rights as citizens to clean water, clean air, and sensible land-management. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Barbara Burkhart Barbara Burkhart 3501 - 15th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407

Barbara Crow

42603

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Curphy 19963

Hello. I am a Wisconsin resident with summer recreational lake property on Cadotte Lake in Minnesota. I have many questions and concerns regarding the current EIS surrounding this project. Attending the forum at the DECC, some of my questions were answered most not. I am very concerned about the lack of knowledge of this type of mining. What kind of clean up will be needed. The amount of sulfuric acid into the ground water. The 500 year plan for clean up That is just too bizarre to comment on. I was born and raised in MN. The land and water is like no other. I pay taxes in MN, I work in MN. I have boats registered there. We have discontinued all further development of our property until this is figured out. Please reconsider the continuation of this EIS and the project until we can comfortably say this mining will not now or ever damage our beautiful land and water. Thank you, Barbara Curphy 4989 S. Rockmont Rd Poplar, WI. 54864 Sent from my iPad

Barbara Downham 39751

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Downham 4141 Arbor Ln Eagan, MN 55122-2893 (651) 454-2818

Barbara Durbin 42822

See attachment

barbara erickson 46649

To Whom it Concerns at the MN DNR and State of MN: I am opposed to copper/nickel mining in MN. I am opposed to a foreign company mining on our soil China has a poor history of protecting its environment and people. Water is a huge natural resource, and in shortage worldwide. It is only going to get worse as time goes by. We should protect a very important resource for the planet as well as humans. In the short run this allows us to continue tourism to a very pristine place. In the long run it protects generations. The decisions we have made in the last 100 years have decimated the planet. 20 years of jobs for what this will do to the land, air and water, is shortsighted. It will not provide a man or family with a lifetime of work and wages. Please do the right thing, not the shortsighted money decision. Thank you for opening this to the Citizens. Barbara Erickson 104 West 36th St Minneapolis, MN. 55408

Barbara Fleishman 17662

Thank you. I don't want to lose anymore of these precious birds d/t environmentally unsound practices by humans.. On Sat, Feb 15, 2014 at 5:53 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record - Barbara Fleishman

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Fleishman

17664

Feb 15, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Fleishman 5522 Century Ave Apt 4 Middleton, WI 53562-2029

Barbara Garett

24482

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please, please think long and hard about the consequences of the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. This type of contamination can have drastic effects on future generations of humans and animals, even to the point of extinction of species. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest It MUST be prevented. It is incomprehensible for a project of this nature to be planned for PROTECTED NATIONAL FOREST LAND. Sincerely, Barbara Garett 13384 Ravine View Dr Grand Haven, MI 49417-9165 (616) 847-3576

barbara goodman-fischtrom

38897

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms barbara goodman-fischtrom 5600 Mahoney Ave Minnetonka, MN 55345-5119 (952) 975-0065

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Hughes

39069

---Original Message--- From: dlhuskins@hotmail-com [mailto:dlhuskins@hotmail-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 8:37 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, barbara hughes 2624 Windsor Ln Saint Paul, MN 55125-2792

Barbara Imes

42624

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Janssen

9963

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Barbara Janssen 7356 Quantico Ln. N. Maple Grove, MN 55311

18719

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Barbara Janssen 7356 Quantico Ln. N. Maple Grove, MN 55311

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Janssen

50794

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Barbara Janssen 7356 Quantico Ln. N. Maple Grove, MN 55311

Barbara Johns

40298

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Barbara Johns 693 Yorktown Road Lewisberry, PA 17339 US

Barbara Jones

42541

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Kantola 38839

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Barbara Kantola 835 Platt St Niles, MI 49120-1535

Barbara Kittinger 48155

See attachment

54804

See attachment

Barbara Mathes 40991

Mar 9, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mrs Barbara Mathes 1431 Alisa Ct Rio Rico, AZ 85648-1062

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Monks

39129

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms barbara monks 420 Minnie St Trlr 5 Paynesville, MN 56362-1800

39165

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Monks 420 Minnie St Trlr 5 Paynesville, MN 56362-1800

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Naber

39573

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the TIME. ine should not be built as described. NO PROJECTS OF ANY SIZE SHOULD BE APPROVED TO GO FORWARD UNLESS CLEAN ENERGY IS USED. IT IS CRAZY WHAT HAS BEEN ALLOWED IN THE PAST 50 YEARS. IT DOE NOT TAKE A COLLEGE EDUCATION TO KNOW AND SEE ALL THE DAMAGE DONE IN THIS SPAN OF TIME. THESE GREEDY PERSONS MUST NOT HAVE GRANDCHILDREN THEY CARE ABOUT. .. PLEASE CONSIDER WHAT IS HAPPENING TO ALL HUMANITY BY MANY BAD DECISIONS. THANK YOU. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Naber 723 Evergreen Ct Burnsville, MN 55337-4672 (952) 210-8021

Barbara Nelson

42768

See attachment

Barbara Peterson

7153

I believe PolyMet has done their due diligence and has provided a detailed and thorough SDEIS. I feel they are responsible and capable of managing this project. This study proves they are committed to the environment. The number of jobs PolyMet would create would be a huge benefit to the Iron Range and increase the tax base which in turn benefits our local economy. Including families, schools, and merchants. This is a project that the Range hasn't seen the likes of in decades. It's time to put Iron Rangers to work and prove to the rest of the country that we can do this right. Barbara Peterson 401 Douglas Ave Eveleth, Minnesota 55734 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Barbara Raye

42034

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Barbara Raye Mpls, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Ritter 57245

I am concerned about the impact the proposed mine will have on the state's water. The plan for treating polluted water does not have enough detail. How will this be paid for in the future? Is having polluted water for hundreds of years a reasonable by product of this mine? Please don't sacrifice our water resource for the mine. Barbara Ritter 2117 Sioux Blvd New Brighton, MN 55112

Barbara Ronningen 44833

I am totally opposed to the Polymet project in northern Minnesota. To me, the risks are too great in a pristine environment. I am more concerned about the rush job the DNR has taken on comments. I agree with the Minnesota 2020 piece on the very short comment period. See http://www.mn2020hindsight-org/view/trust-me-the-polymet-comment-period-was-too-short.utm_source=emailandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=polymet Makes one wonder who's pushing this - citizens, environmentalists or more likely Polymet. BJR Afton, MN Laughter is the sun that drives winter from the human face. Victor Hugo [HYPERLINK "http://www.goodreads-com/author/show/1673-Thomas_Jefferson"](http://www.goodreads-com/author/show/1673-Thomas_Jefferson) Barbara J Ronningen, Chair 2014 NALS Show <http://allstarlilies-org/> July 9-13 in Bloomington, MN

Barbara Sellers 45687

Dear Ms Fay: 1- Polymet's mine plan fails to address mitigating the environmental impact of the mine by using underground mining, rather than open-pit mining. If the financial cost is currently too great to justify underground mining, the metals should be left in the ground until the demand for them justifies the cost of underground mining. 2- The precious metals that Polymet proposes to mine would currently be available in sufficient quantities if previously-mined metals were reclaimed and recycled. Polymet's mine plan fails to address mitigating its environmental impact by reclaiming and recycling previously-mined metals instead of digging any mine, whether underground or open pit. Thank you. Barbara S. Sellers 1875 Juliet Avenue St Paul, MN 55105 [HYPERLINK "mailto:BarbaraSellers1947@msn-com"](mailto:BarbaraSellers1947@msn-com) BarbaraSellers1947@msn-com

Barbara Snyder 58063

This type of project is just nonsense - big money destroying our state! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Barbara Stamp 40006

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Stamp 6901 W 84th St Apt 216 Bloomington, MN 55438-1188

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Stamp 52293

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Barbara Stamp 6901 W 84th St Bloomington, MN 55438

Barbara Teawalt 23422

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Teawalt 11234 Isanti Ct NE Blaine, MN 55449-6113 (763) 780-4691

Barbara Walker 14210

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I despair at how often, with regard to safeguarding our environment and wildlife, our country engages in repeated forgetfulness, denial, rationalization, negligence, spite. Mining results in toxins that almost always eventually leak or leach or belch into our waterways, soils, air. Enough.. As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Barbara Walker 5450 Windsong Ct Morrison, CO 80465-2177

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barbara Wirth

16942

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Barbara Wirth 4834 33rd Ave s. minneapolis, MN 55417

51034

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Barbara Wirth 4834 33rd Ave s. minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barry Babcock 39440

The Polymet non-ferrous sulfide mining proposal should not be allowed. The lakes and rivers in N MN are a national asset. Few if any states have the abundance of relatively clean waters we do. The historical evidence of contamination from sulfide mining is too risky to place our waters in jeopardy. The MN DNR should be more protective of our clean water assets than catering to the wishes of industry. According to "Earth Works" a 2008 study shows that the American taxpayer is stuck with a 70 billion dollar cleanup cost for sulfide mine AMD in our waters. We would be foolish to risk our waters to a 20 or 30 year mining project. Barry W. Babcock 38998 315th Ave Laporte, MN 56461 solaris@paulbunyan-net

Barry Bissonett 43007

This is a letter that my wife (milli) and I wrote. I want this copy submitted for my name as well – Barry R. Bissonett. Thank you.

Barry Peterson 38618

Representative Kahn and Lisa Fay, I just learned of this concern on Monday, March 10, 2014- How is it that a 90-day response period will end on March 13, 2014 when citizens have not had an adequate time to know about the horrific pollution this will cause in inhabited regions, and near regions where a substantial water table exists. The comment period should be extended until June 10, 2014- Barry N. Peterson 1600 South Sixth Street - 334 Minneapolis, MN 55454 USA [HYPERLINK "mailto:encourageothers@gmail-com"](mailto:encourageothers@gmail-com) encourageothers@gmail-com 1-612-276-6266 On Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 6:23 PM, Phyllis Kahn <[HYPERLINK "mailto:rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn"](mailto:rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn) rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn> wrote: State Rep. Phyllis Kahn NEWS RELEASE Minnesota House of Representatives District 60B [HYPERLINK "tel:651-296-4342"](tel:651-296-4342) 651-296-4342 – [HYPERLINK "mailto:rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn"](mailto:rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn) rep.phyllis.kahn@house.mn 365 State Office Building, St Paul, MN 55155 FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE CONTACT: Tim O'Brien Communications Specialist [HYPERLINK "tel:%28651%29%20296-8877"](tel:%28651%29%20296-8877) (651) 296-8877 tim.o'[HYPERLINK "mailto:brien@house.mn"](mailto:brien@house.mn) brien@house.mn March 11, 2014 REP. KAHN HAS CONCERNS ABOUT POLYMET PROPOSED NORTHERN MINNESOTA MINE St PAUL – Rep Phyllis Kahn (DFL-Minneapolis) said in a statement on Tuesday that she has serious concerns about PolyMet's proposed open-pit mine and ore processing facility near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt. While she believes the environmental impact will be significant, her statement stuck to the issue of financial assurance. Her statement will be part of the public record of review and comment called for by the Department of Natural Resources regarding the controversial proposed copper-nickel mine. The Canadian mining company has proposed building the first of what could be a series of many copper-nickel mines in the state. The area for the possible mines is just east of the Iron Range north to the edge of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Kahn's statement is: The scope of the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS [Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement] is seriously lacking. This is especially the case when the issue of financial assurance is concerned. I have three points:

I. In chapter 3, pages 136 to 138, you list information that includes the preliminary cost estimate of closure. The source cited is "Foth 2013." I've looked at the Foth memo cited in the SDEIS. The Minnesota DNR has simply copied information from PolyMet's hired consultant without confirming or fact-checking their work. If the Minnesota DNR and its co-lead agencies are unable to fact-check the work they presented on financial assurance, how are we to expect that they are capable of the adequately protecting the citizens of Minnesota.

II. This project should not go forward unless a third-party insurer, such as Lloyd's of London, can be found. The simple fact is, if a third-party private entity will not take on PolyMet, the state shouldn't. Private insurers have expertise in managing risk that the State of Minnesota can't match. Additionally, policymakers could tap the assurance funds for other purposes. Private insurance is clearly superior to a state managed approach in this case.

III. In the SDEIS you say that financial assurance will be done in the Permit to Mine stage. Looking at the most recent MinnTac Permit to Mine document, there is one short paragraph on financial assurance. This project shouldn't go forward without robust public debate, and the opportunity for legislative hearings, if what we can expect is a paragraph from the DNR in the Permit to Mine phase. You must ensure that the public, including financial experts and those elected to represent the citizens of Minnesota, have a chance to weigh in on financial assurance. It has not been your practice to do so in the past; will it be in this case. The

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Barry Peterson 39706

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining.
***** Regardless of the fact that this type of mining has never been done before, this toxic mining organization will be harming both wildlife and humans for over 500 years. There is just too much ground water around that area to risk poisoning citizens and guests who depend on potable water. I vigorously request that this project be denied in a steadfast, solid, and intolerable manner. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Barry Peterson 1600 S 6th St Apt 334 Minneapolis, MN 55454-1615

Barry Shoultz 20022

I am opposed to the mining proposal due to likely negative impacts on our natural resources which may never be corrected once they occur. Barry Shoultz 5182 Moline Road Kellte River, MN 55757 612-751-7359 phone [HYPERLINK "mailto:shoultz@comcast.net"](mailto:shoultz@comcast.net) barry@shoultzadvertising.com

Barry W. Tungseth 10161

To the Minnesota DNR, in regards to the Polymet mining situation in Northern Minnesota . Rebecca Otto has it correct when it comes to Polymet putting it`s money where it`s mouth is. The claim they have made, is that they will be around to monitor the mine site and it`s holding and run-off ponds for 250-500 years. That is longer than Minnesota has been a state. Facts are, all ANY company has to do in this state, is to go bankrupt, and the taxpayers are held up to paying the cost Minnesota knows it, the public knows it, and the companies know it. Also, for a 20 year life span of a mine that will not even complete the working lifetime of one single long term employee, the risks out weigh the bennies. In 20 years or so, the entire area here in Northern Minnesota will be right back to ground zero, and will be going through exactly the same set of long term employment problems, and economic depression all over again. Those who tout the saying, "Mining supports us", must be talking about someplace else in Minnesota, because it hasn`t done it here in northern Minnesota at all. In the last 10 years, while our economy was turning into depression, the steel and mining companies made RECORD PROFITS, while those who were the labor force, went into record unemployment. Most sought everything from state and federal help, after their unemployment bennies ran out. THAT made them fall out of the "count of those unemployed". Mining has a proven track record of "NOT supporting us" should be the slogan. An example of the public held at bay via a mining company would be the status of state HWY 53 through Virginia .WE THE PEOPLE of Minnesota will be paying to move an entire highway because of the companies mining "rights". Taking THAT into effect, just how can this state look at the Polymet statement of , "we`ll be here for over 250 years to monitor at no cost to you the taxpayer, as truth. Let alone believe their propaganda that says they have figured out how to mine it correctly, when they have no there mine using the Tec. they claim they perfected. They can`t show one ounce of proof to that at all. Clean water is FOREVER. Mining is not. Period. I`m against the Polymet mine, and agree with Rebecca Otto put your money where your mouth is first, and prove the things that are claimed as fact before even looking at opening any new mine in Northern Minnesota. Thank you, Barry W. Tungseth 13898 Romberg Shores / P.O. Box 537 Ely, Mn. 55731 Phone:: 218-365-7112 Email:: [HYPERLINK "mailto:fernbergbear1953@aol-com"](mailto:fernbergbear1953@aol-com) fernbergbear1953@aol-com

Barry Wolfe 42700

See attachment

Bart and Lynn Galle 54498

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bart and Lynn Galle 54499

See attachment

Bart Sutter 11356

The moose population has been dropping precipitously in northern Minnesota over the past two years, yet the SDEIS offers no detailed analysis of the possible effects of the proposed NorthMet operation on moose. Why is that. Sincerely, Barton Sutter 1321 East 8th Street Duluth, Minnesota 55805

Barton Sutter 42705

See attachment

42776

See attachment

Basil Loney 54868

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bea Eichten

16276

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bea Shemberg

40325

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Bea Shemberg 13228 Central Ave, Unit #101 Hawthorne, CA 90250 US

Beacoms

5949

Just wanted to provide comment that I am fully against the proposed mining projects in NE Minnesota. Thanks Joe Beacom 4856 Louisiana Ave N. Crystal, MN 55428

Becca Krasky

57190

As a local youth environmentalist, I care deeply about the state of Minnesota and our pristine north woods and the BWCA. I can't imagine the havoc and destruction Polymet mining near the Boundary Waters would cause. Please consider the generations of future Minnesotans that could be impacted by your decision. Think about the well-being of Minnesotans. Our wilderness is priceless. Becca Krasky 3436 41st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Beck Austin

39709

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We have had a family cabin up north for over 50 yrs. The changes we have seen have been very concerning, we used to have tons of green frogs, cray fish and yes even leeches. I don't know how long it has been since we've seen them but it has been long while. Though you may think you may not see any changes but believe me they do happen faster than you think. We are suppose to be good stewards of the land. This is not about jobs etc It is about taking care of what we have been entrusted with. Please think long term. Don't be short sighted. Like they say "pay back is a Bi .". And the pay back would be polluted water, soil and air. Look what has happened to W VA and the oil from the gulf spill has been making it way down the coasts and they have found it is make the sea life sick.. Leaks and spills can never be cleaned up, really they can't. Please don't allow this to happen Please. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Beck Austin 3145 44th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2313

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Beck Austin 48874

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We have had a family cabin up north for over 50 yrs. The changes we have seen have been very concerning. we used to have tons of green frogs, cray fish and yes even leeches. I don't know how long it has been since we've seen them but it has been long while. Though you may think you may not see any changes but believe me they do happen faster than you think. We are suppose to be good stewards of the land. This is not about jobs etc It is about taking care of what we have been entrusted with. Please think long term. Don't be short sighted. Like they say "pay back is a Bi .". And the pay back would be polluted water,soil and air. Look what has happened to W VA and the oil from the gulf spill has been making it way down the coasts and they have found it is make the sea life sick.. Leaks and spills can never be cleaned up, really they can't. Please don't allow this to happen Please. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Beck Austin 3145 44th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2313

Becky and Jack Hustedt 58000

I agree that we can't continue to destroy our environment - especially for supposed "energy" mining. We need to find alternate energy sources, & projects for jobs. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Becky Ault 44084

To Whom It May Concern: I feel strongly that sulfide mining should not be allowed in NE Minnesota until it has been thoroughly explored. Citizens like myself (I am an 83 year old farmer) must be heard before letting it be done. This is a democracy and my point must be heard. Dwight Ault 51564 262 St Austin, MN 55912

Becky Erickson and Dan Sullivan 40122

I would like to express my strong opposition to granting the permit to pursue this copper mine project. While the SDEIS indicates few cumulative effects, there are many unknowns and a significant number of assumptions contained in that report. We know for certain that other similar mines have had measureable adverse environmental impacts. We also know that mining companies have poor track records for safety and environmental concerns. Given the fragility of the environment in the vicinity and the potential for long term adverse impacts, I would encourage the DNR to decline this permit. It would be unfortunate to allow a short term economic interest endanger long term environmental balance. I will watch the proceedings with great concern. Sincerely, Daniel Sullivan 857 Lincoln Avenue St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Becky Hall

41645

I'm writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. For almost a decade, PolyMet has been going through a permitting process with several, highly rigid and regulatory agencies to develop a plan that addresses issues concerning safe copper mining in Northeastern MN. Having participated in the public comment events, reading the SDEIS, visiting with PolyMet officials at their site as well as reviewing information provided by the three governmental co-lead agencies (MNDNR, USACE and USFS), I am very confident that each entity has done thorough and extensive work to address the environmental concerns of this project and it should be permitted to move forward with its construction and production of the mining facility at the former LTV site in Aurora, MN. PolyMet's SDEIS, in partnership with the three co-lead agencies, overwhelmingly addresses many facets of the environmental impact of this project. However, initially I did have some concerns regarding the 200-500 year ground water flow model and after further review of all the pertinent information, I believe there is a bit of misinformation regarding the model from those who oppose this project. The argument I'm hearing in the community states that it's next to impossible to expect a mining company to mitigate any environmental hazards for 200-500 years. My understanding is that this model was created to show that, due to the water flowing ever so slowly through the stream system from the site to its end point being Lake Superior, that the model is based on that movement of water taking somewhere between 200-500 years to make it to its endpoint. By the time, such water from site empties into Lake Superior, the acidic level is well below the co-lead agencies requirements. The argument that it will take 200-500 year to treat the water from the site is factually incorrect. What the model does show is that PolyMet can comply with Minnesota's laws, some of the strictest in the nation, regarding environmental protection of its lands and water. I also learned, after visiting PolyMet, that even at the site, should any water inadvertently escape the "lined" tailings basins, its acidic level (after being treated at the site) is well below the agencies requirement as well, about the same acidity as milk for that matter. Additionally, PolyMet has already committed somewhere between \$100 – 200 million for water treatment, clean-up and mitigation once the plant is closed. Along with already investing millions of dollars in the permitting process over the last decade, PolyMet is also committed to investing millions more in leaving its home, once the mining is complete, in the best condition as it received it. Under the ground near Aurora, MN lies the second richest resource of precious metals in the world. And here in this region, with PolyMet, it can be mined safely and within the rigid regulations of our governmental agencies. I support this project wholeheartedly rather than remaining dependent on these resources coming from other countries with less environmental regulation and more harm to their environments. Aside from the environmental impact of this project which I believe has been thoroughly addressed by the company and the governmental co-lead agencies, this project has a huge economic impact on our region creating hundreds of great paying jobs for families – 360 full-time jobs, 600 more related jobs, 2 million construction hours, and increased tax revenue that benefits our communities and education system. It's time to support our region's families and communities by putting folks to work. It's irresponsible to import these metals from other countries and export our jobs when we can mine safely here in Minnesota. I look forward to an exciting and promising future for the Iron Range and our region with companies like PolyMet at the helm providing safe opportuni

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Becky Larson 16060

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Becky Milanese 54766

See attachment

Becky Richardson 54826

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Becky toner

45535

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Becky toner PO Box 325 Grand Marais, MN 55604

Becky Zientek

45149

Hello, I am opposed to nickel/copper sulfite mining in Northeastern MN because my understanding is that it has never been done before without polluting the water where these mines are located. I live outside Ely, just 3 miles from where Twin Metals has one of their proposed sites and I am extremely concerned about how it will affect my well water and general quality of life from traffic, noise, mine construction, etc I know this is not about the Twin Metals sites, but if Polymet gets their's approved, it would seem that Twin Metals would be allowed in as well. I am all for good paying jobs, but it is just too risky and not worth the harm I believe these mines will very likely cause. Time and again you read about environmental disasters and the companies that cause them who fight tooth and nail not to pay what they should for a proper cleanup or declare bankruptcy and leave taxpayers with a large cleanup bill along with the wrecked environment. Clean air and water are priceless resources that belong to millions of Minnesotans and should not be risked for a hundred or even thousand jobs. The short term benefits just do not add up to outweigh the very real likelihood of the long term negative effects. Thank you, Becky Zientek 1587 Saari Rd Ely MN 55731 Beckyzientek@gmail-com 218-365-3447 Sent from my iPad

45169

Hello, I am opposed to nickel/copper sulfite mining in Northeastern MN because my understanding is that it has never been done before without polluting the water where these mines are located. I live outside Ely, just 3 miles from where Twin Metals has one of their proposed sites and I am extremely concerned about how it will affect my well water and general quality of life from traffic, noise, mine construction, etc I know this is not about the Twin Metals sites, but if Polymet gets their's approved, it would seem that Twin Metals would be allowed in as well. I am all for good paying jobs, but it is just too risky and not worth the harm I believe these mines will very likely cause. Time and again you read about environmental disasters and the companies that cause them who fight tooth and nail not to pay what they should for a proper cleanup or declare bankruptcy and leave taxpayers with a large cleanup bill along with the wrecked environment. Clean air and water are priceless resources that belong to millions of Minnesotans and should not be risked for a hundred or even thousand jobs. The short term benefits just do not add up to outweigh the very real likelihood of the long term negative effects. Thank you, Becky Zientek 1587 Saari Rd Ely MN 55731 Beckyzientek@gmail-com 218-365-3447 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ben Christiansen

39799

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. An impact study would be the very least you could do for the public. We Minnesotans take pride in our pristine land. Consider the public's well being as much as you consider the opportunity for profit. Please make a balanced decision and don't let the motivation of greed after your decision. Sincerely, Ben Christiansen 6425 W Franklin Ave St Louis Park, MN 55426-2107

Ben Cushing

40128

From: benjamin@greencorps-org [benjamin@greencorps-org] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:43 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Ben Cushing 2232 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ben Isbell

52493

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Ben Isbell 6016 north pike lake road Duluth, MN 55811

Ben Miller

21290

To Whom It May Concern: The reuse of brownfield sites and existing infrastructure make this project a very low impact operation. The proposed environmental mitigation meets or exceeds the requirements as shown by the provided documents. Regards, Ben Miller

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ben Niessen

41187

Dear Ms Fay, 9 March 2014 Marquette, MI 49855 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My addition to the following information relates to forty-five years of living in Marquette County Michigan. Mining has been part of life here for over 100 years. The cumulative effects of mining can be seen everywhere. Two groups of people have benefited from mining; those who own the corporations, companies and businesses who supply the particular mine, and the group of people who are their employees-those whose who do the heavy lifting. Efforts here to forbid or restrict mining have always failed. It is primarily about the power of money, pure and simple. All of Earth has been degraded for profit. I look at a Google map of areas I explored as a child-now I can only see the orange tailing pools, where once was nearly virgin forest towering high above, and plant life on the forest floor seemingly gone forever. Doing no harm at all may be a dream, but mitigation of harm should not be in the category of wishful thinking. The mining companies of the present and future should be forced to jump through as many hoops as scientists and environmentalists can design. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, f

Ben Senauer

58058

Claiming environmental safeguards can prevent pollution from this mining is a JOKE! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Ben Trump

41606

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Ben Trump 8750 Georgia Ave Apt 303b Silver Spring, MD 20910-3610

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ben Wagner 45344

Benjamin Wagner 329 West Arrowhead Road Duluth, MN 55803 To Whom It May Concern: As a concerned citizen and resident, I feel compelled to draw your attention to certain portions of the industrial copper mining plan which fall short of providing a clear picture of a safe future for Northern Minnesota. As I understand, the plan allows for the industrial mining interest ('PolyMet') to simply state that it plans to contain any contaminated waste water from this operation, additionally planning to 'treat' any contaminated waters for up to and beyond -five-hundred- (500) years. All this, in the midst of a vast, complex system of inter-connected waterways which serve as habitat for many of our state's treasured residents, including Common Loons, Moose, Lynx, as well as many precious plant species including Wild Rice, Labrador Tea, orchids, and many other incredible residents of this state. How can a responsible plan, which supposedly(.) aims to protect and preserve the future interests of the state, as well as the common citizen and local resident, allow for a plan with abstractions such as "500 years" of ongoing water treatment. In considering such a mine project, I think to myself, as one regulating the issue must think too; 'What was going on 500 years ago around this region of North America.' And, more important in this discussion, 'What will be taking place on this continent in another 500 years.' THINK about the spans of time you are considering. THINK about the habitat and animals whose futures you are sending towards doom if this mine becomes reality. Can we really say, in an -HONEST- assessment of human civilization at this point in history, that we are in some golden age, at some point of collective stasis that will continue and reign dominant over the course of 500 years.. HAH. Has anyone considered where we will be in even 100 years. Any plan that talks about ongoing water-quality issues that will require intensive treatment at timescales of 500+ years is obviously extremely risky and requires extremely careful examination, creative and open foresight regarding all possible futures, and probably should involve lots of effort towards gathering public input (for many different reasons). As a citizen of this state I demand that you be honest about water quality issues surrounding this mine, and provide us with a REAL plan to treat contaminated water. If the plan calls for water to be contaminated, perhaps it is a bad idea in the first place, since it clearly is a plan that threatens the well-being of human and non-human residents and future residents of this state. What happens when(not if) the mine pollutes surrounding waters, and let's say anecdotally, the mining company is dissolved and/or goes bankrupt. Who will pay for further maintenance of the polluted waste site. Who will oversee water issues. Will I, as a taxpayer, be charged to maintain what was destroyed to create profits for others. This subject of water quality and future maintenance of the site is clearly worth discussing for hours, perhaps days or week on end, and is only one of many issues surrounding this mine project which did not receive adequate public discussion. This is only one of quite a few grievances I have with the plan being offered. You also need to HONESTLY address issues of habitat destruction and impacts of stress on local inhabitants (MOOSE anyone.), regional human health impacts of mining, effects on local infrastructure, noise pollution in surrounding wilderness areas, HONEST information on local job creation associated with mining, and most importantly, HONORING THE EARTH. I happen to have a deep connection with Loons, and am very concerned about your plan to seriously impact a favored area of one of the most enchanted, magical creatures of this landscape. Please provide me with details of how you will meet the requirements of guiding us into a safe and livable future in this part of Northern Minnesota. Sincerely, Benjamin W

Ben Wolfe 42701

See attachment

Benjamin A. Sullivan 43004

Benjamin B. Eide 42450

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I am writing to state my strong opposition to the PolyMet mine. Our lake and waterways are what help make Minnesota a great place to live. And Lake Superior is not only a state or national treasure but a ONE OF A KIND treasure that is vital to our state. Please don't risk polluting it for a few jobs and a few dollars. We have to much to lose. Please don't go down that slippery slope of allowing non-enviromently friendly industries to destroy our states future beauty. Thank you for your time , Sincerely, Mr Benjamin B. Eide 519 Heinel Dr Roseville, MN 55113-2108 (651) 245-8538

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Benjamin Cook 51560

Dec 24, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have witnessed sulfide mining firsthand in South America. The waste-water from sulfide mining damages the ecosystem around the mine, as well as everything downstream from the runoff. Studies show there is not a possibility long term pollution, but a certainty. It doesn't belong in Minnesota. The companies that own the mines will reap the profits and then leave, forcing the citizens of Minnesota to deal with the damage to the health of humans as well as wildlife. There is no guarantee that any company will be around long enough to sufficiently correct all of the damage done, no matter what these companies promise in the beginning. However, there is a guarantee that damage will be done to the natural environment, especially the irreplaceable Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Destroying the beauty and health of the state of Minnesota is not worth creating a few hundred temporary jobs. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Benjamin Cook 6805 Athena Way Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-2413 (651) 492-1640

Benjamin H Johnson 43031

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms Fay: Attached as a PDF file, please find my comment on the Polymet mining proposal. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Benjamin Johnson - Benjamin H. Johnson Associate Professor, Global Studies and History University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee P.O. Box 413 Milwaukee, WI 53201 johnsobh@uwm.edu 414-229-5204 <http://www4-uwm.edu/lets/history/faculty/johnson.cfm>

Benjamin Johnson 38724

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Benjamin Johnson 11 Daniels Farm Rd Saint Paul, MN 55110-5211

Benjamin Krohling 52291

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Benjamin Krohling 1819 5th Street South, 104 Minneapolis, MN 55454

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Benjamin Tsai 58160

I regularly go to the Boundary Waters and surrounding areas for camping and fishing opportunities. I want to voice my opposition to the PolyMet mine plan because I do not want us to endanger these beautiful areas with long-term mining pollution. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surface waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever.

Benji Pajari 42664

See attachment

Bentleydog 21277

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. We vacation in northeastern Minnesota every year and we are concerned about the long-term environmental impacts of mining sulfide-bearing rocks. We have read the DEIS and our concerns about the adequacy of the DEIS are included below. Please forward the land exchange comments to the Forest Service. · Land Exchange: The DEIS does not adequately address all the biological and land use issues with the land exchange. Additional information on the natural heritage and timber resources of the exchange lands need to be gathered. In the long run, the public is best served if the public gains much more public land than it gives up. The exchange ratio should be at least 2 to 1. · Storage of Tailings: To prevent the oxidation of sulfide tailings a tailings basin must be designed to secure those tailings forever. Forever is a very long time. No made-made structure can be designed to last forever so at some point in the future the tailings storage facility will be compromised. At some time in the future the people of Minnesota will have to pay for and clean up the failing tailings storage facility. Large amounts of money put aside today for future remediation will fall short of what is really needed. Millions of dollars today will equate to pennies in the distant future. The DEIS should make very clear that the tailings storage facility will not last forever and at some time in the future the people of Minnesota will either pay huge amounts for a cleanup of endure sulfide pollution. Thanks again for this chance to comment. Ron and Jan Eckstein 5059 Sunset Dr Rhinelander, WI 54501

Berdena Antilla 54152

I do NOT support Polymet mining NO. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Bernadine Rolle 54148

NO! Save our water! Visit Sudbury Ont. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bernard Malacina

29436

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I have personally worked in the BWCAW as a outfitter and have taken several canoe trips into this pristine area. I can't believe any company would want to endanger this area where you can actually drink from the lakes. I have had people from Denmark come to this country just to canoe in this area. Please stop putting our public lands into destructive companies hands. Sincerely, Bernard Malacina 215 N True St Griffith, IN 46319-2645 (219) 922-9081

Bernard Schmidt

39618

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Bernel Bayliss

15746

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bernice Norregaard

10440

After working for both Reserve Mining Co and Northshore Mining Co I was able to retire with healthy lungs in 2010- I saw how environmentally sound their practices are and know how the air and water is tested for contaminants. Any water (even rain water) leaves the property cleaner than when it came in. I would expect that the State and Federal government would be just as strict with the non-ferrous as they are with the taconite mines. The mines offer a quality way of life with a great respect for the environment. I believe that it is better to have the mines in Minnesota with its tough laws than in third world countries where they don't care how they pollute the air and water and they have no regard for the safety of their employees. We would not have children working for little of nothing so that big corporations can get even bigger profits. We have to care about those far off countries, because their polluted air and water does make it to North America. Not only are the mines scientifically safe, but they add tax dollars to the local, state and federal coffers. Those of us who have lived here all or most of our lives are proud of how we have maintained our beautiful Arrowhead Region, we won't turn our "back yard" into a sewer. We will demand responsible mining practices. We can have both mining and clean air and water. Bernice Norregaard

39844

I believe that the environmental impact studies will show that Polymet's plan to operate a mine on the Iron Range are very sound and will not adversely affect the air or water of NE Minnesota. In Minnesota we have strong environmental laws and the mines are monitored regularly to insure that they don't pollute. It is much better to have the mines here, where they will add to our productivity, rather than in third world countries that exploit not only the land, but the people as well. Bernice Norregaard PO Box 351 Babbitt, MN 55706

Bernie Baltich

42580

See attachment

Bernie Schlafke

44588

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bernie Schlafke 1029 Spaight St C6 Madison, WI 53703

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bernita flynn 38523

The Polymet project is a bad plan for Minnesota. Minnesota should be putting its efforts and funds into alternative forms of energy such as solar and even nuclear. Both would create more skilled jobs that pay higher wages that could employ our graduating college students who are now unable to find jobs. We must stop destroying our land and atmosphere and it is time to take other forms of energy seriously. The company says it will restore the land for 500 years following the sulfide mining. Really. They won't be around and our future generations will be the ones to suffer. I beg you please do not allow the destruction of our water supply and wildlife. Sincerely, Bernita Flynn
1310 32nd St NW Rochester MN 55901

Bert and Cynthia Weberg 57171

Have other sulfide mines been near a big body of fresh water? If so, what are/were the results? We would hate to be part of the generation that would allow Lake Superior and other great lakes to be poisoned. Bert & Cynthia Weberg 1067 6th Street SE Forest Lake, MN 55025

Bert BG Hyde 42868

See attachment

Bert Hyde 46196

This is my fifth letter. The others were sent by US Mail, and I'm emailing this one to get it in before the deadline. There is so much more to comment on. I've been reading carefully for months and have only reached section 5- I hope these letters will convince you that this SDEIS is so inadequate that at least it should be redone. Pg.3-136 Section 3-2-2-4 Financial Assurance Paragraph 2 - The wetland mitigation that would be constructed should require financial assurances. These wetlands would be in place before the mining process begins. They will be monitored throughout the "life" of the mining project. Hopefully information gathered throughout the monitoring process will aid in creating the best possible wetland outcomes - "best possible" means matching exactly the wetland in form and function with complex and interrelated species. Why are the financial assurances not spelled out in the SDEIS. These should stand to answer many of the "what if." questions raised in these SDEIS reviews. With all the pages of "infrastructure" that PolyMet has generated, it seems suspicious that they did not have the time, resources, or expertise to put together a complete and accurate financial assurance plan. Please have PolyMet submit a true financial assurance detailed statement. Please include financial assurances that include information that extends 500 years into the future. Please include information that would make clear how the state of Minnesota would not be financially liable for environmental clean-up if PolyMet goes bankrupt, dies, disappears, or otherwise "skips town." Pg. 3-158 Section 3-3-1-1 Priority 2, 2b through 2e The reasons that the land exchange should NOT take place: I ask that the USFS reconsider and then refuse the USFS land exchange. 2a and c Land that enhances recreational opportunities, public access, and aesthetic values. The area of the proposed land exchange includes much of the High Value Biodiversity, 100-mile Swamp wetlands. This area supports many varieties of life forms that are not common to other areas in Minnesota. *Caltha natans* and *Felm Canadensis* are but two. 2e. The Partridge River, among others, would be severely negatively impacted by this PolyMet project. The Partridge River flows into the St Louis River, then Lake Superior. Heavy metals and other toxic and carcinogenic pollutants would definitely be washed to the lake Superior waters. Please read pg. 4-157, paragraph 2, and Table 4-2-3-4- Wetlands 92% high quality. I ask that the USFS land exchange NOT go forward. Pg 3-158, Priority 2-2c Environmentally sensitive and/or ecologically rare lands and habitats. 2d Wetlands 2b Land needed to enhance or promote watershed restoration or improvements riparian areas. Pg 4-192 - 4-2-3-3 Threatened and Endangered Plan Species There are three state-listed ETSC plant species. Even though they are not federally listed, that does not weaken the argument that they are rare and unique individuals and deserve full protection. The land exchange would doom these plants and their community. The No Action alternative is the only fair and reasonable path. Pg 4-1732 Mn Biological Survey, paragraph 2 Two native plant communities: Black Spruce-Jackpine woodland (FDn32c) is 34% of the mine site and Rich Black Spruce Swamp are characterized by the MBS as "imperiled/vulnerable" and "vulnerable" - another reason for the No Action alternative. Pg 5-4, 5-2-1-2-2 paragraph 1, last sentence: "The USFS also requires preparation of associated reclamation plans to insure the long term protection and restoration of the natural resources." The SDEIS has not documented the "protection and restoration" of the natural resources. See pg 3-124, 3-2-2-3-1-2 PolyMet says they have developed a Reclamation Plan, but they WILL submit it to the MDNR (not USFS) as part of the permit process. These plans should have been included in the SDEIS for examination and evaluation by the public. I ask that these plans be included in the next dr

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bert Hyde

46197

This is my fifth letter. The others were sent by US Mail, and I'm emailing this one to get it in before the deadline. There is so much more to comment on. I've been reading carefully for months and have only reached section 5- I hope these letters will convince you that this SDEIS is so inadequate that at least it should be redone. Pg.3-136 Section 3-2-2-4 Financial Assurance Paragraph 2 - The wetland mitigation that would be constructed should require financial assurances. These wetlands would be in place before the mining process begins. They will be monitored throughout the "life" of the mining project. Hopefully information gathered throughout the monitoring process will aid in creating the best possible wetland outcomes - "best possible" means matching exactly the wetland in form and function with complex and interrelated species. Why are the financial assurances not spelled out in the SDEIS. These should stand to answer many of the "what if." questions raised in these SDEIS reviews. With all the pages of "infrastructure" that PolyMet has generated, it seems suspicious that they did not have the time, resources, or expertise to put together a complete and accurate financial assurance plan. Please have PolyMet submit a true financial assurance detailed statement. Please include financial assurances that include information that extends 500 years into the future. Please include information that would make clear how the state of Minnesota would not be financially liable for environmental clean-up if PolyMet goes bankrupt, dies, disappears, or otherwise "skips town." Pg. 3-158 Section 3-3-1-1 Priority 2, 2b through 2e The reasons that the land exchange should NOT take place: I ask that the USFS reconsider and then refuse the USFS land exchange. 2a and c Land that enhances recreational opportunities, public access, and aesthetic values. The area of the proposed land exchange includes much of the High Value Biodiversity, 100-mile Swamp wetlands. This area supports many varieties of life forms that are not common to other areas in Minnesota. *Caltha natans* and *Felm Canadensis* are but two. 2e. The Partridge River, among others, would be severely negatively impacted by this PolyMet project. The Partridge River flows into the St Louis River, then Lake Superior. Heavy metals and other toxic and carcinogenic pollutants would definitely be washed to the lake Superior waters. Please read pg. 4-157, paragraph 2, and Table 4-2-3-4- Wetlands 92% high quality. I ask that the USFS land exchange NOT go forward. Pg 3-158, Priority 2-2c Environmentally sensitive and/or ecologically rare lands and habitats. 2d Wetlands 2b Land needed to enhance or promote watershed restoration or improvements riparian areas. Pg 4-192 - 4-2-3-3 Threatened and Endangered Plan Species There are three state-listed ETSC plant species. Even though they are not federally listed, that does not weaken the argument that they are rare and unique individuals and deserve full protection. The land exchange would doom these plants and their community. The No Action alternative is the only fair and reasonable path. Pg 4-1732 Mn Biological Survey, paragraph 2 Two native plant communities: Black Spruce-Jackpine woodland (FDn32c) is 34% of the mine site and Rich Black Spruce Swamp are characterized by the MBS as "imperiled/vulnerable" and "vulnerable" - another reason for the No Action alternative. Pg 5-4, 5-2-1-2-2 paragraph 1, last sentence: "The USFS also requires preparation of associated reclamation plans to insure the long term protection and restoration of the natural resources." The SDEIS has not documented the "protection and restoration" of the natural resources. See pg 3-124, 3-2-2-3-1-2 PolyMet says they have developed a Reclamation Plan, but they WILL submit it to the MDNR (not USFS) as part of the permit process. These plans should have been included in the SDEIS for examination and evaluation by the public. I ask that these plans be included in the next dra

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bert Hyde

46198

This is my fifth letter. The others were sent by US Mail, and I'm emailing this one to get it in before the deadline. There is so much more to comment on. I've been reading carefully for months and have only reached section 5- I hope these letters will convince you that this SDEIS is so inadequate that at least it should be redone. Pg.3-136 Section 3-2-2-4 Financial Assurance Paragraph 2 - The wetland mitigation that would be constructed should require financial assurances. These wetlands would be in place before the mining process begins. They will be monitored throughout the "life" of the mining project. Hopefully information gathered throughout the monitoring process will aid in creating the best possible wetland outcomes - "best possible" means matching exactly the wetland in form and function with complex and interrelated species. Why are the financial assurances not spelled out in the SDEIS. These should stand to answer many of the "what if." questions raised in these SDEIS reviews. With all the pages of "infrastructure" that PolyMet has generated, it seems suspicious that they did not have the time, resources, or expertise to put together a complete and accurate financial assurance plan. Please have PolyMet submit a true financial assurance detailed statement. Please include financial assurances that include information that extends 500 years into the future. Please include information that would make clear how the state of Minnesota would not be financially liable for environmental clean-up if PolyMet goes bankrupt, dies, disappears, or otherwise "skips town." Pg. 3-158 Section 3-3-1-1 Priority 2, 2b through 2e The reasons that the land exchange should NOT take place: I ask that the USFS reconsider and then refuse the USFS land exchange. 2a and c Land that enhances recreational opportunities, public access, and aesthetic values. The area of the proposed land exchange includes much of the High Value Biodiversity, 100-mile Swamp wetlands. This area supports many varieties of life forms that are not common to other areas in Minnesota. *Caltha natans* and *Felm Canadensis* are but two. 2e. The Partridge River, among others, would be severely negatively impacted by this PolyMet project. The Partridge River flows into the St Louis River, then Lake Superior. Heavy metals and other toxic and carcinogenic pollutants would definitely be washed to the lake Superior waters. Please read pg. 4-157, paragraph 2, and Table 4-2-3-4- Wetlands 92% high quality. I ask that the USFS land exchange NOT go forward. Pg 3-158, Priority 2-2c Environmentally sensitive and/or ecologically rare lands and habitats. 2d Wetlands 2b Land needed to enhance or promote watershed restoration or improvements riparian areas. Pg 4-192 - 4-2-3-3 Threatened and Endangered Plan Species There are three state-listed ETSC plant species. Even though they are not federally listed, that does not weaken the argument that they are rare and unique individuals and deserve full protection. The land exchange would doom these plants and their community. The No Action alternative is the only fair and reasonable path. Pg 4-1732 Mn Biological Survey, paragraph 2 Two native plant communities: Black Spruce-Jackpine woodland (FDn32c) is 34% of the mine site and Rich Black Spruce Swamp are characterized by the MBS as "imperiled/vulnerable" and "vulnerable" - another reason for the No Action alternative. Pg 5-4, 5-2-1-2-2 paragraph 1, last sentence: "The USFS also requires preparation of associated reclamation plans to insure the long term protection and restoration of the natural resources." The SDEIS has not documented the "protection and restoration" of the natural resources. See pg 3-124, 3-2-2-3-1-2 PolyMet says they have developed a Reclamation Plan, but they WILL submit it to the MDNR (not USFS) as part of the permit process. These plans should have been included in the SDEIS for examination and evaluation by the public. I ask that these plans be included in the next dr

54711

See attachment

Bert Weberg

54572

Some years ago, the acid rain resulting from emissions from coal fired power plants south of us was a problem for the northern Minnesota ecosystem. Would the acid resulting from the extraction and processing of the sulfide ores present the same problem?

54573

In other sulfide mine sites, as in So. Africa, have there been problems with dust from the mining process? We worry about the workers and flora/fauna in nearby forests.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Beryl Schewe 40146

I am writing to voice my deep concern about PolyMet's proposal for copper and nickel mining in the Masabi Iron Range. I am deeply concerned that pollution to this pristine area of our state will be potentially devastating. Can we realistically accept a plan that demands remediation for the next 500 years. Do we expect PolyMet to exist in 500 years. In 50 years. If the best case scenario that PolyMet puts forward does not happen, what then. The consequences for any misstep, any glitch in PolyMet's plan could be devastating. The Natural Resource we should be protecting are our waterways, the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior. Can PolyMet or the DNR give ANY example of copper or nickel mining that has not caused pollution. And if the pollution proves too costly for PolyMet to clean up, they will most likely file for bankruptcy and leave Minnesota with both the spoiled and polluted environment and the bill for the cleanup. PolyMet's proposal does not make long term economic sense for Minnesota. PolyMet's proposal is not without grave environmental costs. Please reject PolyMet's proposal. Beryl Schewe 11054 Bluestem Lane Eden Prairie, MN 55347 612-578-4971 Beryl Schewe, MBA, MDiv, BCC Director of Pastoral Care Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church Edina, MN 55436 952-929-3317 ex 106 [HYPERLINK "mailto:berylschewe@olgparish-org"](mailto:berylschewe@olgparish-org)berylschewe@olgparish-org www.olgparish-org

besbig 44126

You have the Scientific Data ,Enforce it. Tell polymet and their Chinese Investors to go elsewhere. Awas. ,go away. Have some courage to stand up to Corporations. Do not be Bribed. Lavern Shotley 7748 Jokela Road Cloquet mn.

Beth Beattie 42581

See attachment

Beth Blackledge 10139

Recently I have heard about the water shortage problem in western United States. We have water in Minnesota so why should we take any chance of polluting it with a material that wrecks it for people and wildlife. No one can drink money. The water shortage throughout the world does not appear to be getting any better. Who in that area thinks they will make a lot of money from this mining project. Do cities and the state think they will collect high amounts of taxes. Do people think there will be a hugh number of high paying jobs connected with it. The only people making large amounts of money are the owners of the companies, and it is my understanding that no one has on record just who these companies are. It would be best for the whole state to deny this mining project forever. Beth and Leland Blackledge 2430 Heimele Street South St Paul, MN 55075

Beth Cutting 48304

FYI

Beth Davidson 42604

See attachment

Beth Gohdes 57986

In addition to the risks outlined below, I remain very concerned that the long term effects of keeping the water clean are not being acknowledged. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

beth knudtsen spears

16776

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, beth knudtsen spears 807 N Main Cambridge, MN 55008

50125

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, beth knudtsen spears 807 N Main Cambridge, MN 55008

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Beth Lewis 7022

Please find attached a PDF letter with my comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. I also plan on attending the January 28 hearing. Beth Lewis bal588@comcast.net 588 Terrace Courte2372 Gray Jay Drive Roseville MN 55113Ely, MN 55113

9291

Please find attached a PDF letter with my additional comments on the SDEIS following my attendance at the January 28 open house and hearing. Beth Lewis 588 Terrace Courte2372 Gray Jay Drive Roseville, MN 55113Ely, MN 55731

Beth Yokom 43334

Dear DNR,, Assuming the above is a true equation, I find it shocking that anyone is still considering approving this mining operation. Water is essential for all life, and in MN we are especially known for our water Land of 10,000 Lakes To consider jeopardizing our water flabbergasts, confuses and disappoints me. The environment and natural splendor of the Arrowhead region of MN is it's greatest asset (not to mention one of our state's greatest assets) and the reason folks visit and want to live there. DO NOT even consider jeopardizing such a jewel. Thank you, Beth Yokom 806 Linwood Ave St Paul, MN 55105

Bethany Ebert 9599

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: When the information given regarding pollutants in the atmosphere is inaccurate, it is impossible to have an open and honest dialogue regarding pollution. Therefore it is my opinion that the SDEIS should be redone to reflect the new information. I also think that, considering what I already know about the topic, PolyMet's sulfide mining plan should be rejected. PolyMet gave inaccurate information about the amount of waterflow. Therefore it's possible they also gave inaccurate information about air pollution. Speaking as a person with lungs that are annoying at best and life-threatening at worst, I prefer to not sit in my apartment all day because there's too much pollution in the air to enjoy the weather. Sitting inside all day gets boring, and I like walking outside. People need to breathe fresh air and get out there and get exercise. If the sulfide mining plan messes with my lungs too much, I could die. I know I'm just one person, but there are other people in the Midwest who have to use inhalers. A lot of us would be affected. Please also keep in mind there are some people in the world who are predisposed to cancer, and too many carcinogens in the air could aggravate their conditions, causing more illness and death. This would change the city drastically as well. While death is a natural part of life, it's also true the quality of life while living should be a good one. PolyMet is not going to do much to improve the quality of life. It will just make the environment more polluted. A lot of people here like to fish and hunt, a lot of people like walking their dogs, a lot of people like just hanging out by the lake, and if the mining happens, who's to say any of that would continue. And then there's the part about pregnancy. What sort of risks would the pollutants in the atmosphere bring to a fetus in the first trimester, or a newborn. The first trimester is one of the most important times regarding health. If a woman is exposed to too much at that time, with regards to pollutants, she is more likely to miscarry, which is a terrifying thing to go through as a young woman. And if the baby is carried to term, there is still the risk of its future health, as well as the hobbies it can be part of once it's old enough to get outside and have fun. Kids should be able to get outside and play. If there's a lot of pollutants in the environment, this kind of ruins that. I know a lot of people are big on sitting a kid in front of the television set or a cell phone or an iPad, but we should be allowing our children the ability to play outside. Technology should not be running everything. We don't need a ton of iPads and televisions to be happy. These are luxury items I understand video games are fun, I love them too, but there is nothing wrong with going outside. And I think we don't need too much that we don't already have There are jobs in the area. People just aren't looking for them because they've given up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. That's all I've got to say on the matter for now. Thank you for considering my opinion. With respect, Bethany A. Ebert Bethany Ebert 230 West 3rd St #306 Duluth, MN, MN 55802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bethany Ebert

18506

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: When the information given regarding pollutants in the atmosphere is inaccurate, it is impossible to have an open and honest dialogue regarding pollution. Therefore it is my opinion that the SDEIS should be redone to reflect the new information. I also think that, considering what I already know about the topic, PolyMet's sulfide mining plan should be rejected. PolyMet gave inaccurate information about the amount of waterflow. Therefore it's possible they also gave inaccurate information about air pollution. Speaking as a person with lungs that are annoying at best and life-threatening at worst, I prefer to not sit in my apartment all day because there's too much pollution in the air to enjoy the weather. Sitting inside all day gets boring, and I like walking outside. People need to breathe fresh air and get out there and get exercise. If the sulfide mining plan messes with my lungs too much, I could die. I know I'm just one person, but there are other people in the Midwest who have to use inhalers. A lot of us would be affected. Please also keep in mind there are some people in the world who are predisposed to cancer, and too many carcinogens in the air could aggravate their conditions, causing more illness and death. This would change the city drastically as well. While death is a natural part of life, it's also true the quality of life while living should be a good one. PolyMet is not going to do much to improve the quality of life. It will just make the environment more polluted. A lot of people here like to fish and hunt, a lot of people like walking their dogs, a lot of people like just hanging out by the lake, and if the mining happens, who's to say any of that would continue. And then there's the part about pregnancy. What sort of risks would the pollutants in the atmosphere bring to a fetus in the first trimester, or a newborn. The first trimester is one of the most important times regarding health. If a woman is exposed to too much at that time, with regards to pollutants, she is more likely to miscarry, which is a terrifying thing to go through as a young woman. And if the baby is carried to term, there is still the risk of its future health, as well as the hobbies it can be part of once it's old enough to get outside and have fun. Kids should be able to get outside and play. If there's a lot of pollutants in the environment, this kind of ruins that. I know a lot of people are big on sitting a kid in front of the television set or a cell phone or an iPad, but we should be allowing our children the ability to play outside. Technology should not be running everything. We don't need a ton of iPads and televisions to be happy. These are luxury items I understand video games are fun, I love them too, but there is nothing wrong with going outside. And I think we don't need too much that we don't already have. There are jobs in the area. People just aren't looking for them because they've given up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. That's all I've got to say on the matter for now. Thank you for considering my opinion. With respect, Bethany A. Ebert
Bethany Ebert 230 West 3rd St #306 Duluth, MN, MN 55802

50588

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: When the information given regarding pollutants in the atmosphere is inaccurate, it is impossible to have an open and honest dialogue regarding pollution. Therefore it is my opinion that the SDEIS should be redone to reflect the new information. I also think that, considering what I already know about the topic, PolyMet's sulfide mining plan should be rejected. PolyMet gave inaccurate information about the amount of waterflow. Therefore it's possible they also gave inaccurate information about air pollution. Speaking as a person with lungs that are annoying at best and life-threatening at worst, I prefer to not sit in my apartment all day because there's too much pollution in the air to enjoy the weather. Sitting inside all day gets boring, and I like walking outside. People need to breathe fresh air and get out there and get exercise. If the sulfide mining plan messes with my lungs too much, I could die. I know I'm just one person, but there are other people in the Midwest who have to use inhalers. A lot of us would be affected. Please also keep in mind there are some people in the world who are predisposed to cancer, and too many carcinogens in the air could aggravate their conditions, causing more illness and death. This would change the city drastically as well. While death is a natural part of life, it's also true the quality of life while living should be a good one. PolyMet is not going to do much to improve the quality of life. It will just make the environment more polluted. A lot of people here like to fish and hunt, a lot of people like walking their dogs, a lot of people like just hanging out by the lake, and if the mining happens, who's to say any of that would continue. And then there's the part about pregnancy. What sort of risks would the pollutants in the atmosphere bring to a fetus in the first trimester, or a newborn. The first trimester is one of the most important times regarding health. If a woman is exposed to too much at that time, with regards to pollutants, she is more likely to miscarry, which is a terrifying thing to go through as a young woman. And if the baby is carried to term, there is still the risk of its future health, as well as the hobbies it can be part of once it's old enough to get outside and have fun. Kids should be able to get outside and play. If there's a lot of pollutants in the environment, this kind of ruins that. I know a lot of people are big on sitting a kid in front of the television set or a cell phone or an iPad, but we should be allowing our children the ability to play outside. Technology should not be running everything. We don't need a ton of iPads and televisions to be happy. These are luxury items I understand video games are fun, I love them too, but there is nothing wrong with going outside. And I think we don't need too much that we don't already have. There are jobs in the area. People just aren't looking for them because they've given up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. That's all I've got to say on the matter for now. Thank you for considering my opinion. With respect, Bethany A. Ebert
Bethany Ebert 230 West 3rd St #306 Duluth, MN, MN 55802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bethel Anderson 42722

See attachment

54470

See attachment

Betheny Ebert 18932

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Betheny Ebert 230 West 3rd St #306 Duluth, MN, MN 55802 218-269-3883

Betsy Blume 44364

To whom it may concern, My name is Betsy Blume and my address is 5157 Upton Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN, 55410- I am grateful for the DNR's effort in taking on the huge undertaking of providing the public with information and the ability to comment on this project. It is truly all of our responsibilities to understand the long term consequences of allowing this and other similar projects to go forward After reviewing some of the executive summary report information and other information that is part of your website I believe the risks for allowing this project to move forward are too great. My greatest concerns are: Review of other EIS from Hard Rock mining projects in other parts of the US show that of the 20 mines reviewed, 80% or more had a violation of water quality standards. A recent statement by the EPA says that Hard Rock mining is the most toxic polluter in the US today. The problems with this type of mining have not been solved. It is an experiment that Polymet proposes in dealing with the issues of polluting our watersheds. New technology is Not evidence that the projects will not have severe long term damage to our water resources. Hard Rock mines in Colorado and Montana have permanently caused the death of rivers. Noise pollution near wilderness areas like the BWCAW will effect users (like me.) and the economic interests of the community that supports these recreation geMs There are many untested laws in this proposal that could cause years of litigation that lie in wait for the citizens of the state of Minnesota. Is the environment (water, air, wildlife, wetlands, Lakes) worth less than these precious minerals. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Betsy Blume

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Betsy Bowen 42857

See attachment

Betsy Daub 47793

From: Betsy Daub [mailto:betsy@friends-bwca-org] Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 11:52 AM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: Fwd: PolyMet water data issues -----
Forwarded message ----- From: Betsy Daub <HYPERLINK "mailto:betsy@friends-bwca-org"betsy@friends-bwca-org> Date: Fri, Mar 7, 2014 at 11:48 AM Subject:
PolyMet water data issues To: "Rye, Marty E -FS" <HYPERLINK "mailto:mrye@fs.fed.us"mrye@fs.fed.us>, Mary Shedd <HYPERLINK
"mailto:mshedd@fs.fed.us"mshedd@fs.fed.us> Cc: "Radosevich-Craig, Lisa -FS" <HYPERLINK "mailto:lradosevichcraig@fs.fed.us"lradosevichcraig@fs.fed.us>, Nancy
Schuldt <HYPERLINK "mailto:nancyschuldt@fdlrez-com"nancyschuldt@fdlrez-com>, Margaret Watkins <HYPERLINK "mailto:watkins@boreal-org"watkins@boreal-
org>, John Coleman <HYPERLINK "mailto:jcolema1@wisc-edu"jcolema1@wisc-edu> Dear Marty and Mary, I am emailing you with a big concern about our attempts
to get geochemistry leachate data and other relevant water data from the MN DNR regarding PolyMet. I am hoping you might work with Brenda to urge the MN DNR to
grant a 30-day extension to the comment period, and that the DNR would be encouraged to fully share the data that has been requested repeatedly. Here is a quick summary
of the key issues: MCEA and the Friends have retained 6 technical experts to help us evaluate the SDEIS for PolyMet. These are hydrologists, geochemists, geophysicists,
wetlands ecologists, etc They have been hard at work on the SDEIS and its thousands of background documents for months. But their analyses have been hampered for a
number of reasons: 1- Several technical documents that MCEA requested of the DNR were not sent in a timely fashion. The first document: "Wetland Impact Assessment
Technical Memorandum - Appendix B" was requested from the DNR on January 23, 2014- MCEA did not receive a copy of it until February 24, 2014- This technical
memo was the sole basis for the sensitivity analysis that determined the extent of the potential indirect wetland impacts that could occur as a result of groundwater
drawdown. The second document, PolyMet 2013k, was cited 14 times in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and should have been included on the SDEIS reference disk but was not.
This document provided data on potential indirect impacts that may occur as a result of the augmentation of Second Creek. MCEA requested the data from the DNR on
February 20, 2104, and received it on February 24, 2014- The delay in receiving these documents resulted in delays to our technical expert's review of the information.
2- We have had recent issues in obtaining geochemistry leachate data. These are data that should have been attached to the original SDEIS or in the reference documents,
but were not. We are still trying to obtain them. MCEA made several requests for documents that were cited in reference documents, only to find more citations to earlier
documents. The path has finally led to documents from 2007, which MCEA requested. The database MCEA received this week is incomplete and has many empty cells in
the Excel spreadsheet. Many of the missing cells appear that they would have contained leachate concentrations above water quality standards. For example, a plot of nickel
concentrations in one document shows a great many samples of test pile leachate to be above the 10 mg/L for Ni. But in the database that accompanied it, only six samples
with concentrations above that limit are shown. Most of the entries in the database are filled with "#N/A." It seems odd that the higher values for Nickel are missing. This
occurs for many constituents - not just Nickel. We still need a database with all the entries included. 3- Our geochemists have found the documentation to be extremely
complicated. We are working with two geochemists, both of whom have worked on hundreds of mining proposals. They have found the SDEIS materials to be extremely
difficult to understand and to work with. Part of the problem is t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Betsy LePlatt

23581

Please see the following. Elizabeth LePlatt 7012 Cheyenne Trail Chanhassen, MN 55317 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 I do not believe PolyMet's NorthMet project would be good for the State of Minnesota. I am very concerned about trading our long term environmental health for short term and not clearly spelled out financial gain. One of the things which concerns me most is permanent water pollution. I do not think it is good enough to base such important decisions on "probabilistic simulations," or computer models, of the effects of PolyMet's mining activities on water quality. After all, I read the other day that the flow rates on the Partridge River entered on the SDEIS were wrong. How would we know the models were correct. Are there any real world examples of similar mines run in equivalent environments which have not resulted in major environmental problems. Seems to be a pretty big gamble to me. "Direct and indirect effects to wetlands would result from mining operations. The NorthMet Project Proposed Action would directly affect 912-5 acres of wetlands located within the NorthMet Project area, mostly within the Mine Site, as a result of activities such as filling, excavation, and installation of a containment system within the wetland boundary, and, therefore, these wetlands would be permanently lost" "Due to both on- and off-site limitations and technical infeasibility, it is not practicable to replace all affected wetland types with an equivalent area of in-kind wetlands." The SDEIS states there will be water pollution and loss of wetlands. I do not understand why this would be okay for Minnesotans. I have narrowed my comments in this letter to focus on water quality and wetlands, however, I am very concerned about other effects of the mining project on the environmental balance of northern Minnesota. The long term economic impact of this project is also a big concern of mine. Would the clean up cost the State more than the economic gains of the project. It seems to me it would be wise to have a more concrete answer to this question before approving this sulfide mining project. My family and I have loved Northern Minnesota – the beautiful boreal forest, the pristine lakes for years. We own a cabin near Ely, where we spend our summers. I do not look forward to the industrialization as well as air pollution this mine and others proposed near our cabin would bring. Thank you for your time and extreme consideration of this matter. Sincerely, Elizabeth LePlatt

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Better MN

16000

cid:image001-jpg@01CEFBFF.AF2AC0D0 February 2014 "What's Happening in Better Government for a Better Minnesota" is the source for the latest news and info on government reform as seen from the perspective of state employees. We want to hear from you. Have something from your agency to share. Tips, best practices, success stories or other news of note. Send them to us at [HYPERLINK "mailto:better@state.mn.us"better@state.mn.us](mailto:HYPERLINK \). A Message from Chief of Staff Jaime Tincher cid:image010-jpg@01CF2E33-8F05DE50Dear Colleagues, After a year and a half as Governor Dayton's deputy chief of staff, I am excited to take on a new role as the Governor's chief of staff. I look forward to working with you and continuing our work together to build a Better Government for a Better Minnesota. The upcoming Unsession truly gets to the heart of our better government efforts. The Unsession legislative recommendations we are developing will incorporate many of the great ideas that state employees across the administration recommended this past summer and fall. Paired with suggestions from people around the state, the Governor's Unsession agenda and additional Unsession efforts from legislators will help state government better serve the needs of all Minnesotans. In the upcoming session, Governor Dayton also has proposed providing additional tax relief for middle class Minnesotans, eliminating business to business taxes, and passing a comprehensive bonding bill that will create an estimated 27,000 jobs. These initiatives along with your valuable service for the people of Minnesota will help us support continued economic growth, while making critical investments in the state's future. Thank you for the work you do every day to build an even brighter future for all Minnesotans. Sincerely, Jaime Tincher Chief of Staff, Governor Mark Dayton and Lt. Governor Yvonne Prettner Solon cid:image012-png@01CF2E3C.A7B2EBB0 "Transition Briefs" Aid Disaster Response and Recovery

Betty Holmen Greene

54730

See attachment

Betty Preus

46968

To whom it may concern: I am writing in strong opposition to the Polymet copper mining proposal. There are so many concerns and unanswered questions that it is unbelievable to me that we would risk our future by moving ahead with this project. These are just a few of my concerns: - Health risks such as exposure to mercury, asbestos and arsenic. Mercury is already a problem with 10% of newborns in the Lake Superior basin. Polymet admits that mineral dust released could harm workers and nearby residents. Doctors have recently requested a study of the potential health impact of this project. Let's study the potential impact and not the problem after it has sickened or killed many people. - Hundreds of years of polluted water seeping into our streams I am not convinced that Polymet would be able to contain all polluted water. It will inevitably seep into our clean waters. Boundary Waters rivers have been named at risk for pollution as a result of this proposal. The Boundary Waters is a most precious resource that we simply must preserve for future generations. - Destruction of 6,000 acres of wetland which are currently habitat for our endangered moose and lynx populations and many other species. - Questions about whether Polymet would cover the costs of cleanup and whether they would be paying fair taxes. To me, I don't think it would be possible for them to pay enough for damage and taxes because they would be destroying a treasure that is priceless and irreplaceable. Please stop this proposal from moving forward. Elizabeth Preus 40 E. Faribault St Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Betty Tisel

38391

Dear reader at the MN-DNR, My name is Betty Tisel. I live in South Minneapolis and am a lifelong Minnesotan. My Slovenian-American grandfather spent his working life in the open pit mines in Virginia, Minnesota, as an employee of Oliver Mining, and then US Steel. He was also a union member. I am writing to convey just one of my many concerns about the mine plan and PolyMet's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I am concerned that the SDEIS does not include any analysis of the health effects for on-site workers at the mine. The only "health-risk assessment" in the SDEIS was done for people who are off-site. Mining industry workers are at a higher risk of fatal mesothelioma. PolyMet ore will include asbestos-like fibers. According to the PolyMet SDEIS, exhaust from the rock crushing plant will be vented back into the plant, in order to reduce heating costs. In a recent University of Minnesota study, workers involved in the crushing process had toxic particle exposure over the safe exposure limit. The PolyMet site is a "lean" deposit of copper and nickel - 99% of what is dug out of the ground will be considered waste. Blasting and grinding the dug-up rock will unleash huge amounts of particles and fibers that workers will breathe. Other Minnesota environmental impact statements and documents have looked at cancer risks for workers. Why not PolyMet. The SDEIS must let the public know the health risks to on-site workers. The SDEIS must analyze particles and fibers in crushing plant air, not just air outside the property boundary. Sincerely, Betty Tisel 4155 Garfield Ave Minneapolis, MN 55409 612-824-5820 Betty Tisel HYPERLINK "mailto:betty@tiselfarley-com"betty@tiselfarley-com

58075

Others will speak more specifically about this specific mine's potential negative impacts. My concern is also that 1) we need to stop all projects that will worsen the environment anywhere and 2) if we want more jobs in MN let's create jobs that people can really take pride in. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Bev Gillen

40727

DNR, I am highly against the proposal to allow PolyMet to operate mines in Minnesota. I have lived in the Twin Cities for 50 years. My husband and I chose to raise our family here because of the beautiful lakes, trees, wildlife, and clean air. My family has camped in the Boundary Waters and experienced its beauty and peacefulness. We cannot afford to have this resource polluted by mining companies who lamely promote job growth but are really counting profits. Counting on you to represent the best interests of Minnesota families in the face pressure from these big companies and their slick staff. Please say NO to Polymet and preserve Minnesota's beauty for generations to come. Regards, Bev Gillen Bev Gillen | Sr Electronics Commodity Manager | Rosemount Flow Emerson Process Management | 12001 Technology Dr | M/S AE07 Eden Prairie | MN | 55344 | USA T +1 952 828 3019 beverly.gillen@emerson-com

Bev Scalze

47482

Please enter these comments into the public comment process: The SDEIS doesn't account for the replacement capital costs of the mine proposal, eg. water treatment plant, holding pond liners, etc The SDEIS is silent regarding emergency measures in case of failures in construction and treatment. The SDEIS doesn't analyze the relationship between Polymet and Glencore Xtrata. If the Glencore firm is a silent partner, or at least a financier, that information should be included in the SDEIS because a partner or assign should be part of the application for the permit. The partner or assign (or any other term) should be noted so that all parties are included in the permit and are responsible for cleanup if Polymet (or NorthMet) goes bankrupt. The draft SDEIS doesn't include a long-term analysis of present or failed sulfide mines anywhere in the world. The draft SDEIS doesn't include capital costs of the life of the liners of the pits or stockpiles, nor does it include methods to monitor the liners and the replacement of those liners and the surrounding possibly-contaminated soils and aquifers. The aquifers surrounding the proposed sites haven't been monitored for the existing conditions of the waters. The draft SDEIS doesn't include maps and analyses of surrounding streams and rivers as to their existing conditions and a process for monitoring in the future. No accounting for monitoring of conditions in he 200 and 500 year models as included by Polymet. The Polymet document labeled Figure H-16-24-2 shows Mixed Influent Cncentration (ug/L) at year 200 that is six times higher than the present water quality standaRd These and other concerns should trigger an additional document that addresses the items that are missing from the draft SDEIS. Bev Scalze 969 Beam Avenue Little Canada, MN 55109 (651) 483-1055

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Beverly Blinde 42457

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The risk to our children, grandchildren, and the environment for many generations to come is too great - and not worth the benefits of a few jobs for a few years. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the precious Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Beverly Blinde 5620 Bloomington Ae. So. Minneapolis, MN 55417 Sincerely, Mrs Beverly Blinde 5620 Bloomington Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-2641

Beverly Finke 16154

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Beverly Hanson 42727

See attachment

Beverly Kenealey 54761

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Beverly M Berntson 42738

See attachment

Beverly Schell 38773

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Beverly Schell 401 Hiawatha Blvd Winona, MN 55987-2164 (507) 454-3260

Beverly Schilleman 41563

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

beverly zamora 42421

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms beverly zamora 4107 Lowry Ave N Robbinsdale, MN 55422-3110 (763) 273-8600

bhughes03@yahoo.com 21762

The employment is good for the workers in that area.

Bianca Geisdorf 18104

My name is Bianca Geisdorf and I'm from Aurora. I am the vice-president of the 7th Grade Student Council for Mesabi East High School. I know numerous students who live at or beneath the poverty line due to the loss of jobs or lack of opportunity for good-paying jobs. Jobs are important for the future of the students of Mesabi East and the Iron Range. Presently good-paying jobs are secured and many of us will have to move away in order to be able to earn a living capable of supporting a family. The reason our towns are here today in the first place was because of money. It provided our families with jobs capable of supporting them. We need these jobs that PolyMet will bring to our towns for strong communities and thriving families; not ones that just get by living in poverty. We truly care about our land, air and water and believe that the SDEIS is sufficient to address this. The co-lead agencies have done the job needed to show that PolyMet will not pollute our land, air and water. I support the work of the DNR, the Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Forest Service. I also believe that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is the best in the world and will make sure that PolyMet does not pollute. Thank you.

Bill 6595

Let them build the copper mine so we can have jobs in Minnesota. Bill_Thiffault@yahoo-com Da Bill

18121

BILL: Hello. I am Bill (inaudible) from Ely. I am a lifelong resident and third-generation business owner and former school board member. I look at the opportunity to bring PolyMet to our area and look at the needs, the jobs, the benefits, and (inaudible) and also look at the challenges that face a project like this in water quality, wetlands, wildlife. Growing up in Ely, the population was near 6,000. The K-12 enrollment was 1,775 students. Today there are 540 kids in Ely's K-12. That's a drop of 70 percent resulting in the loss of dozens of teaching jobs. Ely's population today is about 3,460. A drop of 264 from 2000 to 2010. Sure there is more people living in the townships, but that doesn't tell the whole story. Drive into town and look at the shuttered storefronts. The additional people in the townships haven't kept those businesses open. Drive to the post office. Eight empty house in two blocks. (Inaudible) shingles coming off the roofs. Our median age is now 45.3 and climbing. A jump more than 6 percent since the 2000 census. The median household income has dropped from 27,602 to an average of 24,000 as of the 2010 census. 200 families on food-shelf assistance this year compared to 110 last year. Tourism by itself is not providing sustainability. Obviously there is a tremendous need for jobs here in our area, not China. We need the metals. We also care if mining is done environmentally responsibly to maintain our clean water and air. I-Pads, computers, electronic places use the metals that come from this project. Hybrid cars, (inaudible) wind turbines. When you turn on the appliance or lights in your house, you are using copper. When you go to the dentist or doctor, the stainless steel surgical tools are nickel alloyed steel. Therefore, after reading the SDEIS summary and reviewing other documents of the document, I can conclude that the scientific integrity, the research, (inaudible), including the mitigation and mtreatment procedures have done an in-depth job to accurately address the issues. And I support the findings for this project to move forward.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill 45634

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. NAME. Bill Culbert ADDRESS 601 5th Av. So. Virginia, Mn. 55792 Sent from my iPhone

58167

Hello. I am Bill (inaudible) from Ely. I am a lifelong resident and third-generation business owner and former school board member. I look at the opportunity to bring PolyMet to our area and look at the needs, the jobs, the benefits, and (inaudible) and also look at the challenges that face a project like this in water quality, wetlands, wildlife. Growing up in Ely, the population was near 6,000. The K-12 enrollment was 1,775 students. Today there are 540 kids in Ely's K-12. That's a drop of 70 percent resulting in the loss of dozens of teaching jobs. Ely's population today is about 3,460. A drop of 264 from 2000 to 2010. Sure there is more people living in the townships, but that doesn't tell the whole story. Drive into town and look at the shuttered storefronts. The additional people in the townships haven't kept those businesses open. Drive to the post office. Eight empty house in two blocks. (Inaudible) shingles coming off the roofs. Our median age is now 45.3 and climbing. A jump more than 6 percent since the 2000 census. The median household income has dropped from 27,602 to an average of 24,000 as of the 2010 census. 200 families on food-shelf assistance this year compared to 110 last year. Tourism by itself is not providing sustainability. Obviously there is a tremendous need for jobs here in our area, not China. We need the metals. We also care if mining is done environmentally responsibly to maintain our clean water and air. I-Pads, computers, electronic places use the metals that come from this project. Hybrid cars, (inaudible) wind turbines. When you turn on the appliance or lights in your house, you are using copper. When you go to the dentist or doctor, the stainless steel surgical tools are nickel alloyed steel. Therefore, after reading the SDEIS summary and reviewing other documents of the document, I can conclude that the scientific integrity, the research, (inaudible), including the mitigation and treatment procedures have done an in-depth job to accurately address the issues. And I support the findings for this project to move forward.

Bill & Nancy Henke 4783

Hello. It is my belief that this project should not proceed without full due diligence environmentally (ie. conservation over mitigation/ repair of damage) and full and complete financial assurance by Polymet. Full financial assurance by my definition means that it is provided for by the company inflicting the damage, for the duration, whether this is for decades or for hundreds of years. The monetary amount backing this full financial assurance should take into account not only industry projections of clean up needs but also worst case scenarios including catastrophic accidents and acts of nature that overcome technology. Minnesota's water and land resources are an undeniable treasure and absolutely cannot be compromised. We are already so hard on our environment and can ill afford to further punish it with impunity. A legacy of a well cared for and sustainable Minnesota natural environment holds far more value to me than the convenience of my cell phone and the limited entertainment emanating from my big screen TV. Thank you. William C. Henke MD 962 South Shore Drive Detroit Lakes, MN 56501 HYPERLINK "mailto:wchenke1@gmail-com" wchenke1@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bill braskey

41803

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, bill braskey Mankato, Minnesota

Bill Collins

57476

To Whom it May Concern- I am writing to express my support for the issuance of permits for PolyMet Mining. I have been actively following Polymet's efforts and after reviewing SDEIS, news articles and opinion pieces I am confident PolyMet's project will have no discernable impact on the natural environment while at the same time greatly benefitting the economic environment. I have personally invested in the project not only because of my confidence in PolyMet but also because I want to see my state benefit from the great jobs, economic synergy and expanded tax base and my country from the increase in the domestic supply of critical metals needed in many vital manufacturing industries. I urge you to approve PolyMet's mining permits. Bill Collins, Managing Director N 44 Productions 275 East 4th Street, Suite 730 Saint Paul, MN 55101 Phone: 651-290-2290 Cell: 612-961-7311 Fax: 651-224-6902

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill Conger

38700

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: While I am not against mining in general, this type of mine in this location seems like a recipe for disaster. Please consider the quality of life, the value of wild and natural places, and the health of our citizens and environment and reject the PolyMet plan. It is difficult to place a dollar amount on the above items. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Bill Conger
Bill Conger
455 Ridge View Circle Hamel, MN 55340

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill Dilley

16105

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Bill Doran

42523

See attachment

Bill Erzar

38801

To whom it may concern: Attached to this email is my comment letter as a Microsoft Word document on the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS and my feelings on the environmental aspects and socio-economic needs of the Project. Sincerely, Bill Erzar 1232 Heather St Ely, MN 55731 PS: Please Forward to: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 LaFayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025

Bill Fredrickson

43099

Attn. Lisa Fay - EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division Of Ecological and Water Resources Please green light the permitting and approval process required for the proposed PolyMet mining operation in your jurisdiction. I have followed this approval process for several years and strongly believe that the PolyMet Mining Company has operated in the best interests of the public and the enviroment. Both in the past and fully intends to meet all expectations in the future of the EPA and the Minnestota Department of Natural Resources. Also Minnesota really needs the jobs. Thank you for your consideration and this opportunity to weigh in. Sincerely, William Fredrickson 5428 Overlook Drive NE Albuquerque, NM 87111

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill Holden

58108

My February National Geographic Magazine came yesterday and the article, "Gold Fever in the Yukon", documents the exact issues we debate today. That is; long term environmental and economic stability versus short term extractive wealth and its threats to a regional community. Yes, twenty to thirty years is very short term for the issues we must decide today a wealthy owner of a current Yukon prospecting company is quoted in the article; "I tell people not to get too attached to all this beauty. We just might want to mine it." I have seen firsthand the yellow orange acidified streams flowing near western state copper mines. I have seen firsthand the moonscape desolation around Sudbury, Ontario caused by the copper nickel mines and smelters. Treeless granite hills where the rocks crumble in your hand and the lakes sparkle blue and fishless. Granted, companies who extract and process ores have been forced to meet much more stringent environmental guidelines in the past few decades, but significant air and water pollution will occur in any mining project. PolyMet has done a lot of advance work on this DEIS. It is an impressive document. It is also imperative to always remember that a corporation is required by United States law to reap maximum monetary rewards for its stockholders. This fact mandates that business operations externalize costs whenever feasible. The DEIS states on page 5-7 that the mine and plant site might need hundreds of years of monitoring and maintenance. What American companies can you name that are still viable after only one hundred years? How will future inhabitants of northeastern Minnesota pay for this task? St. Louis, Lake, and Cook counties have a combined population of approximately 220,000 people. The PolyMet plan estimates about 360 permanent jobs over the twenty year life of the mine. This means that the equivalent of .16% of the 3 county regions will have jobs through the mine. If those 360 jobs each pay \$100,000 per year then they will bring thirty six million dollars a year into the community, for the 20 years of operation. In 1996 David T. Schaller from the Department of Geography at the University of Minnesota did a research study of the economic impact of tourism in the region. He found that the major group of visitors are from Minnesota and visit for the fishing. He estimated the regional monetary impact of tourism at around fifty million dollars a year. Tourism and diversified small businesses will bring in that fifty million dollars a year for the next twenty years and on into our great grand kids' futures. The issues are simple but deep. Short term extractive wealth and its threats to the established community or long term environmental and economic stability. The people of PolyMet and Glencore Xstrata must PROVE IT FIRST at another copper nickel mine and then return in twenty years to talk about sulfide mining in the St. Louis and Rainy River watersheds of Minnesota.

Bill Horsch

7663

I am writing to you today to thank you for the excellent job done putting together the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS for the PolyMet Project. It is a thorough analysis of all aspects of the proposed mining effort with specific solutions defined to address all areas where the environment could be impacted. Thank you for a job well done. I fully support the PolyMet project and ask that you complete the SDEIS review phase and move to the permitting phase as soon as possible. In addition, I want to convey my strong support to maximize the protection of the environment while the project is underway. I believe we must do both, safely mining for critically necessary metals and protecting the environment are both necessary. I do not think these are mutually exclusive goals and I believe the PolyMet project has developed a comprehensive, practical plan for safely developing, executing, and closing the mining project. So, please, endorse the PolyMet project. Remember, We Must Do Both. Sincerely yours, William H. Horsch 2292 Timberlea Dr Woodbury, MN 55125

Bill McKechnie

39014

You cannot build this mine because the company and its owners will not fund the two hundred plus years of compliance to protect their mine waste from our fresh water. It is simple if they can insure for the two hundred plus years a fund to observe and protect our fresh water, then the market forces can be used to protect the water, however, I know of no insurance company that will underwrite such a risk at a premium that Poly Met can afford, thus there is not way to mitigate the risk of the mining wastes thus no mine should be build. Given the track record of the mining industry in managing mine wastes, we can not trust our fresh water to these business people. There is not enough money to be made to risk our fresh water future. With a barrel of water put in plastic bottles more expensive than a barrel of oil, we should protect our water. Finally, there is not enough jobs to make this work either. Bill McKechnie Wolf Hill Management 1394 Blackburn Dr Cotton, MN. 55724 952-237-2962 612-208-7753 wemwolf@gmail-com USBC Agent

Bill Morrissey

42739

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill Polchow 19524

My name is Bill Polchow, P-O-L-C-H-O-W. I reside at 49623 County Road 191 in Deer River, Minnesota. My comment is the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmith Forgers and Helpers, Local 647, would like to comment on the implementation of PolyMet. Boilermakers Local 647 covers all of Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota. Although we are considered one of the least-known construction unions, we feel we play a big part in the industry. In a nutshell, we construct and repair power and steam-generating boilers, construct and repair pressurized vessels, construct and repair stacks, and more importantly, construct and repair pollution control devices, such as baghouses and scrubbers. Our trade has been around a long time with many generations of proud boilermakers who have seen the streets and yards black with soot and the air hazy from the emissions from smoke stacks of factories. We are proud of the fact that we are partly responsible for the cleanup, clean air we now have, and the fact that most of the emissions we now see from the stacks are mostly steam. In fact, most of our work today is the construction of pollution control systems. Boilermakers do not look at the construction of PolyMet as a full-time employment opportunity. As a matter of fact, most boilermakers work short-term jobs and then move to the next. They do, however, believe in protecting the environment in which they live and investing in the economy. The fact is, a third of the Local lives in the area affected by the plant, another third lives in Minnesota outside range, the rest live in North and South Dakota, but we all respect the environment and a strong economy. We also believe in not passing the buck. We look at the environment globally. If these resources are not produced in an area where they are monitored by the finest governing agents in the world, they are still needed and will be produced or shipped out to be produced in an area that is not controlled. As boilermakers, we believe the construction of PolyMet is a win-win situation. Not only does this put back to use the mine, but can create jobs and much needed resources in an environmentally-friendly fashion. Thank you.

Bill R Doherty 7632

See attachment

bill seifert 3309

Noooooo. On Dec 15, 2013 5:54 PM, "NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Bill Sorem 41839

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Bill Sorem Minnetonka, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bill Steele

15967

21 February 2014 Dear Sir or Madam: I am writing to express my views concerning the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). My wife and I moved to northern Minnesota 17 years ago because of its relatively pristine environment with many lakes and forests. As a 71-year old retired geologist, I have seen more than my share of both active and abandoned sulfide mines. I have never seen either an abandoned or a working sulfide mine that was not causing water pollution. Tailings dams leak, pipes leak, waste water seeps through liners, etc According to the SDEIS, At the Mine Site, about 10 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to groundwater seepage), which represents less than 5 percent of total Mine Site water releases. At the Tailings Basin, about 21 gallons per minute of untreated water would be released during closure (all related to Tailings Basin seepage that bypasses the groundwater containment system), In other words, 5-2 million gallons of polluted, untreated water from the mine site and 11 million gallons of untreated seepage from the tailings pond will enter groundwater every year with no treatment whatsoever, and ultimately much of this water will end up in the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers. That in itself should be unacceptable. Moreover, the groundwater model used to obtain these numbers may be flawed so as to skew them to be unrealistically low. Even more problematical is that the SDEIS indicates that the NorthMet Project is to operate for only 20 years but water from the site may need to be treated for 500 years. If we consider a human generation to be 25 years, is one generation of mining employment worth condemning 20 generations to pollution. I think not. In my opinion, to do so is both illogical and immoral. I am adamantly opposed to ruining part of northern Minnesota with this project. If, however, the project is approved, somehow Minnesotans must be protected from the expense of treating waste water for 500 years and other environmental problems that turn up. Our country is not even 500 years old. How can 500 years of waste water treatment be financed over such a period. In my experience the old adage about mining that "Wealth strays and pollution stays," always applies. I doubt that Polymet will exist 500 years from now. I suspect that even 10 years after closure of the mine, when some pollution control agency tries to find Poly Met Mining, Inc. to send a bill for environmental remediation, the result will be something like, "Oh, Poly Met was sold to Acme Mining Company, which is now defunct." If mining does occur, provision must be made to protect Minnesota taxpayers from the expense of dealing with the abandoned mine and plant sites. How do you finance waste water treatment for 500 years. Regulators must obtain funds for long term waste water treatment and cleaning up failures of tailings management facilities up front. The SDEIS itself gives no indication about how centuries of waste water treatment and remediation of probable failures of tailings containment infrastructure will be financed. Clearly, the state of Minnesota must mandate establishment of a large fund for future environmental maintenance at the NorthMet site. The huge Glencore Corporation owns 25% of Polymet. Glencore has extremely deep pockets, and consequently Polymet should be able to provide a very large trust fund for future cleanup actions. Government regulators have an obligation to secure funding to protect Minnesota taxpayers. Large ownership of Polymet by Glencore should itself be a red flag. Glencore and its many subsidiaries are notorious for a wide variety of egregious behavior including tax avoidance, violating UN embargoes of despotic regimes, rampant pollution by its mines, and even major human rights violations. A quick reading of the Wikipedia entry for Glencore gives an overview of some of its wrongdoing as does the site <http://pu>

Bill Thronson

54654

See attachment

Bill Wallace

9644

DNR, I am submitting my feedback regarding the Polymet proposal. It seems to me that the solution to this issue can be had pretty easily. We all want more jobs and everyone benefits from the materials that will be mined through products used in everyday life. The company says they have a plan to deal long-term with the water pollution and will be putting away money into a fund to address it. The easy solution is to triple or quadruple the amount of funding that the company "claims" needs to be set aside. It is certainly in the company's best interest to lowball the number needed so let's have them put in a much higher number that would cover all possible worst case scenarios. What we don't want to happen is for us to run out of money 40 years from now and be stuck with a company that may not even exist. If putting triple the amount of money into the fund forces the project to be uneconomical then maybe it shouldn't be built. I certainly think we can negotiate in good faith and say that milestones can be met for the company to get the money back if it isn't needed at long-term intervals in the future. Bill Wallace Mound, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Billy Southwell

43142

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Billy Southwell 425 13th Ave SE Apt 804 Minneapolis, MN 55414-2060

Birgit Walch

42462

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Birgit Walch Stone Church Rd E Hamilton, ON L8W 0B1

Bjorn K Monson

43043

March 8, 2014 Tim Dabney, Deputy Forest Supervisor U.S. Forest Service, Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Avenue Place Duluth, MN 55808 Dear Mr. Dabney, I am writing in opposition to the PolyMet copper-nickel mining proposal. In 1948 Aldo Leopold wrote in his A Sand County Almanac that, East of the Rocky Mountains, the only remaining parcel of true wilderness was the boundary waters area of Minnesota and Ontario. So far we have been able to preserve this as the BWCA. Permitting the PolyMet project would be the opening of a Pandora's Box releasing multiple evils: Sulfuric acid, the result of disruption of the sulfide containing rock and exposing it to water and air (oxygen.) This will poison the watershed. It is unlikely that this can be neutralized or contained in the short term, let alone for half a millennium. Poisonous heavy metals, especially mercury which is already a problem in northeastern Minnesota. Asbestos causing malignant mesothelioma, which is a horrible disease. It causes a slow painful death. Asbestos also increases the incidence of lung cancer. As a retired heart and lung surgeon I am particularly concerned this problem. Although drainage from the PolyMet mine would flow to the St. Louis River, which already has adverse effects from acid drainage, allowing a permit for the PolyMet Mine would set a precedent, and likely accelerate permits for mines closer to the BWCA. Acid drainage from these mines would then drain into the boundary waters with disastrous effects. Like with Humpty Dumpty, once we break it, all the king's horses and all the king's men, all of the money and all of good intentions cannot put it back together again. I urgently implore you to decide in favor of preservation, and not allow this process to proceed any further. Sincerely, Bjorn K Monson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bjorn K Monson 54768

See attachment

54816

See attachment

Blake Romenesko 42670

See attachment

Blakely Fraasch 44379

Hi my name is Blakely Fraasch, It has come to my attention that Polynet will build their first mine on the edge of the Boundary Waters. In my science class here at Prior Lake High School, we learn the pros and cons of mining. I realize that this mine could cause severe environmental damage with little pros to individuals (little jobs created, with the boom hitting only the corporation). As well as a little economic impact for the state of Minnesota with a huge environmental impact to our land. I believe the right thing to do is to save the beautiful and preserved environment from severe damage. It's time we stop "looking away" from the damage we are causing this planet in order to make some bank. Do the right thing for the true Minnesotans that love our state. Sent from my iPhone

blayne johnson 57479

I would hope people agree that Minnesota's Natural Resources and water quality is more important than pillaging a beautiful natural forest area for a few dollars and a lifetime of potential contamination. I would express my opinion to not allow the mine to proceed.

Bo Benya 39352

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bo Benya 3325 High Way 55 Eagan, MN 55121 (651) 621-3109

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Amis

15289

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay, Please consider this my comment on the SDEIS for the NorthMet mining project. My name is Bob Amis. I live in Minneapolis, and own a cabin near the Boundary Waters in Cook County, MN. I have a number of serious concerns with the current Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Even though it has been improved from the original Draft Environmental Impact Statement, there appear to be a number of deficiencies remaining in the document, including numerous unsupported assumptions and unsubstantiated, overly optimistic projections which, if uncorrected, will not adequately protect the region from an unacceptably high risk of air and water pollution. I will give two specific examples, although there are many others: First, The SDEIS estimates that the project will increase seepage at the LTV tailings dump from 2,020 to 3,380 gallons per minute. The SDEIS then claims that all but 21 gallons per minute will be contained. That's a collection rate of over 99%. The SDEIS does not support this estimate by naming one tailings pile in Minnesota, or anywhere else, that has experienced such a high collection rate from pumps at the edge of an unlined tailings pile. It is my understanding that comparable real world experience is between 50% and 75% collection rates. The SDEIS does not consider the impact to water quality if the collection rate is lower than this extremely optimistic estimate. I ask you to require the SDEIS to be revised to include real world data on collection rates for tailings piles of this type, and an analysis of water quality outcomes if the tailings pile collection rate is not what PolyMet claims. Second, The SDEIS acknowledges that the bedrock at the mine site contains numerous fractures, but states that these fractures won't transport pollution into the nearby 100-Mile Swamp and Partridge River. In order to come to this conclusion, the SDEIS assumes low average, or "bulk" rates of rock conductivity, claiming that any pollution will take dozens, or even hundreds of years to travel even a short distance. This defies common sense. We all know that water will flow along the bedrock, find the fractures, and then flow through those fractures at a rapid rate, much faster than the SDEIS assumes. Furthermore, in addition to the existing fractures, mine site blasting will occur every 2-3 days, breaking up 200,000 to 300,000 tons of rock with each blast, creating more fracturing in the bedrock. The impact of this increased bedrock fracturing is not contemplated in the SDEIS. Therefore, I ask you to require the SDEIS to be revised to clearly analyze and explain the impact on surface and ground water if contaminated water from the mine site is transported through fractures in the bedrock. Ms Fay, I am not opposed to this mining project per se, but I am opposed to any project that will pollute the air or water of this beautiful state. I implore you to hold this project to a high enough standard to ensure that our air and water quality are not compromised. Sincerely, Robert W. Amis Jr. 1911 Kenwood Parkway Minneapolis, MN 55405

Bob and Joy Johnson

42045

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Bob and Joy Johnson Harmony, Minnesota

Bob and M Wright

58081

What will we have left for our grandchildren? Everything in our country is not for sale. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Bartlett

9394

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Bartlett 5080 Silver Lake Rd 5080 Silver Lake Rd Mounds View, MN 55112

18647

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Bartlett 5080 Silver Lake Rd 5080 Silver Lake Rd Mounds View, MN 55112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Bartlett

18985

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Bob Bartlett 5080 Silver Lake Rd 5080 Silver Lake Rd Mounds View, MN 55112

28003

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The BWCA is unique to the world. There is no other place like it, except for a smaller area in Canada. This treasure has to be given the best protection possible. PolyMet must be able to prove, guarantee that their mine will not affect the quality of wetlands and water in this area. They cannot do this as of yet. Human error happens. that is how we got Asian carp and oil spills. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Bob Bartlett 5080 Silver Lake Rd NW Mounds View, MN 55112-4817 (763) 780-1110

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Bartlett

40461

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Bartlett

50722

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Bob Bartlett 5080 Silver Lake Rd 5080 Silver Lake Rd Mounds View, MN 55112

Bob Beutel

44578

Dear Director, I cannot find on the DNR website the public comment section on the Polymet application, so please forward this to the appropriate office/file/folder: Polymet has no record at all of mineral mining, much less a record of environmentally safe mining. All the promises and assurances it gives are of no value. The cost of failure is cataclysmic: All of the Boundary Waters and Quetico from Basswood to Crane Lake, and Voyageurs National Park, Rainy River, and Lake of the Woods would be rendered sterile – no fish, no vegetation, no clear water, no safe swimming, nothing. That kind of risk is inconceivable and unimaginable. Those waters are not ours to ruin – we hold them in trust for many succeeding generations. 20 years of profit and a handful of jobs are not justification for ruination of our natural jewels. Robert Beutel Attorney at Law 2080 Edgumbe Road St Paul, MN 55116 Phone: 651-699-7392 Fax: 651-699-6308 <http://bobbbeutel.wordpress-com/about/>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Boeck

45187

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Boeck 2207 10th Ave S St Cloud, MN 56301

45189

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Boeck 2207 10th Ave S St Cloud, MN 56301

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Brezinski 54473

See attachment

Bob Carlson 18089

My name is Bob Carlson. I'm from Ely. I'd like to address wild rice. I started picking wild rice in 1963. I think I'm familiar with all of the major rice beds in Northern Minnesota, and many, many, many of the small, little rice beds. I went through the draft statement. I read everything that I could read on wild rice, and I think that the DNR and the other people involved did a really thorough job in their research on wild rice. Several comments I got about that. The areas downstream of the PolyMet Project have such a tiny bit of wild rice that I don't think it's really an issue. There's not a bed of rice down there that's large enough to harvest any rice out of, and -- and another thing to add in that tiny bit of rice down is something that really went haywire with the wild rice, we've got a lot of lakes in this area that historically didn't have rice. Some examples are Stone Lake near Hoyt Lakes, Seven Beaver. Stone Lake's got more than 100 acres of rice. Seven Beavers has got 4 or 500 acres. Those were seeded by the forest service in the 1970s, and they've got good crops of wild rice right now. There's a whole bunch more and I know a bunch of them that were seeded, some by the DNR, which they're in the process right now of trying to seed some, so that would mitigate any damage, should something happen. A couple other comments on this. They've got Hay Lake listed as a control site, you know, for comparison to the PolyMet Project. I think that's a poor, poor lake for a number of reasons. I picked rice in that lake for a number of years starting in the '60s. Sulfate levels. They check the sulfate downstream of this PolyMet site at a number of places. Two of the places where they checked sulfate layers, levels were much higher than the 10 parts per million. One was 17.something, another one was in the 30s. So it makes me wonder if the DNR and maybe our legislators shouldn't look at raising that 10-part-per-million sulfate level because rice is growing pretty darn good right now where that -- where the levels are higher. I guess the last thing I'd like to say is that the band members in the 1854 Treaty area have concerns about wild rice, but I think their concerns are really unfounded due to all these other lakes that have been planted that historically didn't have rice. Thank you.

19523

My name is Bob Carlson. I live at 324 East White Street, Ely, Minnesota. I'd like to address the wildlife -- or the wild rice issues. I think that concerns about wild rice with this PolyMet Project are really overblown. I've been picking wild rice since 1963, and I've picked most of St. Louis County and adjoining counties, and downstream of PolyMet, I'm completely unaware of any significant wild rice stands. So even if they did release sulfites that were damaging to wild rice, there isn't any wild rice there to hurt, so I think it's an insignificant thing to think about. And another thing, if wild rice was harmed by some sulfides released from the PolyMet Project, they could quite easily mitigate that by purchasing some ponds and planting wild rice. The United States Forest Service and the State of Minnesota have planted wild rice in the area with very good success. Stone Lake near Hoyt Lakes is one example, it has at least 150 acres, or maybe 200 when the crops are good. Seven Beavers, which is at the headwaters of the St. Louis River, has much more than that, maybe 4- to 500 acres of wild rice. That was planted by the United States Forest Service in the '70s. Plus, there are some lakes near Ely that were planted and wild rice grows well, and the State of Minnesota, at this time, the Minnesota DNR is attempting to get rice growing in a lake called Garfield Lake. It's between Soudan and Ely off the Mud Crick Road. So I think the wild rice concerns are really insignificant and should not be a factor in this draft EIS. Thank you.

Bob Hale 44617

My concern with granting permits to the mining companies pertains to the water quality of the mines after the metals have been exhausted. I do not see adequate funds being required to execute a plan B in case all the currently mentioned mitigation fails. The main issue is: you can't take it back once it has been released into the environment. According to my analysis of past industry cases, there is a larger than prudent risk of contamination. I don't see specified, who will monitor these so called bedrock walls that would contain pollutants. Overall, it doesn't seem like a good idea to risk our wonderful resources. Why don't we just give the mine workers a salary, it would be cheaper than trying to fix things afterwards. Bob Hale St Paul, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Haugen

17228

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Haugen 5813 36th Ave N. Crystal, MN 55422

50494

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Bob Haugen 5813 36th Ave N. Crystal, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Haugen

52227

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Bob Haugen 5813 36th Ave N Crystal, MN 55422

Bob Ilg

45848

Subject: SDEIS Date: March 12, 2014 To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Minnesota DNR, Please do not let SDEIS do any mining in the Superior National Forest Please save our wetlands, bogs, and swamps from being destroyed by pollution due to open-pit mines. We do not want contamination of ground water or our lakes and rivers. Once the water is polluted it will never be the same. Clean water is precious to every form of life. Minnesota's valued resource today and the future for its economy. SDEIS is inadequate and should not be mining in a fragile ecosystem. Robert Ilg 57 Bunn Trail Grand Marais, MN 55604

Bob Kaiser

16234

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Lenzmeier 44829

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Twenty years of jobs with the result being hundreds of years of polluted water. Any project that harms the water supply should be turned down without question. Sincerely, Mr Bob Lenzmeier 5041 Wood Ave Saint Paul, MN 55110-6625

Bob Ray 42027

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Bob Ray St Paul, Minnesota

Bob Shannon 47660

Please find attached my comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS. Sincerely, Robert Shannon Grand Marais, Minnesota

Bob St. Dizier 21252

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. The United States needs and the jobs it can get. Complete the process. Bob St Dizier 316 Montrose Ave Lafayette, LA 70503 bstdzier@cox-net

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Tammen

18090

I'm Bob Tammen from Soudan, Minnesota. I worked in several of the mines, and in the '70s, I had the privilege of working on the PolyMet site, back then it was Erie Mining Company, and it's an interesting history, and in my golden years, my wife and I spent a lot of time working with environmental organizations and I worked the Blueberry Festival in Ely, and perhaps some people here have stopped by and talked with me, reasoned with me, and there are a few that agree with me and one, especially, stuck in my mind. He was a water plant operator that worked on the Dunka site. They had a water treatment plant on that site to clean up the water before it ran into Birch Lake and they eliminated his job. They shut down that water treatment plant, which was meeting Minnesota's discharge standards, and they went to a constructive wetland, which was cheaper to operate but did not consistently meet Minnesota's discharge standard. As a matter of fact, there's a variance request in right now for the Dunka site. And just recently, we've had other request for a variance. We've heard so much about Minnesota's stringent environmental regulations. There's a request for a variance in right now on PolyMet's leaking tailings pond over here. It's leaking 2.9 million gallons a day. Now, that plant shut down in 2001. They've had a very good opportunity to clean it up. I think it's time they started cleaning up their mine sites and quit granting variances. We've also heard mention of socioeconomic effects and I think, once again, the environmental impact statement should do the science. We've heard people talk about 2,000 pages of science in that EIS and we've heard talk about socioeconomic effects. The studies are out there. If you build your economy on a mining industry, on the average, in the United States of America, you have you lousier economy than people that built their economies on nothing but the intellectual horsepower of their residents. We're going to be trapped in this boom-and-bust economy until we finally accept that we are a talented people up here and we're going to have to build our economy on the talents of our people instead of on stripping our assets, which are going to be shipped overseas, they aren't going to be building windmills in our backyard. We've already got a contract outstanding with Glencore. There's only half a dozen places on earth that can process these plant minerals. They're headed out of our country. So with that, I'd say, we should start working now on the future of our children. Give them something besides mining. Thank you.

18205

My name is Jacquelyn Halberg, and I respectfully defer my time to Mr. Bob Tammen. I'm Bob Tammen from Soudan, Minnesota, T-A-M-M-E-N. My wife and I live in Soudan, a little mining town, and I worked in several of the mines when I was younger, so I'm familiar with the process, with the economy, and so a lot of people have spoken on environmental issues. I want to focus a little bit on socioeconomic issues. First, I would respond to the mayor of Hoyt Lakes who said the IRRRB is working tirelessly to diversify the economy of Northern Minnesota. I go to IRRRB meetings, and I can assure they work tirelessly to rebate tax dollars right back to the mining industry; In the last 20 years, over \$200 million. They did it again last year, and they'll do it again this year unless we embarrass them enough to quit rebating tax dollars to taconite companies, and it takes a lot to embarrass a mining company. I would also comment on the Chamber of Commerce spokesperson that said the industry does not seek to weaken Minnesota's environmental regulations. The industry regularly requests variances to Minnesota's discharge standards, and the State of Minnesota regularly grants those variances. I checked the list at the end of 2013. There is a variance request for PolyMet's tailings pond which is leaking approximately 2.9 million gallons a day as we speak. If we have stringent environmental regulations in Minnesota, why are these tailings ponds constantly leaking. And in closing, I would speak as a union member who believes in collective bargaining, and I would point out to our friends in the labor movement that have been promoting this project that it's been a long battle. I lived through Reaganomics. It's even worse now, and I sympathize with people trying to maintain a decent standard of life, but we've seen what happened in Wisconsin, we couldn't get the vote on the recall. We've seen what happened in Michigan, right to work. Why does that happen? You union people should realize that environmentalists tend to be progressive people that support your collective bargaining agreements and tax (inaudible.) Why are you bashing the last friends you have in the State of Minnesota? Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Tammen

41216

Please accept the following comments. They will also be submitted as hardcopy for your convenience.-Bob Tammen Lisa Fey, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Comments on Northmet SDEIS Dear Ms Fey: Please accept the following comments on behalf of myself and my wife Pat. I have worked in the mining industry as both a direct and contract employee in Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. Pat was employed as a teacher for over 30 years and we have seen the negative economic and environmental consequences of mining in the communities where we were employed. As retirees in northern Minnesota, we oppose opening up a sulfide ore body while the State of Minnesota has demonstrably failed to properly regulate the taconite mining industry. Sincerely, Robert Tammen PO Box 398 Soudan, MN 55782

***** GLOSSARY It has been my experience in the industry that acid draining from a mine is referred to as Acid Mine Drainage. Industry efforts to euphemize the term to Acid Rock Drainage is sadly unprofessional and should be corrected in the glossary and in the SDEIS. ES-10 "uninterrupted operation" There is no history or probability of uninterrupted mining operations in Minnesota. ES-24 Adaptive Management. As a Vietnam veteran, I personally participated in one of the larger adaptive management exercises in American history. When my unit, the 173rd Airborne, was transferred from Okinawa to Vietnam in the spring of 1965, we were told we'd be returning in a few months. Of course, we never returned to Okinawa. The war drug on for 10 years but the magic of adaptive management allowed the military industrial complex to keep the profits rolling in regardless of costs or casualties. Just as the military industrial complex dominated US policy, the mining-political complex dominates Minnesota to the detriment of its environment and economy. As a firewall against excessive meddling by agency personnel, the mining industry hires retiring State employees to make sure that any "adapting" they must do is favorable to their bottom line. Our environment should not be exposed to the vagaries of adaptive management. ES-31 PolyMet. Several documents refer to PolyMet and Poly Met (Two words). There must be a reason for having two different legal entities. The SDEIS should explain the difference and perhaps declare which will get dividends and which will have environmental clean up liability. ES-40 Federal, state, and local taxes. The SDEIS does not quantify rebates traditionally given to the mining industry. Our history of rebates to the taconite industry should be documented and the probability of rebates to the sulfide mining industry should be acknowledged. ES-40 IMPLAN. The November 2012 UMD Economic Impact Report and it's IMPLAN references are not credible. Page 4 declares that mining totals approximately 5-3% of Minnesota's Gross Regional Product but the same page lists Minnesota GRP as \$281-1 billion and mining GRP as \$4-5 billion. Mining is obviously less than 2% of Minnesota's economy. ES-41 "There is no legal access to the federal lands via land, The SDEIS should acknowledge that the mining industry has the power to prevent American citizens from accessing Superior National Forest land and should resist efforts to give the industry even more power by facilitating a sulfide mining operation in Minnesota. ES-41 Cumulative Effects. Respected geologists have estimated that the Duluth Complex is a 10 billion ton ore body and have predicted with great certainty that it will be developed. Being the State of Minnesota has been able to estimate the cumulative benefits for school trust funds, the State should also be able to give a

44398

Dear Ms Fey, Wetlands Action Group requests that a cost-benefit analysis be done that recognizes ore removal as asset depletion. We also request that the EIS analyzes the synergistic effects of discharging mineral based endocrine disruptors from mining operations into waters that already have other endocrine disruptors. Sincerely, Robert Tammen, President Wetlands Action Group PO Box 387 Soudan, MN 55782

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bob Tanner

18377

I'm Bob Tanner from Soudan, Minnesota. An old mining town. I worked in several of the mines in my younger years. And there are a few issues with the supplement to the EIS that I believe need improvement. Of course, being we live in that economy I don't think the EIS treats the economic issues thoroughly. Now there's some sections in there that talk about the benefits of mining, but we know that there are significant costs to living in a mining economy. I will start with the rebates we're giving to the mining company. We read that EIS and see that we're getting millions in taxes. But that EIS doesn't disclose that we're giving \$220 million back to the mining companies. Over the last 20 years they clawed back \$220 million of our tax dollars. Now that's important to my wife Pat and I because our high school in Tower closed a couple of years ago. Just a little bit of that 220 million could have healed us up for quite a while. But the mining company has the political clout. They get that money back. And those of us that came down here from The Range drove down Highway 53. What is it going to cost us to move that highway? The mining company wants the highway moved. We're going to pay. They have enough political clout to get an agreement that we're going to move that highway. Well, Pat and I go to the informational meetings to try to figure out how much it's going to cost us to move that highway. A year or so go they said, "Well, between 60 and \$150 million." A couple weeks ago we went back for another informational meeting. "Well, we have a lot of alternatives. Between 80 and 300 million." Now any time you got blacktop involved, I would say you're going to end up the higher end of the range. But that's the cost of having a mining economy and not being diversified. Another thing I bring up is that we've heard lot of people say that we have clean water in Northern Minnesota. We're responsible stewards. That we can trust our mining organizations up there to do the right thing. I live within a mile of Lake Vermilion. Sulfates in Lake Vermilion are now over 10 milligrams per liter on our end of the lake. We know there's over 100 miles of headwaters in the St. Louis River. My wife and I love Birch Lake. The Dunka site is still leaking toxic crap into Bob Bay of Birch Lake. We've heard speakers say, "Well, we've got reverse osmosis. We got wonderful technology now." If this technology is appropriate for mining, why aren't we using it to clean up our existing messes? Minnesota has a history of being unable to regulate the mining industry. Thank you.

Bob Wirtanen

46536

My name is Robert A. Wirtanen currently residing at 5805 English Drive Farmington, NM 87402 I was raised in northern Minnesota for 24 years and I currently own property in Minnesota. I am opposed to the SDEIS NorthMet Project for the following reasons. Waters Resources are portrayed as capturing greater than 90% of the water for treatment. This should be reset to 100%. Mercury loading levels to a receiving water resource should NEVER be allowed to increase.(example Table 1 Page 53 the Embarrass River) Aluminum and lead evaluation criteria should NEVER be allowed to exceed applicable water quality evaluation standards Robert A. Wirtanen, CSP Retired - Environmental Specialist (35 years) Oil and Gas Industry.

Bobbi Galush

4

I have been following this saga for over 8 years now. Northern MN needs this. Let's go. The EIS addresses all of my concerns. I am embarrassed that the government has delayed this project for this long. No wonder why northern MN has been suffering for so long. Reverse osmosis is the best technology to keep the water supplies clean. I deal with it daily at my place of work. It is extremely effective. Quit catering to all the tree huggers in this state. We need mining for northern MN. Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bobby King

16260

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bodin sabrina 40392

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, bodin sabrina 3 allée anatole france séné, ot 56860 FR

Bois Forte Band 42979

All; Please find attached the Bois Forte THPO comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. If there are any questions feel free to contact me. Sincerely; Bill Latady
Curator/THPO Bois Forte Band of Chippewa Bois Forte Heritage Museum 1500 Bois Forte Road Tower, MN 55790 218-753-6017 (v) 218-753-6026 (f)

Bonnie 45164

I believe it is not worth the risk to our water resources so I am opposed to the PolyMet proposal. I have studied the issues and attended the public hearing in St Paul. I do own property just a few miles from Hoyt Lakes and the proposed site. Bonnie Boberg 12600 Parkwood Drive Burnsville mn 55337 Sent from my iPhone

Bonnie Blodgett 38722

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Bonnie Blodgett 1 Crocus HI Saint Paul, MN 55102-2809

Bonnie DeClercq 10748

Water needing to be treated for 200-500 years is just too long. What an awful legacy to leave future generations. They need to have a better process before I would be in favor of this mining. Bonnie DeClercq

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bonnie Ford

57873

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Bonnie Kamel

40182

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bonnie Morris

39523

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please consider the significant environmental impact that this mine would have to the treasure that is our Northern Minnesota- the wilderness, the pristine waters of the BWCA, to the Great Lake of Superior. Please think of the generations of the First People's who lived lightly on this land. Consider how the unintended consequences of what is projected but not known about how this mine's construction and operations could lead to impacts that would affect this area for generations to come. Sincerely, Ms Bonnie Morris 3129 James Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-2519

Bonnie Nelson

18279

Bonnie Nelson. For the Land Exchange, I am concerned that we are taking land that is currently in a natural state and turning it into or exchanging it into land that's going to be mining. It would make more sense to take mining land and turn it into a natural state in exchange, so that the two would have an equal use exchange. Does that make sense?

Bonnie Peterson

45234

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Who really believes that polluted leach water would be monitored and treated for hundreds of years after the mining ends. We have no mechanism for long term treatment on that scale. It's more likely that a polluter-friendly government will reduce treatment requirements - or forget them entirely. The land swap should be denied, and mining company should not be allowed to strip mine and expose sulfide waste. Mining company should instead mine underground, replacing waste materials in mined out tunnels. If the strip mine is to be allowed, regulators must keep in mind that are no materials that will hold up for hundreds of years. Waste pit liners will degrade over time, and leak. The project must include at least one, and probably more liner replacements. Look around the country and notice neglected pipelines that leak and burst because once they are installed we neglect them. 20 years of jobs is a bad trade for hundreds of years of problems I am counting on you, as regulators, to protect Minnesota's long term interests. Thank you for your work. Sincerely, Bonnie Peterson Bonnie Peterson 155 Sherwood Road Shoreview, MN 55126

45618

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Please reject the land swap that would enable sulfide mining in the arrowhead region of Minnesota. Sulfide mining and resultant fragmentation of our wild areas would be a permanent loss for Americans. With so few wild areas left in the world, it is more important than ever to preserve them where we can. Sincerely Bonnie Peterson Bonnie Peterson 155 Sherwood Road Shoreview, MN 55126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bonnie Peterson

45621

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Please reject the land swap that would enable sulfide mining in the arrowhead region of Minnesota. Sulfide mining and resultant fragmentation of our wild areas would be a permanent loss for Americans. With so few wild areas left in the world, it is more important than ever to preserve them where we can. Sincerely Bonnie Peterson Bonnie Peterson 155 Sherwood Road Shoreview, MN 55126

Bonnie Ploger

16213

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Bonnie Shallbetter

45677

Hello, I am a resident of Hackensack, Minnesota. I have lived in Minnesota all of my 60 years and have been very proud of that fact. Minnesotans treasure the out of doors and the myriad of outdoor activities the state has to offer. I have been going to the Boundary Waters since I have been 13 years old and it has been a significant factor in shaping me as an adult and my relationship with the outside world. It is truly rare to have a place like the Boundary Waters where one can experience quiet and a sense of self. I, therefore, am very much against any mining by PolyMet or any other company with that goal. I strongly believe that it will change the Boundary Waters forever. The shortsighted 20 years of jobs verses 500 years of pollution (and why would it stop there.) is not the legacy we should be leaving for our children and the generations to come. I fear that if the mining proceeds we will hugely compromise our natural resources and our beautiful state of Minnesota. Thank you for your time, Sincerely, Bonnie Shallbetter 934 32nd Street NW Hackensack, Minnesota 56452

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bonnie Shenski

19531

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Bonnie Shenski 2606 Chapel Lake Dr apt105 Gambrills, MD 21054 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bonnie staples

17433

Feb 16, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Brad Bjorklund

40311

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Sometimes one relies upon experts in the field and in this case I find that Dave Crawford of White Bear, Minnesota, a retired State Park Naturalist, has made correct and truthful comments about the SDEIS that need to be adopted. I have read and agree with his conclusions. Please adopt them. I do not want my grand children to have to drive way around the dead zone you will create on and around the Polymet site. Sincerely Brad Bjorklund 36290 Westlund Ave Taylors Falls, MN 55084 Brad Bjorklund 36290 Westlund Ave Taylors Falls, MN 55084

Brad Borrman

36887

To Whom It May Concern; I am against copper-nickel mining by PolyMet, or any similar operation in NE Minnesota. I have seen the damage done by other mining projects and do not want to jeopardize the clean water, fishing, forests, and tourism industry we currently have in place. When you make an informed decision, you balance the risks vs rewards, and the risks are far too great. We have something special in NE Minnesota. Do not take the chance of ruining it for our generation, my children's generation, grandchildren's generation, and all generations to come. Please do what is right and deny this permit. Thank you. Brad Borrman 111 Westmaher Drive Marine on St Croix, MN. 55047 612-850-4152(cell) bradbwca@aol-com Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brad Clifford

19530

My name is Brad Clifford. I'm with -- I live at 1006 West Sixth Street in Duluth, Minnesota, 55806. My comments are in agreement with the Water Legacy in addressing the cumulative effects and the request for an EPA study. Last month, 59 groups in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan asked the United States Environmental Protection Agency to do a cumulative analysis of the effects of mining on the Lake Superior Basin. These 59 groups included Duluth businesses, non-profits and faith groups like Whole Food Co-Op in Duluth; the Institute for a Sustainable Future; Idle No More Duluth; Peace United Church of Christ; Food, Energy and Environmental Team. On January 6, Congresswoman Betty McCollum sent a letter urging the EPA to use the funds provided by Congress to conduct an assessment and inform citizens of the generational consequences of sulfide mining to impact ecosystems, human health and the basis of tremendous water resource. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't study impacts that could affect mercury contamination of fish in the St. Louis River Estuary, let alone impacts to habitat and tribal resources in the region. A cumulative effect analysis of mining should be done before the PolyMet SDEIS gets finalized. That would permit us to know the consequences before opening up Minnesota's northeast to a sulfide mining district.

57354

My name is Brad Clifford. It is C-L-I-F-F-O-R-D. I live at 1005 W.6th Street, Duluth, Minnesota 55806. My telephone number is (218) 260-3208. And my comments are reflective of that information that I've heard in many community conversations, as well as conversations that we have looked at at Northstar Community Development Corporation, which for 35 years we, as a nonprofit organization, look at economic development, small business development, job creation, cost per job, and sustainability of risking capital to create economic opportunity. Over our 35 years we have invested eight million to nine million dollars with 350 ventures, and 125 are still in business today, with about 600 jobs. So, with that, I look at the history of '72, 1972, when US Steel closed down out in Morgan Park 320 acres that are still on the Remedial Action Plan with the Superfund site, and there is no money to clean up an estimated 28 to 38 million dollar cost to reclaim and restore the land. And some say the land will heal itself. And others say, "If we ever lived out there, we would create a Love Canal incident all over again." We did manage, I believe, a sizable amount of money, somewhere between I think 15 to 20 million, I'm not sure of the exact amount, with the Equestria (phonetic) cleanup. And there was some dumpings that were in Lake Superior that the Red Lake Tribe is investigating, which many dismissed it, not wanting to look at the impact to fish migratory patterns and other issues to the habitat when contaminants were put into the lake. And when we see drought and when we see lack of water, like in Colorado or other places in the country, and we can buy water at \$10 a gallon, our greatest resource, above and beyond what we cut down of the trees or what we can dig up out of the earth, really is our water. So, as citizens of Duluth, the question we are scratching our head and saying is, "Well, wait a minute. Nobody has cleaned up the US Steel site." So, if we are going to exploit and take one percent of the earth and crush the other 99 percent and leave tailings, what would Judge Myles Lord say? What would we do to clean up after the fact? And if we simply say, "Well, we will shove it down the road to the next generation," and here we are, 40 years later, and the US Steel site is still a mess. How do we trust this economic opportunity? And how do we assure ourselves that we can see sustainability, we can see an economic balance, sort of the idea of an "economic equilibrium," and Dr. Gram Nash's theory, who was a Nobel Prize winner on economics, where values were assigned to each component, the land exchanged, the reclamation, the actual value of the minerals in the ground and the cost to get them up, and the tax revenue that the agencies and state can levy to keep it balanced. And as long as those answers come up to a balanced equation, then we should -- we should go forward as quickly as possible. However, if the questions aren't answered and mitigation and rationalization and the science isn't proven, that's the problem that we have. Who can say honestly and clearly that this science has been proven? When Mesabi Nugget tried to prove their technology, they did a very, very small equation, and it took several years for that to be proven, before they went forward to the next step. And if we skip any step and try to argue that our concerns are dismissive, then the deliberative democratic process gets thwarted. And so suddenly somebody's assertion isn't as important as the individual that has more money and can buy it, does it? So, when we look at our mineral rights in our forest, they may not be worth what some people believe them to be worth. And if they are, then show us what the math is. And if they can do that, then people will buy into it. But if they can't, and they can't deliver, then remediation, for example, in the river, if it gets to certain levels -- and how do we determine those levels? At .2 on the map, and down at the rice patties

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brad Davidson

44755

269 Anemone Dr Boulder, CO 80302 TO: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, My name is Bradley R. Davidson, I have a Masters in Environmental Geochemistry and have lived in the Southern and Central Rocky Mountains for most of 40+ years. I have seen first hand the results of the hard rock mining of massive sulfides underground though out the WeSt Efforts to control AMD in many area of the West have met with limited success and long, long term care and oversight has been the prognosis. The only bright spot is that some sites have become living laboratories for the study of AMD. Requests for samples come from around the world. Not an export to be proud of. The NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange and its Supplemental DEIS represents a significant improvement in identifying impacts and solutions. This is due to the expanding embrace of interrelated parties and their interests to the realization that other resources will be impacted and their availability to future generations imperiled. It is encouraging to see that the rice waters as well as other 1854 treaty concerns are priority iteMs The potential impacts to the watersheds and the other renewable resources which support sustainable economies cannot be taken lightly and trusted to the normal economies of mining. We owe it to the future to take it slow and do it right the first time. I feel that the process of Impact Assessment continue but not progress with the following points addressed. 1) Why Sulfides will always present a hazard and to consider a sulfate potential standard related to surface area. 2) What kind of extreme weather events are considered. 3) Who would maintain containment in perpetuity. 4) What value do we place on the complete loss of a renewable resource in the immediate area. 5) What value do you place on the potential loss of a much greater area and its resources. 6) What if we made a Return To Initial State a requirement for tailings. I can comfortably discuss just the first point but it is to the heart of the issue. It is a matter of chemistry and physics. Rock turned to coarse flour. In order to separate the low grade disseminated metal sulfides from the waste rock, the ore must be milled to the point where the target minerals are liberated. Liberated: that the grain size is small enough so that one material (mineral) dictates the grain's response to various processes and treatments. Sulfide ores had been sequestered within solid rock for millions of years. What had been solid rock will run through you fingers easily, the texture of fine sand with grains . 074 to .42 mm in diameter. The separation process will evolve as conditions change but the goal is to efficiently remove the valuable from the waste. Trial and error is a common method of refinement in recovery rates. Most likely much regrinding occurs and as a result of the milling the surface areas of metal sulfide minerals such as pyrite and chalcopyrite could be on the order of a fraction of a square meter per gram. The now liberated sulfide minerals are very reactive with respect to oxygen and immediately begins to oxidize or at least will if given the opportunity. The urge to oxidize begins during the milling process and the oxygen is quickly depleted in the early stages of the milling process. Sulfate formation is usually anticipated in flotation processes. The specific hydro-metallurgical process employed will probably strictly control oxidation. The dramatic increase in material surface area contributes to this extraction process but it leaves the discarded sulfide ripe for oxidation. The rate of pyrite oxidation by O2 is first order with respect to the surface area. First order: as you increase a concentration of a particular reactant the reaction increases by a like amount. Double the exposed surface of metal sulfides the rate of oxidation doubles. We are in fact faced with a tremendous increase in the concentration of sulfide surface area by many orders of magnitude. If No

Brad K

43090

Lisa, I am 100% IN FAVOR of the PolyMet Met Mining project and the firm's plans to extract minerals and metals on the Iron Range and northern Minnesota lands managed by the firm. I will also state that I am an avid BWCA/Quetico canoe camper and also water sports enthusiast who frequents numerous northern Minnesota lakes and rivers. I am also involved as a volunteer and camper parent of a YMCA youth camp near Eveleth, MN . I also use the area's bike trails/paths and state and national forests and campgrounds on the Iron Range. This project will be good for the region and state. Again, I am in favor of issuing PolyMet the necessary permits and regulatory paperwork necessary to proceed with the firm's mining plans. I believe it will be very positive for Minnesota economic development and provide much needed natural resources for our region and nation and others around the globe. It will provide needed jobs so more people can pursue the American dream. I am confident in PolyMet's ability to manage its operation(s) and comply with Federal and State regulations - and not have a negative impact on outdoor recreation activities or the natural environment beyond the boundaries of the mining operation and related land/soil and watershed. Thank you, Brad Brad Konkler 23 Wildwood Ave St Paul, MN 55110 952-491-1470 - cell

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brad Little

38871

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Brad Little 2729 E 6th St Duluth, MN 55812-1507 (218) 269-0904

38873

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. A health impact assessment should be standard for projects like this that have the potential to affect both human and environmental health across the Arrowhead. Sincerely, Mr Brad Little 2729 E 6th St Duluth, MN 55812-1507 (218) 269-0904

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brad Little

38939

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. If this mine is to be developed safely and responsibly, we must take the time to ensure that PolyMet is willing to make sure no human lives or ecosystems are put at risk by this project. 20 years of copper reserves is not worth jeopardizing ten percent of the world's fresh water in the Lake Superior watershed. I suspect that in my lifetime we will see fresh water become even more valuable than copper. Sincerely, Mr Brad Little 2729 E 6th St Duluth, MN 55812-1507 (218) 269-0904

38942

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Brad Little 2729 E. 6th St Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brad Little 48630

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Brad Little 2729 E. 6th St Duluth, MN 55812

Brad Oachs 18088

Good evening. I'm Brad Oachs; Oachs is spelled O-A-C-H-S. I'm chief operating officer of Minnesota Power. I've lived in Northeastern Minnesota for over 24 years. In my various us roles at Minnesota Power and through its utility operations, I have worked with several Iron Range mining businesses; US Steel Minntac, Hibbing Taconite, Arcelor Metal and North Shore Mining. The metals mined at PolyMet will be used for electrical components, cell phones, computers and catalytic converters; products critical to our lives. Mining has a long history this our region. Because of this history, significant support exists; the regulatory framework, the people and technical expertise, the physical community infrastructure, all there to safely mine copper-nickel. For these reasons, there is no better place in the world to be mining copper-nickel than right here, and I support the PolyMet Project. So often the response to opportunities and projects like this is not in my backyard. I find it very refreshing to hear many of you speak to, "Yes, in my backyard," and why we can do that is because we know we can do it well. Thanks.

Brad Sagen 42928

Public Comments on the NorthMet SDEIS by Bradley Sagen are attached. Bradley Sagen 13667 Deer RD Ely, MN 55731 218 365-6461 hbsagen@frontiernet-net

Brad Snyder 40701

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As a current Science Teacher and Outdoor/Environmental Education instructor, and former Engineer I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Brad Snyder 8887 Dallas Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-9270

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bradford c.

43234

My name is brad carlson. My wife and I own a cabin outside of ely - 840 kawishiwi trail. We have had the place for over ten years. Our six acres is a precious place to us as is the entire wilderness, surrounding national forest and community of ely. We are in strong opposition to allowing copper mining in Minnesota. For a few jobs created during the brief period such mining would be around it will leave in its wake hundreds of years of toxic waste and destruction. We do not consider this a fair trade off - not even close. This type of mining has a proven track record of being destructive to the environment and communities - without exception. This fact alone should dictate a flat denial of permitting for such mining in Minnesota. The US e.p.a. has shown this industry to be the largest polluter in our nation. There is no doubt this type of mining if allowed in the area proposed would have devastating negative effects on the wilderness, the local communities, water supplies, wetlands and property values (ours included). We urge you to deny the permit for polymet to mine for copper in this area and in the state. Shame on Minnesota for even considering it. Signed, Brad carlson and barbara garza, residents of the affected area in question. 840 kawishiwi trail Ely, mn 55731 This is a second version of this comment because I forgot to put our full address on the firSt

43249

My name is brad carlson. My wife and I own a cabin outside of ely - 840 kawishiwi trail. We have had the place for over ten years. Our six acres is a precious place to us as is the entire wilderness, surrounding national forest and community of ely. We are in strong opposition to allowing copper mining in Minnesota. For a few jobs created during the brief period such mining would be around it will leave in its wake hundreds of years of toxic waste and destruction. We do not consider this a fair trade off - not even close. This type of mining has a proven track record of being destructive to the environment and communities - without exception. This fact alone should dictate a flat denial of permitting for such mining in Minnesota. The US e.p.a. has shown this industry to be the largest polluter in our nation. There is no doubt this type of mining if allowed in the area proposed would have devastating negative effects on the wilderness, the local communities, water supplies, wetlands and property values (ours included). We urge you to deny the permit for polymet to mine for copper in this area and in the state. Shame on Minnesota for even considering it. Signed, Brad carlson and barbara garza, residents of the affected area in question.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bradley janssen

41875

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Bradley Schmidt

39982

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bradley Schmidt 17 13th St NE Faribault, MN 55021-3813

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bradley Sorock 42468

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Bradley Sorock 1917 Irving Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55403-2824

Bradley Thompson 41666

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bradley Thompson 5400 46th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-2310

Brandenburg Gallery 46103

To whom it may concern: M.I.T. researchers, when asked their opinion on whether or not copper-nickel sulfide mining should be permitted in northeastern Minnesota replied: "In a water table as fragile and valuable as the one in northeastern Minnesota, you just don't do it." The PolyMet Environmental Impact Study is hypothetical. Even proven first methods can result in environmental disaster given the event of natural earth movement, equipment failure, or human error. Should companies be allowed to put at great risk the health and welfare of ecosystems, people, and wildlife. No, because individual citizens are not permitted to. If a terrorist were to come and poison our water supply we would go to war over it. Minnesota is defined by its lakes and quality of clean water. The shortage of clean water in the world is becoming increasingly severe and large scale. Unlike other resources, there is no substitute for clean water. The world's water crisis is closely related to the flaws of modern economics and politics. Greater than a crisis in jobs, is a crisis in our own values. We need jobs. Well, some jobs will kill you. I am saddened to think that Minnesota even considers permitting copper-nickel sulfide mining. Minnesota ought to first make mandatory the recycling of all metals. Just say NO to permitting sulfide mining in Minnesota. Sincerely, Milli Salmela Bissonett P.O. Box 31 Ely, Minnesota 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brandi Balmer

38878

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Brandi Balmer 1422 E 3rd St Apt A Duluth, MN 55805-3936 (608) 201-9519

Brandon

44581

Hello, I am a current student at prior lake high school and I would like to let you know that the mining idea next to the boundary waters will be a bad decision for not only the company but also the environment. The clean up costs will far outweigh the costs of running this mine for only 20 years. It is absurd to think that you will be able to clean up and pay for the clean up many years after. I believe that this is a bad decision for the fate of the precious boundary waters and the environment around it. Please make your decision wisely. I normally don't get involved with environmental impact statements, but this one stands out to me. Thanks, Brandon

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brandon Cooke

16243

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Brandon Swann

42684

See attachment

Breawwna Wunder

19513

My name is Breawwna Wunder, B-R-E-A-W-N-N-A, W-U-N-D-E-R. My address is 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. And here is my statement. The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. It does not provide adequate information about the water treatment. How will up to five centuries of water treatment be paid for? No details are provided as to how the centuries of operation, maintenance, monitoring and reconstruction of water treatment facilities will be paid for. What financial institution has ever lasted even one century, much less five? The mining industry as a whole is responsible for the largest and most costly environmental cleanups in our nation. Across the country, environmental damage from sulfur mines is well documented and well known. In Minnesota, we value our waterways, and it is unacceptable to not be protecting our ecosystems for our current citizens, as well as our future citizens. Claims in the SDEIS that mercury and sulfate pollution will decrease in nearby waterways as a result of mining are dependent in large part on operation of water treatment systems that are not detailed. To ensure protection for future generations, we need a detailed report that guarantees the protection of our waterways. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda Adams

16912

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Brenda Adams 101 Judd Street Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047

50215

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Brenda Adams 101 Judd Street Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda Ammon

41988

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Brenda Ammon Wabasha, Minnesota

Brenda Beebe

22188

Dear Sir or Madam: If it is the mission of the Minnesota DNR is to “work with citizens to conserve and manage the state’s natural resources, to provide outdoor recreation opportunities, and to provide for commercial uses of natural resources in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life”, I don't understand how we can even be having a conversation about the possibility of allowing this mining. Even if the PolyMet mine were going to provide for thousands of good paying jobs, it would not be worth a minimum of 500 years of cleanup. The cost to the taxpayers of this state will be unthinkable, and the costs will be on the taxpayers because corporations always externalize such costs. No reasonable person can think that any corporation will live up to the responsibility of paying for that kind of cleanup, and that is just the financial coSt The cost to the environment would be a sustainable quality of life. No one would be able to live in that area. A minimum of five hundred years of cleanup basically means there is no way to clean it up. As a taxpayer and a citizen that loves this state, I say this mining project should not be approved. Regards, Brenda Beebe

22192

Beebe, Brenda (DLI) would like to recall the message, "PolyMet Mining".

22660

Dear Sir or Madam: If it is the mission of the Minnesota DNR is to “work with citizens to conserve and manage the state’s natural resources, to provide outdoor recreation opportunities, and to provide for commercial uses of natural resources in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life”, I don't understand how we can even be having a conversation about the possibility of allowing this mining. Even if the PolyMet mine were going to provide for thousands of good paying jobs, it would not be worth a minimum of 500 years of cleanup. The cost to the taxpayers of this state will be unthinkable, and the costs will be on the taxpayers because corporations always externalize such costs. No reasonable person can think that any corporation will live up to the responsibility of paying for that kind of cleanup, and that is just the financial coSt The cost to the environment would be a sustainable quality of life. No one would be able to live in that area. A minimum of five hundred years of cleanup basically means there is no way to clean it up. As a taxpayer and a citizen that loves this state, I say this mining project should not be approved. Regards, Brenda Beebe

Brenda Doup

5992

I know I am a small voice, however, please do not let Polymet or any other mining company destroy our natural resources. There is no amount of jobs worth putting MN resources at risk. Our freshwater lakes already have contaminates. Stop the purposed copper-nickel mine (and make the other mining companies more responsible for what is already happening. Sometimes in life we all must sacrifice something to insure the future population can live in a clean, safe environment. There is no amount of money that will ever bring back what the mines are taking. Polymet and others will continue to throw money at this and pay off Politicians to get their way. Please do everything you can to secure our great resources in our state. Health all around us is a beautiful thing. Thank You, - Brenda Doup 4556 Miller Rd Duluth, MN 55803 Work: Program/Project Specialist University of Minnesota Duluth 1035 University Drive, 109 Med Duluth, MN 55812 218-726-7581

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda Doup

5993

I know I am a small voice, however, please do not let Polymet or any other mining company destroy our natural resources. There is no amount of jobs worth putting MN resources at risk. Our freshwater lakes already have contaminates. Stop the purposed copper-nickel mine (and make the other mining companies more responsible for what is already happening. Sometimes in life we all must sacrifice something to insure the future population can live in a clean, safe environment. There is no amount of money that will ever bring back what the mines are taking. Polymet and others will continue to throw money at this and pay off Politicians to get their way. Please do everything you can to secure our great resources in our state. Fresh water is a beautiful thing. Thank You, - Brenda Doup Program/Project Specialist University of Minnesota, Medical School Duluth 1035 University Drive, Duluth, MN 55812 [HYPERLINK "mailto:curaff@d.umn-edu"curaff@d.umn-edu, 218-726-7581](mailto:curaff@d.umn-edu) CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, contains information from The University of Minnesota Medical School Duluth, which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by a "reply to sender only" message and destroy all electronic and hard copies of the communication, including attachments.

Brenda Hoppe

44417

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, As an environmental public health scientist and water quality specialist, I am extremely concerned with the impacts that the PolyMet project will have not only on area ecosystems but to water resources that will serve generations to come. I would like to respectfully urge you to please consider rejecting the PolyMet proposal in defense of Minnesota's proud natural resources and all that Minnesotans gain from them clean water and pristine habitat in particular. Many thanks and kind regards, Brenda O. Hoppe, PhD Sincerely, Brenda Hoppe 2423 Hayes St NE Minneapolis, MN 55418-3935 (971) 222-9117

Brenda Jerich

47225

Five reasons why I'm against allowing PolyMet to open a Copper Nickel Mine in Northern Minnesota. Not in order of importance. 1- Have these facts been checked into. PolyMet is a Canadian Company and their largest investor is a Swiss commodities trading firm (Glencore) with a poor environmental and human rights record 2- This Swiss commodities trading firm (Glencore) has an agreement to sell copper concentrate to China. What about the US. 3- Open-pit mining and the entrails leave behind a devastating landscape. 4- Pollution and toxic waste. 5- 100 jobs (short term) in exchange for millions of dollars lost in tourism and clean up (long term). I beg you, please do not allow Open-pit mining in Northern Minnesota. Sincerely, Brenda Jerich bsjjoy@aol-com

Brenda Johnson

43341

I have lived here most of my life and think our state has the potential to be the cleanest state in this country. People like the idea of waking up and being able to take a shower, get a cup of coffee, or whatever it may be, they count on the water to be clean. This mining operation is filthy. It will have long lasting effects on the environment and our children. No amount of jobs or money could possibly be worth the trade off. Have you not seen the effects of previous endeavors by mining companies. The media has painted a care nothing attitude about the people or the environment by mining companies. Please, prove me wrong. Name one mining company, fracking company that has put the people first Please explain why the continued pollution of our land is in the best long term interest of anyone. Put PolyMets history on the table for review by the people in this state. What is their history in previous places. I'd like to hear interviews by the people who live near a PolyMet mining operation, both current and past Include environmental photos of the areas affected by PolyMet. Brenda Johnson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda L Sweet

44063

I made the attempt to retrieve this message and then thought “really Bren.” So I am resending it as I really do believe we need to consider the impact. Sorry for the confusion and thank you again for your time. _____ From: Sweet, Brenda L Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 10:36 AM To: 'NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us' Subject: Mining concern/comments Good morning, I grew up in the small town of Babbitt during its prime, and enjoyed the spoils afforded us by the mining industry. I understand everyone’s concern for employment. It is unfortunate to go back home and see houses in disrepair, schools closed. I also enjoyed the lake and the woods. My father loved being out in nature and he passed that love and appreciation down to me, although as a child I thought everyone had a lake in their backyard, a forest in the front. After leaving the area to live elsewhere to work, I soon discovered that is far from the truth. How blessed I was without even being aware of what was right before me.. As an adult, I have a whole new appreciation of the area, nature and how fragile it really is. The gratitude for what I had as a child was so deep, that when the opportunity to purchase the home I grew up in presented itself, we jumped. Currently we only get to enjoy the area on weekends but plan is to retire there. So as a child of mining: The history of copper mining/pollution/clean up is very disheartening. What makes us think this will be any different. I have been told “well, it is all underground.” Honestly, that just doesn’t satisfy my concern for such a beautiful area and the potential seepage and damage we are asking them to merely put a deposit on. Think about that. We are saying “We are so certain you are going to mess up this area, we would like a damage deposit. It won’t be enough money to get the job done after you destroy where we live but gosh, go ahead make your mess and leave, we have your deposit.” We will not only lose jobs people are fighting for at that point but we will lose the whole BWCA Wilderness and all this area is appreciated for. All of it gone so much for leaving the world a better place. President Roosevelt had the foresight to reserve some of our lands as national parks. How many of us go enjoy them. Maybe the people there don’t appreciate us all visiting their area like I have heard people on The Range don’t appreciate the BWCA. Yet those parks are there, we go visit them and we are grateful his legacy. Please be certain of your actions and decision. This will be your legacy to our children and grandchildren. HYPERLINK "<http://www.brainyquote-com/quotes/quotes/a/anseladams161651.html>" It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment. HYPERLINK "http://www.brainyquote-com/quotes/authors/a/ansel_adaMshtml" Ansel Adams Thank you for your time, Brenda Sweet

Brenda Palo

35413

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Hello. This issue is the most important environmental issue for MN this century. The Polymet project must NOT go forwaRd I am a MN resident and was born and raised in Eveleth, on the Iron Range. I grew up with iron mining in the strip mining tradition. I am not in favor of this sulfide mining project due to its well documented and clearly established long-term negative consequences for the local and regional people, animals, and natural environment. It must not go forwaRd Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Brenda Palo 1540 Hartford Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1514 (612) 730-6481

39990

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This issue is of paramount importance. I am completely against this going forwaRd Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Brenda Palo 1540 Hartford Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1514 (612) 730-6481

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda Scott

40210

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

42419

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Brenda Scott 409 7th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55413-2028

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brenda Solomon

20207

Dear Ms Fay, My husband and I have had the privilege and opportunity to experience the unique beauty of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area for the past 35 + years. We first visited the BWCA as Sr. High Church Youth Group members, canoeing and camping in this pristine area of MN. Our family thoroughly enjoyed vacations at various campgrounds/resorts every summer in the Ely area. We had a dream of one day owning our own cabin in this paradise, and finally in December 2013 our dream came true. We purchased a cabin in the Isabella area. We, our family and friends, are looking forward to enjoying the breathtaking beauty and tranquility this area offers for many years to come. Until recently, we were unaware of the exact location and potential devastation the PolyMet mining project poses to this sacred area. We are VERY CONCERNED about the negative impact the mining will have on the land, water, wildlife and tourism in NE MN. We understand mining may create jobs/revenue for the next 20 years, but the destruction/pollution it will create will last for centuries. We feel protecting the environment far outweighs any benefits PolyMet claims We are asking you to please protect Minnesota's future. Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank-you for your concern and assistance in protecting the land, water, wildlife, and tourism industry from the devastation this mining project will cause if it is allowed to proceed. Sincerely, Brenda and Jeff Solomon Cabin: 2307 N McDougal Ln Isabella, MN 55607 Brenda Solomon brenda@erahome-com Phone: 507-213-9496

Brenden Obryan

42081

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Brenden O'bryan Woodbury, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brennen Stenke

46226

DNR, Please, do not let PolyMet go through with their project in Northern Minnesota. People have been saying that it is too much of a risk for us to allow PolyMet to exploit our environment, but the truth is, it's more than that. The term "risk" implies uncertainty, but as your Environmental Impact Statement shows, there is no uncertainty that PolyMet will negatively impact our environment. Without doubt, PolyMet will foul our air, dirty our waters, rob habitat from our endangered animals, kill our endangered plants, and alter our landscape and its ecosystems. Indeed, PolyMet will lose an opportunity to make a profit and some of us will miss out on a short-term economic boon. But in allowing PolyMet's project to be realized, you are breaking not only the hearts of thousands of Minnesotans, but those of everyone who has ever fought in the name of our environment. When it comes down to it, this question isn't just about politics and economics— it's about morals. Many people see a dichotomy between nature and culture, but in actuality, we are part of nature. Not only do we depend on it, but it depends on us. And because my words are not as eloquent as his, I will end this letter in the voice of John Muir: "God has cared for these trees, saved them from drought, disease, avalanches, and a thousand tempests and floods. But he cannot save them from fools." Brennen Byrnes Stenke 636 Grand Avenue #202 St Paul, Minnesota 55105

brent chezick

44851

Lisa Fay, I'm writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. First, I want to express my confidence in your agency to thoroughly evaluate the project and its ability to mitigate potential environmental impacts. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, I'd like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out – all the more reason to support it. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws – some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country. Minnesota is home to a world-class deposit of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium and gold. This is an economic opportunity right below our feet that will benefit the state's economy for future generations. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. This project would mean 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state needs. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts has been completed. Sincerely, Brent Chezick 7534 Trapper Trail Eveleth, MN 55734

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brent Gurtek

19006

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Brent Gurtek 1873 Korkki Road Duluth Twp. Duluth Twp., MN 55804 218-525-7573

Brent Notbohm

23922

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a tax paying citizen of the great state of Minnesota who loves the beauty of the Lake Superior basin and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, I am extremely concerned about this project's potentially hazardous environmental impact on the region where I live. Not only have I made my home in this region so that I can easily access its beauty, but I spend literally thousands of dollars each year fishing, camping and canoeing in Northern Minnesota. The fact that something as destructive as sulfide mining is even being considered baffles me beyond expression. As I'm sure you know, Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and its track record has been sketchy at best in terms of environmental consequences. This project is not being proposed in some remote corner of the world where nobody visits, but in the heart of one of the most spectacular and most visited natural areas in the continental United States. I beg of you to seriously consider the consequences heavy metal contamination could have on our precious region, and the wildlife and water quality that people travel from around the world to enjoy. Even one slip of environmental protections could have a dramatic impact on the lives and lifestyles of the people who live here, like myself. Please consider the public's best interest and protect our Superior National Forest by rejecting PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine proposal. The risk is not worth the reward for the people who love and live here. Thank you. Sincerely, Brent Notbohm 5001 Peabody St Duluth, MN 55804-2441

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bret Johnson

40019

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. These risks are not acceptable for the economic benefit in a region that prizes natural beauty and pristine waters. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bret Johnson 1613 Conway St Saint Paul, MN 55106-5925

52261

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Bret Johnson 1613 Conway Street St Paul, MN 55106

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bret Pence

40338

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Brett R. Ewald

41331

Mar. 9, 2014 Dear MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit, I think that we must weigh the possible outcomes of the NorthMet Mine proposal, and other projects likely to follow, against the plausible benefits and detriments. PolyMet offers at least 20 years of jobs for between 300-360 personnel. There are varying estimates of temporary construction and indirect jobs. The state will reap the benefits of taxes per pound or ton with additional taxes from purchased goods in the local communities. Their modeling, as evidenced in the SDEIS, eludes to 200 years of water treatment costing between 3-6 and 6 million dollars per year. This assumes there is minimal exposure, run off, or other means of untreated water leaving the compounds. It is great if their modeling is too farsighted and treatment is not needed for that long. What occurs if treatment is needed after the 200 or 500 years. Can we rely on future technologies to better mitigate the untreated water. I see this issue as short term profits for very few and jobs for some versus potential contamination of water that has existed for millennia. As seen in the news, water is constantly and quickly becoming a scarce commodity. Copper and nickel are not. We need not mine the copper and nickel in NE Minn. using unproven methods for mostly profits of foreign owned and backed corporations. Please take these considerations into account when weighing the benefits and detriments. Thank you for your time. Brett R. Ewald 4790 Centerville Rd, Apt. 215 White Bear Lake, MN 55127 ----- This message was sent using the University of Minnesota Duluth Webmail

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brett Reiersen

43

From: Brett Reiersen [mailto:mr**brett64@gmail-com**] Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 12:37 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: copper mine While i love the Boundary Waters and the wilds of northern Minnesota, i believe we also have to use our natural resources for our modern needs. But USE, not ABUSE our resources. I think a properly planned and managed project could be positive, but i don't think this project, at this point, is properly planned or managed. Please make the mining company provide better answers and solutions.. Thank you for all you do. -Brett Reiersen

Bria Schurke

18212

Hi, I'm Toni Watt. I live in Minneapolis, and I met tonight Bria Schurke who is the daughter of a person who introduced me to the Boundary Waters 30 years ago. My name is Bria Schurke, S-C-H-U-R-K-E, and I am born and raised in Ely Minnesota, White Iron Lake. Kawishiwi River is my literal backyard playground, and I'm a proud customer and friend from of Zup's Grocery Store, but I'm not going to give you my car keys. You don't want my car anyway. I have high expectations of my policymakers and community members to make decisions for my community that will keep Ely and Northern Minnesota sustainable, clean, healthy and inviting for the next generation. I do not want to raise my children in a community that has fallen at the mercy of a money-mongering mining -- international mining company that has yet to prove that they are truly vested in the sustainability of the future generations and for our quality of life. There is more to life than money. I am happy to live cutting wood and living in Ely but live with minimal means. Mining is not the only answer for a middle-income job in Northern Minnesota. Also, sulfide mining is not the same as iron-ore mining. We were not founded on sulfide mining. We were founded on iron-ore mining. That is completely different. 100 percent of sulfide mines around the world have proven to cause pollution. I will not accept any pollution in the community that I want to raise my children, if there's risk that my children will be raised on polluted water. Why? Why would I want to do that. I feel like I am against a wall with these major corporations. It's just another classic story from another small community in the world being pushed up against major corporations. Where are our politicians? Where are our local leaders? Why are we having this conversation right now? There's more to life than corporations taking over small towns. I'm disappointed, and I'm frustrated. We have a huge problem with PolyMet SDEIS, but this is not rocket science. This problem is so alarmingly simple that everyone in this room should be pushing the panic button right now. For five years, PolyMet and various government agencies have studied the potential impact of the (inaudible) polluting it. Thank you. Please protect Ely and Northern Minnesota. We are beyond -- we are above -- we are above this.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian and Ruth Lavelle

19099

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Brian and Ruth Lavelle 19206 Redtail Drve Spring Grove, MN 55974 507 498 3695

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian and Ruth Lavelle

40391

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian and Ruth Lavelle

40472

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Brian Anderson

38814

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. NAME Brian Anderson ADDRESS PO Box 205, Ely, Minn. 55731 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Berggren

43525

SDEIS Comments 13 March 2014 As a Wetland Health Evaluation Project volunteer for the last 13 years, and as a wild ricer during my college years as a biology major, I have seen the limits of mitigation, reclamation, remediation, and restoration. Nothing beats not messing things up in the first instance. Even with significant money, the efforts rarely achieve more than partial success. Section 3-3-3-4 Financial Assurance starts with the grammatical fiction that costs can be better estimated later in the permitting process as outlined in para.4-1- The 200 year and 500 year timeframes, numbers that exceed the lives of nations and certainly that of commercial enterprises, are beyond both planning and funding. The effects of dewatering, sediment movement, chemical leaks and seeps, and ground disturbances on a large scale in such a sensitive area are not possible to estimate. One event like the Duluth deluge will overcome all prior planning. Worse is the statement that “compensatory wetland mitigation” not be approved and constructed in advance – outside of financial assurance requirements. Comments The Watershed Restoration goals described on page 3-71 seem overly optimistic. Water events, sediment and toxic waste or process water migration, have a way of defeating barriers and will only minimize watershed contamination. With the number of sites identified as problems (Table 4-2-1-2) and the sensitivity of wild rice to sulfates (4-2-2-1-3 and Table 4-2-2-3), the state should reduce or eliminate problem sites prior to permitting. Mining may be inevitable someday, but placing processing facilities and tailing sites at the head of an important watershed, and adjacent to the BWCA and Rainy River Watershed should never be allowed. We cannot leave a legacy of NURPs (National Urban Runoff Ponds) for a principal watershed of Lake Superior. Thank you, Brian Berggren 11 High Road Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

Brian Bluhm

43729

Hello - I am contacting you with two of my concerns about the proposed PolyMet Mining Project. I am concerned with humanity's ability to continually monitor and manage, as would be the case with the proposed project. Despite the use of new technology, there is always risk involved when disturbing natural processes. If some aspect of the proposed management system were to fail, for example from a sustained power outage, are there other measures in place to prevent contamination. I am also concerned about the potential effects on human health, and the related monetary costs to those impacted and their communities. If contaminated water were to enter the watershed, are there assurances in place to prevent the cost of these impacts on human and community health from being imposed on the municipalities, tax payers and individuals of northeast Minnesota. Thank you for all the good work the DNR has done and will continue to do in our state, Brian Bluhm 630 N 10 Ave E Duluth, MN 55805

Brian Duren

39789

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Brian Duren 3732 Garfield Ave Minneapolis, MN 55409-1115 (651) 408-5390

Brian Eisinger

40558

Please preserve the BWCA. Thanks, Brian Eisinger

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Freeman

39884

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Brian Freeman 3520 Cedar Creek Dr NW Oak Grove, MN 55303-8421

Brian Guadagno

38900

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Brian Guadagno 101 E 26th St Bayonne, NJ 07002-4904

Brian Hanson

18378

Good evening. My name is Brian Hanson, H-A-N-S-O-N. I'm here tonight because I care. I care about a lot of things in this region. I care about our environment. I care about our economy. And I care about our world's environment. And that's an important part of the component of this whole conversation tonight, because we live in a global environment. We need to make sure that there's protection across that globally. We know that can happen here. So like just about everyone else who is here I consider myself an environmentalist. And with that in mind I took a look through the SDEIS. Now I will be the first one to admit it, I don't have a lot of experience with reviewing these kinds of documents. I'm not a scientist. I work in economic development. But I learned a lot from looking through that. First of all, I learned that it's truly a process that is followed on an independent basis by people who have been trained and do understand environmental impacts. I picked up a lot of information. And I appreciate that. Thank you very much. I think the organizations have done a great job of circling around the most important issues and covering them and talking about them, and talking about how those issues are the things that need to be addressed at a permitting stage. Ultimately what I found as I read through the SDEIS was that it does cover the key issues. That it does create a basis. That it is a document that we can use to safely permit this mine and be able to proceed with (inaudible) mining in Northeast Minnesota. Now, here is what I know about the PolyMet team. These folks are our friends and neighbors. These are people who grew up in the communities that we grew up and the people in this room. We know these folks. They're going to produce metals that we all need, that we all use. No matter who are you are, unless someone came here either walked here in moccasins, clothes that they made themselves, they probably got here aided by the metals we're talking about and that we need. It's irresponsible to use products that are generated elsewhere when we have no idea of the impacts of those areas when we have people who live and work here, who have studied the impacts, can tell us how to control them, and can help make this happen in a responsible manner. So I support PolyMet. I'm proud of the Supplemental Draft EIS that has been put together here in our state. And I look forward to this project moving on to the permitting stage. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Hanson

47634

Minnesota has turned the corner with the state's job market's recent return to pre-recession levels. Forbes recently ranked Minnesota the eighth best state to do business — a 12-spot jump in the rankings. Helping to fuel this economic success is Minnesota's mining industry, which contributed more than \$2-9 billion to the state's economy and supported nearly 10,000 jobs in 2012- As business continues to play the primary role in job creation, it is critical that policy-makers continue to support this industry in order to continue an upward trend in growth, specifically in this region. PolyMet Mining's proposed copper-nickel project on the Iron Range is an example of how Minnesota companies continue to lead the way balancing technological advancement with the State's environmental standards. I support PolyMet Mining and believe they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. Multiple State and Federal Agencies have been involved in preparing the SDEIS document; I place trust in and respect the integrity and the responsibility of these organizations to manage the impact of mining efforts. The SDEIS was a sound process — a detailed and independent review. Federal, state and tribal agencies shaped the development of the draft EIS, which was written by an independent, third party. The draft EIS offers regulators the information they need to issue permits so that PolyMet can operate in a way that protects natural resources. The SDEIS demonstrates that PolyMet can develop resources in a sustainable manner and there are logical, engineered solutions proposed for potential impacts. PolyMet's project is a case study for business and economic development. The Company will put a brownfield site back in operation and reuse existing infrastructure at the former LTV site in Hoyt Lakes — a \$350 million facility that would cost nearly \$1 billion to reconstruct today. PolyMet's project will create 360 direct jobs and over 600 indirect jobs, at a time when family-sustaining jobs are needed in Northeast Minnesota. The project has been designed to minimize environmental impacts and the disturbance of wetlands, utilizing multiple safeguards to protect the environment. PolyMet will be a domestic supplier of critical metals consumed every day. Minnesota's \$5-3 billion electronics industry depends on the metals supply chain to produce the technology that we as consumers depend on for use in medical applications, electricity, catalytic converters, cell phones, computers and other essential products. A decade ago computer chips were made with 16 minerals. Today as many as 60 different minerals and constituent elements are used to produce similar computer chips. Mineral needs will only swell with technological advancement. If we are to maintain our modern way of living, depending on these types of technology, we need to continue to find and extract these metals. Minnesota has the ability to demonstrate leadership in innovation with sound regulations and standards — there is no better location in the Country to access these resources in a responsible manner. As a person who lives, works and plays in the area, I understand the importance of proper use of resources like minerals and preservation of resources such as water and air. I trust and support that the SDEIS lays the proper groundwork for developing an environmentally and economically sustainable project. PolyMet can produce these metals in an environmentally sound manner and create hundreds of jobs that can support families, sustain communities and ensure a thriving Minnesota for future generations. Thank You. Brian W. Hanson President and CEO APEX_Final_New Logo_6 1 10-jpg 306 W Superior St Duluth, MN 55802 P 218-740-3667 C 218-730-7330 HYPERLINK "http://www.apexgetsbusiness-com/"www.APEXgetsbusiness-com Notice: This email contains confidential, legally privileged information which belongs to the se

Brian Harrington

43463

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Brian Harrington 11600 37th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55441

brian huberty

9279

The SDEIS does not include an option or discussion for a closed water system for not only Polymet but also for other Iron Range industries. Instead of making an open system where water can flow in and out of the mining system and impact the environment, it may make more sense to create a closed system where water can be piped between industries as supply and demand dictates. Polymet excess water could be used for cooling at proposed powerplants and steel making operations. In other words, think beyond just the needs of Polymet but to also the needs of other industries as well as the needs of the environment. Given this proposed mine has been in the works for over a decade, Polymet should have in good faith already restored the wetlands needed to compensate for the proposed impacts on the existing wetlands. In good faith, this action would show a more proactive approach which would help mend the long term and permanent impacts any mining operation produces.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian J 43363

I have concerns with this mine (Polymet), and it is not simply because I love the BWCA and all that the northern areas of our state have to offer. My concern lies primarily with the money available for cleanup when the containment fails because it will fail the rock in the area fractures with frost, settling, etc so the containment isn't going to stop it all. I reviewed their stock/invester information and as far as I can tell, they don't have any money they are completely funded by others as a startup which as soon as the well runs dry and income stops, they are going to sell their shares as fast as possible. This will leave MN taxpayers with the cleanup costs and while we are an easy target and can offer little to stop the state from taking the money needed for cleanup I don't imagine this will go over well with the masses. Thankyou for considering my comments regarding this issue. I am not opposed to mining in general, but as far as I can tell, this company cannot prove they can do it safely, and cannot prove they have the finances to keep our waters clean. I have a 5 month old daughter and I don't want to raise her knowing I didn't say anything on the topic hopefully I can raise he knowing I did something to make sure our land and waters are kept as clean in the future, as they are today. Brian J Deering 2009 Longfellow Ave St Paul MN 55119

Brian Jenkins 41811

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Brian Jenkins 5959 E Northwest Hwy Apt 3057 Dallas, TX 75231-7448 (214) 242-9169

Brian Johnson 42625

See attachment

54661

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Maki 18094

Hello. My name is Brian Maki and I'm president and CEO of Lakehead Constructors which is located nearby Virginia, Minnesota in the Twin Ports of Duluth-Superior. We employ over 700 full-time union employees in the construction business across Northern Minnesota. I was born the grandson of Finish immigrants, like so many others, at the White Community Hospital here in Aurora. My parents raised six children in Hoyt Lakes on a draftsman wage from Erie Mining Company. The town was prosperous and bustling with the schools and churches bursting at the seams. There were 100 kids on every block of town. We had a storybook childhood filled with our great memories and all the neighboring towns were the same for generations. This was our way of life. Our immigrant parents and grandparents worked at the mine, at the power plant, on the railroad, construction, grocery stores, coffee shops, restaurants, drugs stores, movie theaters, auto dealerships, logging, trucking, all sorts of other businesses. This was our way of life. We all spent time hunting, fishing, trapping, skiing, shooting, biking, hiking, snowmobiling, camping, swimming, water-skiing and boating. And the list goes on. We were good stewards of the environment. Our communities established campgrounds and parks, preservation areas, ski hills and trails, sanctuaries and other scenic places. We were and are good stewards of the environment. In 2001, Erie Mining Company closed its doors and the east end of the Range began to suffer almost immediately. The darkness days were upon us. It was not a good time for families and the human suffering began. Unemployment, bankruptcies, business closures and all sort of personal tragedies associated with unemployment befell our residents. It's time to turn this around. We have the opportunity to revitalize Northern Minnesota with the promise of good-paying jobs. We have done our homework and science is on the side of progress, and on the side of responsible environmental stewardship. We have the opportunity with non-ferrous mining and PolyMet to demonstrate to the world the type of people we are in Northern Minnesota. Hard working, thoughtful and caring folks who would never harm the land we love so dearly. Every job is a family. Every job is a family, and don't forget it. I would like to thank all the agencies here, working on this project who clearly understand the science behind the project and who deal in fact and not fiction. I'd like to thank all of the elected officials who wholeheartedly back this project. I'd like to thank all of those who came out in support of this great project in Duluth last week and tonight, and finally, I would like to thank PolyMet for their hard work and determination on behalf of the folks the Iron Range and we pray for your success. Thank you.

Brian McClung 54684

See attachment

Brian Mensolek 54502

See attachment

Brian Mulally 40699

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Brian Mulally 8090 Upper 129th Ct Apple Valley, MN 55124-9759

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Murn 40042

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Brian Murn 5421 Twin Lake Blvd E Minneapolis, MN 55429-3356

Brian Nelson 42553

See attachment

Brian Nordlund 41703

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Brian Nordlund 2537 Providence Rd Duluth, MN 55811-2947

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Nordlund

41704

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Brian Nordlund 2537 Providence Rd Duluth, MN 55811-2947

Brian Peterson

44186

I am submitting this comment in order to reflect the position the sulfide mining and mining near culturally and environmentally valued areas is not in the overall, long-term interest of Minnesota and Minnesotans North Eastern MN is one of our state's greatest assets, it has many formally recognized forests parks, as well as an abundance of hills, forests, lakes, rivers that are not on public property but are equally valued for what they contribute to the Minnesota experience. We should be working to expand the borders or protected areas, strengthen the protections and see to it that we save and preserve what we have not yet ruined. In many parts of the state it is too late or not feasible to take such actions. Why should we do this. Because it is the right thing to do for future generations, current Minnesotans, and our long term fiscal health and physical health. I am fully confident that when all true costs are considered (loss of habitat, noise pollution, water contamination, clean-up, human health costs, infrastructure demands, etc) these proposals will be a net loss for MN both in economic terms and human terms I also see almost no circumstance where some of the clean-up and reclamation does not fall on the taxpayers. The jobs this will likely create, long-term, are Superfund jobs, the kind of jobs Minnesotans don't want. Don't let this mining take place, but if you do, Polymet should put skin in the game. My suggestion: \$500,000,000 in escrow, with an oversight board using the money to immediately address environmental and human concerns. Polymet can always add money, and keep any interest If the fund is depleted to \$250,000,000, all mining stops, the money is used to reclaim the land and any leftovers go into the Legacy Fund. When the mine closes and the area is properly cleaned and restored, Polymet gets any remaining balance back. If Polymet intends to play by the rules there should be little objection to such an arrangement. I appreciate you taking the time to read my letter and please make the decision that is best for Minnesotans in the long-term and considers all associated costs and negative, as well as positive, externalities. Thank you Brian Peterson

Brian Slaby

24278

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Considering that Lake Superior has a water retention time of almost 200 years, even a small risk of pollution should be taken seriously. It could create a problem for our continent's largest freshwater lake that's unsolvable for two centuries. Sincerely, Brian Slaby 16218 Edgewood Ct Maple Heights, OH 44137-3921 (216) 475-7767

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Stompe

20141

Feb 27, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I now live in California, but am a native of Wisconsin and have traveled from CA to MN to canoe and fish in your pristine Boundary Waters park, as have tens of thousands of others who appreciate clean water and healthy ecosystems I understand the need for mining but there are places it should not be done no matter what the short term gain. The water shed that feeds into Boundary Waters is one of those places. We have mines from the 1800's in the watershed that feeds in to San Francisco Bay, that despite extensive efforts, are still leaching acid and mercury into the rivers flowing into the bay, and make fish from the Bay unsafe to eat. San Francisco Bay was once a great source of good fish. Not now, thanks to mining. So many waters have suffered a similar fate. No one wants to visit polluted waters with contaminated fish. **SAVE THE TOURISM AND GREAT FISHERY WHICH WILL LAST FOREVER**, and forgo short term profits from mining. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Thank you. I hope to visit Boundary Waters again if they are still pristine. Sincerely, Brian and Susan Stompe 110 San Mateo Way Novato, CA 94945 Sincerely, Mr Brian Stompe 110 San Mateo Way Novato, CA 94945-1201 (415) 897-1610

Brian Thorbjornsen

41667

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brian Thorbjornsen

42271

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Brian Thorbjornsen 2819 Wicklow St Duluth, MN 55806-3405

Brian Tighe

43187

Dear Sirs and Madams, Allowing the Northmet sulfide mining operation would violate a binding treaty with the Chippewa to protect their hunting and fishing rights in that region, by contaminating their food sources. Please protect our most important natural resource: fresh water. Surrounding water would be contaminated by the NorthMet Mine, and though it creates a few jobs and a some tax revenue, the bulk of the profits go to foreign countries. The risks for environmental degradation are too high. The risk that taxpayers will end up footing the bill for long term clean up is too high. The increased risk of chronic illness is too high. When it comes to acid mine drainage, a little goes a very very long way. Please protect our state. Thanks, Brian Tighe

Brian Wicklund

7083

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am deeply concerned about the potential for PolyMet and other mining corporations to be allowed to mine public land that contains Minnesota's most pristine and fragile water system. It is foolish to allow a type of mining with a 100% failure rate of toxic leakage into ground and surface water to be allowed at the source of three watersheds. A decision to allow sulfide mining would also be an economic disaster. Any short term gain of jobs and revenue would be trumped by the estimated 500 years of maintenance of the waste. In spite of assurances by PolyMet, what companies can you name that have been continuously viable for 500 years. You can bet our tax paying children will be footing the bill for clean up for generations to come. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Brian Wicklund Brian Wicklund 800 Broadway St Marine, MN 55047 651-402-5435

Brian_Walvatne

37830

My name is Brian Walvatne and I am a MN resident that is opposed to the opening of the Polymer mine in Northern Minnesota. Water is the essence of life and this mine will increase risk of severe environmental damage that could last for 500 years or more. This mine is not right for Minnesota. Thank you, Brian Walvatne 227 Paisley Lane Golden Valley, MN. 55422

Briana Baumann

42518

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brianna Tinjum 39164

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed sulfide mine does not reflect the values Minnesotans place on the environment and natural world, and the risk of damaging and polluting such a pristine area of our beautiful state is unacceptable. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Brianna Tinjum 3421 17th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-2309

Brianne Plumadore 42730

See attachment

Bridget Carns 41990

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Bridget Carns Rochester, Minnesota

Bridget Mcconville 39624

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Bridget Mcconville 223 Amherst St Saint Paul, MN 55105-1911

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bridget Peterson

43547

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Water is a finite resource. The Great Lakes holds some 80% of North America's fresh surface water and about 20% of the entire world's(<http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/basicinfo.html>). This is about more than us and our region(even though the damage to be done here is to me enough on its own), putting resources needed not just by us here but by the entire WORLD in such jeopardy for mere profit is ridiculous. We are already wasting such resources by not engaging in recycling what's already out there as much as available, something which could both reduce pollution(and the damage done to humans exposed to it wasteful atrocities such as this - <http://www.theguardian-com/environment/gallery/2014/feb/27/agbogbloshe-worlds-largest-e-waste-dump-in-pictures>) and create the much-needed jobs, probably more and longer lasting employment than the mine will create, at a benefit to our environment rather than more harm. It astounds me how willing some are to let an outside corporation come in and muck up our environment so drastically for resources that seem most likely destined to be shipped overseas at a great profit for them, and just a few jobs and decades of likely irreversible pollution to our drinking water and environment for us. Thank you for your time and thoughtfulness in reviewing my, and the rest of the community's, comments. Sincerely, Bridget Peterson 222 N. 2nd Ave E. Apt. #223 Duluth, MN 55805 Sincerely, Ms Bridget Peterson 222 N 2nd Ave E Apt 223 Duluth, MN 55805-1752

Brigette Nies

42801

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brigitte James

40344

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Brigitte James 1482 Wakefield Ct. Upland, CA 91784 US

Britt K Johnson

57263

The impact of winter release of sulfates should be further studied. The sulfides will accumulate in the organic sediments and not flush down river during the winter. Then in the spring when the H2O warms up the microbiome will be high on verifying the stored sulfates into sulfite at the same time as the wild rice begins to germinate. John Patter's research has shown that sulfite is toxic to wild rice seedlings at very low concentrations. Thus the predictor would be that the sulfite concentration would be the highest in the spring after continuous winter loading due to water discharging of sulfate from the Polymet site. This would put the wild rice seedlings at even greater risk. The EIS should assess to the fact of what winter water releases from the Polymet site on spring sulfite levels in the seedlings of wild rice beds downstream. Britt K. Johnson 9007 East Superior St Duluth, MN 55804

Britt See-Benes

42675

See attachment

Britta Dornfeld

42041

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Britta Dornfeld Owatonna, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Britta Dornfeld

45147

Dear Minnesota DNR, Hello. I would just like to say I am against the proposed PolyMet Mine for a variety of reasons. This sulfide mine has said that it has a plan for dealing with acid mine drainage; however, this plan has never been tested before. Minnesota's North Shore and the Lake Superior watershed should not be the guinea pig for this new idea. As no mine has ever successfully mined without creating acid mine drainage, I think this proposed mine is a bad idea. Also, since acid mine drainage can last for hundreds of years, it is highly likely that the mitigation of the drainage will fall upon the government- an expensive, long-term task that we, as citizens and tax-payers who would help foot the bill, can ill afford. Also, I would just like to say that this is not an issue of the environment vs. employment; it is an issue of the environment vs. resources. The jobs that this mine would provide are based off of cycles of boom and bust- while they would provide jobs for a thirty to forty years, areas that benefited from these jobs would be in the same, or worse place than they were before the mine. In starting this mine, more long-term jobs in tourism and public land management would be harmed, since this area would not doubt be damaged by acid mine drainage. Please seriously consider all of the drawbacks to this mine- while it has a significant economic impact, its cons outweighs its pros. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Britta Dornfeld

brittany kron

39112

My name is Brittany Wilson and My address is 1030 Como Place, St Paul, Mn 55103 I am very concerned about the proposed Polymet mining that would be taking place in Northern Minnesota. As someone who spent over 20 years living in Northern Minnesota I am greatly disappointed that our state would even consider putting our states natural assets at risk. I grew up being surrounded by clean fresh water lakes, beautiful coniferous trees, and seeing natural wildlife almost every day. It would be unwise of Minnesota to destroy its streams and lakes, poison its animals, and ultimately lower the living standards of its citizens, because it will more than likely pollute lake superior. A short gain of profit is not worth the hundreds of years this project could take to clean up. I do not support Polymet Mining in our state. Thank you for your time, Brittany Wilson

Bromley Griffin

22700

I've lived for 77 years. I was a natural resources professional for 38 years. I have been a serious supporter of environmental causes for 70 years. I am fortunate to own and live on 1/4 mile of land on the beautiful St Louis River. I am sick of the get-rich-quick schemes of the mega-wealthy here and abroad who promise everything and have historically lived up to virtually no promises to 'keep it clean forever'. Short-term jobs for a few native and non-native Minnesotans is no where near worth the risk of the permanent damage to the resource that almost always follows the flash of profits and then polluted silence following the fading of almost all major mining projects, especially copper mines. I stand in total opposition to the granting of permits to allow the despoliation of the land, streams and rivers of northern Minnesota via copper mining.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Brooke Shepherd

11263

Brooke Shepherd 9185 182nd St N Forest Lake MN Brooke Shepherd Avd. Science, Hour: 4 Ms Olson 30, January 2014 Digging Ourselves a Copper Grave There is much controversy about the new copper mine that Polymet is thinking of building. First of all, copper is a chemical element used in conducting electricity. The mining process is rather complicated and consists of concentrating ore, a type of rock containing minerals. In order to concentrate it, they must crush the ore up and roast it to convert the interior minerals, sulfides to oxides, which they then mine and produce hot metal. They then refine it and finally use a process called electrolysis to obtain the copper. The average American uses twelve pounds of copper per year. Minnesota is considering building this mine because not only is copper a highly useful element, but the mining process will also create hundreds of jobs and a flow of revenue. Northeastern Minnesota, where the mine would be built, has one of the largest untouched copper deposits, as well as other minerals, just beneath the lakes and forests. In my opinion however, building this mine would be a huge mistake. We simply do not have enough information of the damage it could cause to our environment at this time. The Polymet mine will also affect our air quality by releasing sulfur dioxide, greenhouse gases and nitrogen oxide into the environment. They estimate that even with this pollution, the air quality will still be up to standards. However, an estimation alone doesn't seem safe enough to go ahead with the project. The water useage from Colby Lake is another large concern in building this mine. Polymet says it could vary in using between twenty and 810 gallons per minute. There is a very large difference between twenty and 810, so we really won't know what affect it will have on the lake if we aren't sure how much water they'll be using. They say that they will build a waste water treatment plant and let it run off into two nearby rivers, but what does that mean for the lake. There is also a chance of mercury being released into our air and water. Though it would be a minimal amount, it is still dangerous to be releasing any amount of it into our air or water systems. Lastly, we should be thinking of the animals in the area. The construction of the mine, the noise from the workers, the clearing of forests and the changes in air and water quality could greatly affect the several different species of animals who call the area home. Two of which are endangered species, the gray wolf and the Canadian lynx. Polymet claims that once they finish with the land, they will attempt to restore it; however, this could take decades to have it return to normal and the animals who lost their forest homes may not come back. I understand that some would think the jobs and revenue would outweigh the potential pollution but they also need to think of the future of Minnesota. I strongly feel we know too little of the environmental effects that the Polymet Copper Mine will have on our animals, water and air. My opinion should be considered because some of the things we are risking with this mine take decades to correct themselves once the damage is done. My hope for the future is that we find a safer way to extract copper so the flora and fauna and the mining can live peacefully together. At this time however, the Polymet mine is not ready for this and it would be wise to wait until we know more. Websites Used

HYPERLINK "<http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/volunteer/julaug12/nonferrous.html>"www.dnr.state.mn.us/volunteer/julaug12/nonferrous.html

HYPERLINK "<http://dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html>" HYPERLINK "<http://www.startribune-com/local/240643741-html>"www.startribune-

com/local/240643741-html HYPERLINK "<http://www.polymetminning-com/>"www.polymetminning-com/

Brooklyn Blackman

54173

DNR, we should not use the sulfide mining act because it pollutes the water with sulfuric acid the PH levels will go down. People like to fish up there and eat the fish, if the people of Minnesota and tourists eat the poisoned fish it's not going to be good. Also it will put a huge amount of business up there. We as the people should have at least one place of natural wilderness where we could count on our generations to come and be a part of this beautiful wilderness center we have been protecting for 30 years. My name is Brooklyn Blackman and I am Against it. The mine up north is a horrible idea.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce and Linda Anderson

57928

The Boundary Waters and surrounding area is one the jewels of Minnesota and the nation. Any risky endeavors such as this mining project will negatively affect the environment, the wildlife, and water quality. Please don't let this mining project move forward. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Bruce Berggren

44600

From: bruce berggren [mailto:brski67@gmail-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 7:04 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR); Brian Berggren Subject: SDEIS I've worked as a forester for the DNR in northern Minnesota for over 31 years. Caring for the resources on both State and private forest lands was my job and as and as a retiree maintain a Stewardship ethic. Reviewing the SDEIS, I've found certain areas of concern. Minnesota law is in conflict with the SDEIS, as in order to advance the SDEIS an arbitrary term of 500 years is used as the last year that monitoring is needed. The State law I am talking about is the law prohibiting issuing a "Permit to Mine" to any mine requiring Perpetual maintenance after closure. Chapter 5-2-2-8 Mine Site Surficial Flow paths states that both the East and West pits "Solute Source End Time" is listed as continuous. Continuous and perpetual sound pretty similar to this reader. The USFS requires the preparation of a reclamation plan to ensure the long term protection and restoration of the natural resources. If a reclamation plan has, or is being developed, the project may meet their goals. The Weeks Law of 1911 is designed to protect the headwater watersheds of navigable rivers. Both the Partridge and Embarrass river watersheds fall under protection from this law but I could not find it addressed in any of the chapters I read. One more item. In all the tables of contents, I could not find anywhere how an emergency shutdown or closure will take place if or when needed. An emergency Shutdown chapter would let others know what management or mine owners plan to do in an emergency. Or at least think about a course of action to take. This project is for the 300 to 600 jobs that will last for about 20 years or so. The USFS and State are sacrificing portions of the 100 Mile Swamp for this mine. The USFS, in their forest plan, has considered this an ecologically sensitive area. Thank you, Bruce Berggren 5105 Rice Lake Rd Duluth, MN. 55803

44627

I have worked as a forester on the North Shore. This comment is in regards to the land exchange process. The land exchange should consider lands within a reasonable distance from the mine site. The site in Cook county is beyond a fair distance from the mine site and should be removed from the exchange process. All sites in Cook county should not be attached to this project. Thank you, Bruce Berggren 5105 Rice Lake Rd Duluth, MN 55803 On Mar 12, 2014 6:05 PM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

45922

Do you want addresses if all .making comments. On Mar 12, 2014 6:02 PM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Berggren 45923

I've worked as a forester for the DNR in northern Minnesota for over 31 years. Caring for the resources on both State and private forest lands was my job and as a retiree maintain a Stewardship ethic. Reviewing the SDEIS, I've found certain areas of concern. Minnesota law is in conflict with the SDEIS, as in order to advance the SDEIS an arbitrary term of 500 years is used as the last year that monitoring is needed. The State law I am talking about is the one prohibiting issuing a "Permit to Mine" to any mine requiring "Perpetual" maintenance after closure. Chapter 5-2-2-8 "Mine Site Surficial Flow Paths" state that both the East and West pits Solute Source End Time is listed as continuous. Not for the 200 or 500 years will the flow come from the mine, but continuously. Perpetual and continuous sound pretty similar to this reader. The USFS requires the preparation of a reclamation plan to ensure the long term protection and restoration of the natural resources. If a reclamation plan has, or is being developed, the project may meet their goals. The Weeks Law of 1911 is designed to protect the headwater watershed of navigable rivers. The Partridge and Embarrass River Watersheds falls into this type of area. This law has not been addressed in any of the chapters I've read. One more item. In all the tables of contents I could not find anywhere how an emergency shutdown or closure will be handled if or when needed. An emergency shutdown chapter would let others know what management or mine owners plan to do in an emergency. Or give readers what is being thought about for an emergency situation. This project is for 300 to 600 jobs lasting about 20 years. The USFS and State are sacrificing a good part of the 100 mile swamp. the USFS in their forest plan consider this an ecologically sensitive area. Thank you, Bruce Berggren

Bruce Blackburn 54783

See attachment

Bruce Brummitt 40022

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. A very small gain for a very few with long term pain . The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Brummitt 24747 Guyles Rd Ponsford, MN 56575-9276

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bruce downing

38821

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Giving a go ahead to POLYMET mining in northern MN would be probably the dumbest thing I have ever heard of. The ore isn't going anywhere. SO WAIT until the future brings a better way to do it. DON'T DO THIS . Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Bruce Downing 510 North 7 Avenue #2 St Cloud, MN 56303 Sincerely, Mr bruce downing 510 7th Ave N # 2 Saint Cloud, MN 56303-3522

Bruce Droogsma

39126

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Droogsma

39128

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

39130

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Droogsma

39131

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

39134

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Droogsma 39135

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Droogsma 203 1st St Delano, MN 55328-9775 (763) 442-2229

Bruce E Grewcock 42750

See attachment

Bruce Grewcock 42712

See attachment

Bruce Harten 3205

From: asajuce5@hotmail-com To: opinion@startribune-com Subject: Open Pandoras Box . Date: Tue, 17 Dec 2013 12:15:25 -0600 Ive been reading the EIS on the Polymet process. The footprint they want to establish overlays a very messy footprint left by "Bygone Mining interests" that continually pollutes my Brown trout stream (St Louis River @watershed) who's pollution study was recently abandoned by the PCA for reasons not given. PCA is one of the Major Permitters for Polymets application. In putting the polymet footprint into the existing polymet wants to use the same berms, tailing pools, ect ect, which in turn gives Polymet the liability phrase "It was polluting before we began" were not responsible. Eight miles of railroad from defunct upgraded plant to the open pit (42,240 feet of asbestos like dust rout, subject to runoff and derail.) This is Minnesota with the Biggest fortune 500 co.s the best Schools and universities, the absolutely finest engineers and the most accomplished, productive, licenced, organized labor force on the planet : So I propose an underground mine , that does not infringe on the existing mess that has an "adjacent" New Closed Loop Crushing, milling, extraction, smelting, sulphide processing and capture, water filtered and reused, dry tailings/site return with NO EXTERNAL PONDING OR BERMS every process INTERNAL . When the power go's off everthing stops . This Is Minnesota where WE CAN INSIST ON IT . .And We Can Do IT . The EIS also has quite the "Socio-economic" article which is intended to obfuscate anti-pollution criteria in favor of "jobs". Army Corps of Engs, MPCA, MDNR .are charged with decisions on natural "Environmental Impact Only" .and leave Socio-economic to our inept legislature where it belongs. Thank you bruce harten 5640-138 st west apple valley mn 55124 952 431 1123 retired IBEW wireman USAF

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Harten

7564

____ From: asajuce5@hotmail-com To: attorney.general@state.mn.us Subject: FW: Minnesota law. Date: Tue, 21 Jan 2014 08:43:54 -0600 _____ From: asajuce5@hotmail-com To: attorney.general@ag.state.mn.us Subject: Minnesota law. Date: Mon, 20 Jan 2014 09:52:00 -0600 Miss Swanson Can the Department of Natural Resources under Minnesota Statute/Law Refuse to "Issue Permit" to Polymet for the purpose of mining "copper/nickel" in the ongoing process. Minnesotans are due a statement from your office on procedure and "Minnesota Law in effect. Dnr, Corps of Engineers, EPA all are described as having a VOTE on permitting. "What is the truth." What agency has "Yay or Nay" in this event. thank you Bruce A Harten apple valley mn 55124 952 431 1123

10744

____ From: asajuce5@hotmail-com To: opinion@startribune-com Subject: Fun with Copper Mining Date: Sat, 1 Feb 2014 11:10:37 -0600 1955 to 1982 Butte Montana went from tunnel copper mining to "Open Pit" . The Waterfilled toxic hole remaining as one of the top superfund sites is 7000 feet long, 5600 feet wide and sixteen hundred feet deep containing Thirty Billion Gallons of Toxicity. In 1995 a migrating flock of snow geese landed on it .342 carcasses were retrieved,studied and creamated. Im just sayin "How would judge Miles Lord look at this.

46044

This "Polymet thing" as Ive said earlier is going to "Happen" so the effort should be concentrated on "How it Happens". Do not let the Footprint of this Plan get anywhere near an existing "Abandoned or Operating" mining venture. Closed loop crushing, milling extraction, smelting, sulfide packaging, tailing compaction and return, Interior ponding and water reuse ALL IN ONE ENCLOSURE Power Goes off everything stops .and all mining is done without "Open Pit" This procedure also lets Attorney Generals Office off the hook for defending the "Criteria of Permit ."Minnesota has the Resources, Technology and the Manpower to do this right and deserves no less . Bruce A Harten apple valley minn. HYPERLINK "mailto:c.c.opinion@startribune-com" c.c.opinion@startribune-com

46045

This "Polymet thing" as Ive said earlier is going to "Happen" so the effort should be concentrated on "How it Happens". Do not let the Footprint of this Plan get anywhere near an existing "Abandoned or Operating" mining venture. Closed loop crushing, milling extraction, smelting, sulfide packaging, tailing compaction and return, Interior ponding and water reuse ALL IN ONE ENCLOSURE Power Goes off everything stops .and all mining is done without "Open Pit" This procedure also lets Attorney Generals Office off the hook for defending the "Criteria of Permit ."Minnesota has the Resources, Technology and the Manpower to do this right and deserves no less . Bruce A Harten apple valley minn. HYPERLINK "mailto:c.c.opinion@startribune-com" c.c.opinion@startribune-com

Bruce Hurtley

39097

It would be wonderful to be able to live in a beautiful area and have good union job for 20 years. It would be wonderful if the PolyMet and GlencoreXstrata companies could guarantee that the NorthMet mine would be safe for the environment during its operation and centuries after its closure. However, the risks of sulfide mining are very high and there are no guarantees. There are only promises. Mining companies don't always keep promises. Mining executives sometimes exaggerate their commitment to environmental safety and their concern for the well being of union families. Do you trust them. You may believe that PolyMet would never allow sulfuric acid runoff from their mining/refining operations to destroy surrounding wetlands and that any liability for future cleanup costs would fall to the company and not to the tax payers of Minnesota. You may also believe that corporations put people and natural resources ahead of profit. If so, enjoy your hopeful and wonderful fantasies, but please, also consider the track record of sulfide mining because the stakes are very high for Minnesota and this industry does not deserve your faith. Sincerely, Bruce Hurtley 122 Demont Ave E, #159 Little Canada, MN 55117 612-270-7638

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Johnson

48036

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing as a concerned citizen of Northern Minnesota to ask that you reject Polymet's SDEIS as inadequate. There are many reasons why this proposed project would be damaging to the quality of life in this region. A few of the most important problems are: The long-term pollution of our precious water resources is unacceptable. Clean water is our area's most valuable resource. This is not the deserts of Arizona, Chile, or the Australian outback. The wetlands of northern Minnesota are simply not the place for a copper mine of this kind. The financial assurances are inadequate. What is said is vague and completely unacceptable. Glencore, Polymet's 'strategic partner,' has a very poor track record with respect to environmental pollution and human rights abuses. The proposed operation would require massive amounts of carbon-intensive energy. We need to be transitioning to sustainable energy systems. The habitat of already vulnerable species, such as moose and lynx, are threatened by this project. Wild rice would be further damaged by the inevitable pollution from this misplaced mine. We are responsible for the stewardship of this unique and life-sustaining environment. The risks involved are simply too great. Sincerely, Bruce Johnson 835 West College Street Duluth, MN 55811 (218) 724-6084

Bruce Kuehl

39347

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built. I am a long term, out of state frequent visitor to MN for tourism reasons. Should MN allow this mine project I think my friends, family and I will look for a different state/province to visit. Sincerely, Dr Bruce Kuehl 8004 Eagle Rd Lake Tomahawk, WI 54539-9468

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Ludewig

43496

The following are my comments regarding the Polymet NorthMet SDEIS: Regarding the land swap: While the proposed swap would involve roughly equal acreages, it seems like the Superior National Forest would be diminished as a result, since the land to be traded to Polymet is on the perimeter of the SNF boundary, thus reducing the "effective size" of the forest, while the lands traded to the USFS are within the forest boundary and are effectively already part of it. It seems that there would be a net loss of forest and wetland as a result of this trade and the subsequent Polymet operations. I'm also concerned that in the proposed trade the USFS is not getting a good "price" for the lands that would be traded to PolyMet. Since the owner of the surface estate effectively controls access to the minerals below, the value of those minerals should be factored into the value of the surface estate. The lands proposed to be traded to the USFS have little mineral value, so are effectively worth much less. Regarding water quality: Due to the long time span (100s of years) over which treatment will be needed, I think it is a leap of faith to conclude that containment and treatment systems will be effective and can be maintained for as long as necessary. Can we really expect these engineered liners and collection systems to last for hundreds of years. It seems that they would at the least require ongoing maintenance, and possibly require complete rebuilding at some point. I don't trust the engineering over such a long time span. Is there enough financial assurance to cover rebuilding the containment systems 100 years from now. What will the political and economic situation be even 20 years from now. I am not confident that the proper monitoring, maintenance and response to unforeseen issues will occur into the future as assumed in the SDEIS. According to the SDEIS, the water discharged from the mine and plant sites is expected to contain levels of sulfate that are less than or equal to current levels in the watershed, and less than the current standard for wild rice waters. Even assuming that that situation is maintained for the long term, are we certain that we aren't replacing a natural water flow that would have had lower sulfate levels in the absence of the NorthMet project, and thus increasing the flow of sulfate into the watershed. Is sub-aqueous storage really a safe way to dispose of the category 4 waste rock. Regarding the cumulative effects: If the model results show at a 90% certainty level that water quality won't be impaired with this project, isn't it reasonable to expect that one out of 10 similar projects might result in unacceptable contamination. Given that there are several other similar projects likely to be proposed in the region in the near future, I think the 90% certainty level is far too low. For what it's worth, I think the comment period should have been extended; the SDEIS is a very large and complex document. Given the high level of public interest in this issue, 90 days wasn't enough time for an average citizen with a full time job to properly review the document. Thank you. Bruce Ludewig 6 Chester Pkwy Duluth, MN 55805

Bruce Magnuson

12077

Dear Persons, I realize that the NorthMet project is a very emotional issue and I am not an expert on the subject. However, my gut feeling is that in the long run, the proposed NorthMet mining project will be bad for the state. The mining company is looking at it with profit in mind and profit motives can cloud good judgment. As I understand it, there will have to be long-term containment of acid formation, and that means 200 years at the mine site and 500 years at the processing site. I think this is too long. I think the risk is too high. I know there are jobs that would be created by the mining of copper and nickel, but I feel that the area's current economic base of tourism and agriculture can continue to be a good source of income for that area. Sincerely, Bruce Stephen Magnuson 2434 11th Ave South Minneapolis MN 55404

Bruce McBeath

39521

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. This issue is too important and has consequences too extreme to pass human health and safety concerns. Sincerely Bruce McBeath 1687 siewert Red Wing, MN 55066

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce McKay

39078

---Original Message--- From: bmckay.aces@gmail-com [mailto:bmckay.aces@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 8:55 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Bruce McKay 29976 290th St Henderson, MN 56044-4415

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce McKay

42227

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Peck

52548

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Philipson

43701

Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. In short, the time for accepting the PolyMet mine has not come yet. Current mining technology and methods are not environmentally safe enough to operate in Minnesota. Certainly this is not something of honest dispute, otherwise why are we looking at monitoring for 500 years. Is the 20 years of mining really worth 500 years of pollution concern. Seems it would be best to err on the side of protecting the environment certainly at least until safer mining techniques with less risk for pollution have been developed and proven to be effective. Minnesota should not be the testing ground. The precious metals have been there for centuries and are not going anywhere on their own. They will wait until they can be mined in a safe and environmentally responsible manner. I realize the projected economic impact to both the local area as well as the state of Minnesota are large numbers especially to an average citizen, but the reality is the numbers are not that big when compared to the potential costs and risks being pushed upon the citizens. Certainly a 1,000 temporary construction jobs and something less than 400 so called permanent jobs, if 20 years is permanent, all are appealing but at what costs. In light of the recent announcement by one company, Wells Fargo Mortgage, cutting 2,000 good permanent jobs and there being little outcry it does not seem the potential PolyMet jobs are really that big of a deal. Certainly not such a great boon given the potential long term damage to the local environment that is surely to arise from mining in such a delicate environment as that proposed for the PolyMet. History is a great teacher for those who are willing to learn from it. One of the lessons it offers is that mining companies are poor citizens and certainly have not been friends of the environment and all too often not to their employees either. All too often the mining concerns have been interested only in their bottom line and take action to protect, (actually clean up after the fact) the environmental and health concerns only when forced to. The common method of operation is for the mining concerns to get while the getting is good and leave behind a path of environmental destruction. All too often escaping the economic responsibility for cleaning up their mess thru bankruptcy and leaving the public holding the bag. Examples of abandoned polluted mines are ever abundant in the western states. One only need look at the Minnesota's own fight over the taconite tailings pollution at Silver Bay and numerous superfund sites that remain. In short, mining concerns have not been good environmental citizens on their own in the past and should not be expected to have changed overnight. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,34

Bruce Reno

39550

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. There are no safe guards to protect the environment and the tourism industry after the mining has been approved and started. What happens to the businesses and jobs that will be eliminated after the problems arise from this mining practice as has happened every where this type of mining has occurred. I personally have seen the effects of the damage that has come about and once it happens there is no fixing it. The people of this state cannot afford to fix the problems resulting from the mining process and the lack of oversight that always occurs due to greed and mismanagement that is pervasive in the mining industry as a whole. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Reno 2851 Tuxedo Blvd Mound, MN 55364-9158 (612) 801-7138

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Reno

48786

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. There are no safe guards to protect the environment and the tourism industry after the mining has been approved and started. What happens to the businesses and jobs that will be eliminated after the problems arise from this mining practice as has happened every where this type of mining has occurred. I personally have seen the effects of the damage that has come about and once it happens there is no fixing it. The people of this state cannot afford to fix the problems resulting from the mining process and the lack of oversight that always occurs due to greed and mismanagement that is pervasive in the mining industry as a whole. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bruce Reno 2851 Tuxedo Blvd Mound, MN 55364-9158 (612) 801-7138

Bruce Snyder

58064

This type of project has no place in the watershed of the Great Lakes. Do we still offer short term riches in exchange for our long term best interests? I hope not. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Bruce Snyder

18184

Good evening. I'm Bruce Snyder. I noticed all the Snyders that have been here tonight were a proud clan, but actually I'm not related to any of the other Snyders. I've been a neurologist in Minnesota for about 40 years, which means I'm old. And it also means I know a fair amount about technology and scientific literature. And I do know a couple of things. I know that economic interest does affect the perspective of the scientist. I know that in science -- although we count on science to be intellectually honest, we count on science to be technically proficient, and we believe some of it still that science is actually objective. And it's not. It's not. I've seen this in my own line of work. I've seen it with various devices that haven't worked as they should. I've seen it with medications that have turned out to be toxic. I've gotten to be -- because I'm old -- skeptical. Now when it comes to environmental concerns, I'm even more skeptical. I mean I went to college when Rachel Carson wrote her book. DDT was actually a very useful chemical coming out of World War II. It killed fleas and lice. And unfortunately unexpectedly it had a major environmental impact. I was in Minnesota the first years when Three Mile Island melted down. That was a nuclear plant that was designed carefully with a great deal of engineering expertise and responsibility. And God knows, I'm sure well-intentioned and well-informed labor. And we know what happened there. Maybe you don't. You don't remember that it melted down. It was a containment breach. And we just avoided major environmental nuclear pollution in that way. Our energy industry has -- it supports us. I burn oil. I use electricity. We all do. Our energy industry, however, needs to perhaps be held in check. Putting a nuclear plant on a seismically active fault is not the best idea. And putting a polluting mine in our freshwater is not a good idea either. The surface water and streams and groundwater that this plant will be affecting are in the watershed of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes is 20 percent of the world's freshwater. We are in the middle of an impending, increasing, actualizing drought. Two years ago the Mississippi was too low for barges. Groundwater supplies dropped -- and I'll stop there. I'm against it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bruce Ventura 34208

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Sulfide ore based mineral extraction is also occurring in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan where I live, and has similar potential to pollute Lake Superior. Sulfide based ore extraction took place in northern Wisconsin in the late 1990s, with disastrous results for the rivers in that area. NO sulfide based ore mining or extraction of coal that is high in sulfur has ever been done without major contamination of water resources. No technology has ever been developed to prevent the damage and destruction of watersheds in any region in the world where sulfide based mining has occurred. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Bruce Ventura 140 Timber Ln Marquette, MI 49855-8801 (906) 225-0139

Bruce Vukelich 44066

I am writing to submit my opposition to the new proposed PolyMet mining operation. History has shown that despite men's best efforts to prevent accidents, they continue to happen and once they happen it is too late to reverse the damages. The plans which provide for 200 and 500 year spans of cleaning pollutants and waste from water and the land in the area and surrounding areas is testament enough for me of the potential damages we could sustain to our already endangered eco-system. 500 years. In viewing the FonDuLac watershed district maps produced to show current levels of pollution, many with areas that are already over the limit specified by the EPA as being safe is a big concern. Adding this new mining operation to this area will only add to these already troubled areas. Jobs and opportunities are very important to the vitality of the Iron Range of northeast Minnesota but not at the cost of our water and soil. We are one of the few states in the country with the water resources we have and we should be highly protective of those resources. Thank you, Bruce Vukelich 5481 245th Street Forest Lake, MN 55025 651-464-2573

Bruner Bullivant 52290

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota Duluth. The natural beauty of the Great Lakes is what drew me to going to school here. I love Minnesota because it is a state that values and protects these natural spaces. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bruner Bullivant 7518 130th Ave Milaca, MN 56353-4437 (763) 898-0268

Bruno Prata 42437

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Bruno Prata Rua Dr Jorge De Seabra 10 - 1º Esquerdo Castelo Branco (Portugal), None 6000-216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bryan Emmel

39577

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Hydrologists and futurists agree that one of the most precious commodities of the future is clean, potable water. Northeast Minnesota has some of the most pristine surface waters in the world. It makes no sense to trade it for ten pieces of gold. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Bryan Emmel 322 9th St S Virginia, MN 55792-2836

Bryan Hainey

41817

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Bryan Hainey Fridley, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bryan Hansel

18895

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Bryan Hansel PO Box 149 728 Devil Track Road Grand Marais, MN 55604

42226

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Bryan Hansel PO Box 149 Grand Marais, MN 55604-0149 (218) 370-8351

Bryan Nelson

47518

Bryan Nelson Twenty years of minor prosperity is not worth 500 years of pollution. Please do not permit such a man made disaster.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bryan Thao Xao Chay

54220

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, Do you know what you're doing? You are allowing Polymet to mine a very conservative place. Do you know what that would do to the Boundary Waters? It would basically poison the water with sulfuric acid! But that's not all of it. The water would be contaminated for over 500 years! And the cost to decontaminate it would cost a lot, even higher than one billion dollars. Polymet's plan to mine is also wrong too. They plan to mine in a huge area, but they are telling everybody that they're only mining in a small area. Which is a lie! How can you trust and allow a company to go through with this plan, when it is so obvious that they are lying! That is all I have to say. Goodbye and have a good day. And think hard if what you are going to do. Sincerely, Bryan Thao Zao Chay P.S. I am a Humboldt High School student of Saint Paul, MN. Address: 1245 7th Street East 55106 St. Paul, MN

Bryan W Cox

9333

I would like express my gratitude to be able to provide my opinion regarding Polymet's current proposal for a precious metal mine in Minnesota. As a lifelong resident of St Louis County, I too enjoy the natural resources and outdoor activities of the State, but I also understand the importance of economic growth. While the proposal has drawn opponents, alarmed about run off, mining in general, the company's ability to effectively maintain or clean their waste, and preservation of our current environment, a multitude of concerns have been raised that are simply too advanced to truly have an effective answer. One could theorize different circumstances and still remain unprepared for all eventualities. If Polymet has developed a reverse osmosis process that extracts minerals from waste well below the EPA standards as they claim, one would believe their ability to be environmentally viable. Furthermore, waste water can be treated before being reinstated into the surrounding area. Companies throughout the country have practiced this with great success for years. Recent concern regarding water flow data along the Partridge River have been brought forth. Opponents tout further reason to avoid implementing the mine; however, according to the Duluth News Tribune, a sensor was not placed into the river until mid-2011- I question the true impact of this revelation. First, two years is not a sufficient period of time to conclude consistent water flow data. Second, Northern Minnesota went through one of the worst floods in history in June of 2011, which would obviously elevate data. Finally, data can be skewed by both opponents and proponents alike to meet their own agendas. Northern Minnesota is not truly new to precious metal mining. For decades, copper and silver mines were abundant along the shores of Lake Superior. They remain abandoned today along one of the largest watersheds of the country. Such mines, along both Knife and Sucker rivers are well known to locals. Silver mines were present further up the shore. Vegetative growth, habitat, and wildlife remain viable in these avenues. Certainly EPA standards were less aggressive then today and yet run off persist from these mines with little influence to the surrounding area. I have faith that the project will be environmentally wholesome and beneficial for the region and the state. The proposed minerals that will be mined play a vital role in our society. Little do most people understand that day to day devices carry such metals in their structure. These metals already help advance our Country's goal of being energy efficient and will ultimately reduce the carbon foot print of society. There are many ways to protect the environment on an individual basis. Our current laws are sufficient enough to protect these standards. Assuredly, Government agencies will see that it will. Thank you. Sincerely, Bryan Cox This St Lukes communication is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify sender immediately.

Bryan Wood

9521

Dear Ms Lisa Fay and MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit, Please find my attached comments in opposition to the proposed PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Bryan Wood 15410 Groningen Road Sandstone, MN 55072

20814

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I am submitting my opposition to the PolyMet mine proposal in the attached document. I ask that you please read it, and decide against this incredibly environmentally harmful proposal. Sincerely, - Bryan Wood 15410 Groningen Road Sandstone, MN 55072 HYPERLINK "mailto:bwood18@gmail-com" bwood18@gmail-com 320-290-8246

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bryan Wood 49648

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I am submitting my opposition to the PolyMet mine proposal in the attached document. I ask that you please read it, and decide against this incredibly environmentally harmful proposal. Sincerely, - Bryan Wood 15410 Groningen Road Sandstone, MN 55072 [HYPERLINK "mailto:bwood18@gmail-com"](mailto:bwood18@gmail-com) bwood18@gmail-com 320-290-8246

Bryce Makela 19522

My name is Bryce Makela, B-R-Y-C-E, M-A-K-E-L-A, 2504 West 11th Street in Duluth, Minnesota. I don't particularly hold any pro or anti-mining view. I think you can mine and have clean water. They're not mutually exclusive, but what I'm concerned about, I can't find any information in the EIS that has looked at the existing copper mine that was closed in Ladysmith, Wisconsin. I would think that, rather than modeling, computer modeling, you know, sulfite concentrations in water, that there should be a comparison study of a few existing copper mines that use modern technology, such as the Eagle Mine in Upper Michigan, and the closed Ladysmith Copper Mine. I mean, just simply going down there and sampling the water flowing from the waste rock pile will generate a mountain more data than computer monitoring -- or computer modeling situation. That's all I have to say. I mean, it's a mistake if the EIS has not taken real-life measurements from an existing closed copper mine, such -- I think it was in Ladysmith -- I'm not sure of the name of the mine. I'm not pro or against. I think that if -- if they haven't looked at that, they're missing something. That's all I have to say.

Bryn M Shank 57198

Ruining the environment for up to 500 years is selfish! The CEOs of these mining companies won't be around. They won't have to pay for the health concerns. People's lives don't have a price. Let's do the right thing and say NO to PolyMet! Bryn M. Shank 1696 James Ave St. Paul, MN 55105

Bryn M. Shank 16486

Minnesota is well known for its beautiful wilderness. Lets not wreck it. 500 years of clean up is way too long. Do the smart thing for the future of Minnesota. -Bryn Shank 1696 James Ave StPaul MN 55105

BSMAJEWski@aol.com 47161

It is imperative that any water discharges from this operation off site meets all standards that protect all users of the resource (plants, animals, insects, etc that are part of the food chain at all levels) within the watershed it will be placed in. Dilution is not an acceptable solution. Treatment level and time is critical. The SDEIS is not clear on how much time will be necessary to treat the water used in the process. It is assumed that rather large quantities of water will be affected by the process and whether this amount can be adequately stored onsite and treated before release to the adjacent watershed for travel eventually to the St Louis River and Lake Superior where it will be drawn into the intake for drinking water by the residents of the urban area of Duluth and Superior. The 12,000 acre estuary could be adversely affected by the water if it is not adequately treated before release. Contamination of the ground water resource is also a critical concern and needs to be examined more closely. Once groundwater pools are contaminated there is no remediation. This contamination could travel considerable distances to affect areas unknown to us today. If treatment time is in the range of 200-500 years as has been mentioned, it is not acceptable. The adjusted cost for such treatment after the mining activity ceases over that kind of time period doesn't make any sense whatsoever. When put in the perspective of the time between the time when Christopher Columbus discovered America and today, I don't think anyone is going to have the resources to set aside to support the long term cost of the treatment process and replaced equipment for that long.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Bud Fontana

18116

Good evening. My name is Bud Fontana. I'm a manager at Hoyt Lakes Global Mining project. And I'm here speaking in favor of PolyMet. And the DNR's extensive testing has shown we can have industry mining jobs and clean water. According to the document, the average mining job paid \$62,000 per year on average. The jobs PolyMet will create are good, high-paying jobs people on the Iron Range are trained for and are good at. Spin-off jobs created because of PolyMet, like those at (inaudible) also very important to our community. The socioeconomic studies included in the primary geographic area impacted by the PolyMet project include the areas of Duluth, Hibbing, Virginia, Ely, Biwabik, some portions of Cook County (inaudible) population trend in our area you will see 10 percent decrease since 1980. Our young people, my daughter, has had to move away from our community to the Cities to find work. These jobs have to be well paying to sustain a family to be able to purchase products and drive an economy. The PolyMet project can bring hundreds of these direct paying jobs back to our region and bring some of us back to the family that they left. Mining these deposits in a reasonable way represents the largest economic opportunity for the Northeast Minnesota region and the state of Minnesota since the Iron Range ore was (inaudible) bringing construction and jobs to support families, provide high-quality health care, and retirement security for the future. If you use, like I do, all the devices in our life these days, which are coming at us faster and faster, you support the mining industry, whether it's here locally or it's a foreign country. I'm glad they have state policies that call for responsible extraction of our mineral resources and sound laws and processes in place to ensure we protect the people and the environment when we mine. I support the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And I believe it provides sound foundation for the company to seek and obtain the needed permits to operate. The metals used every day, copper and nickel, exceeds the recycle supply. We are net importers of these metals. Given that there are no supports and increases in demand, if we are responsible stewards of our global planet, we should be for locally sourced metal rather than foreign and thereby sending good jobs overseas.

Bud Stone

18096

Good evening. My name is buzz stone. I am the president of the Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce. Our chambers had a formal resolution in place supporting the PolyMet Project since August of 2007. The reasons that we passed that resolution were varied but include the things that you've already heard about, like positive economic impacts, jobs, tax money for the State of Minnesota and funding for schools. Now, some of those opposed to the project talked about the long-term effects of the project in a negative tone, but we don't see it that way. They also talked about unproven processes that might not be perfect and how they don't trust the agencies that are critiquing the project. During the creating of the EIS and SDEIS, hundreds of smart people from these agencies gave their input based on what we call best available technology. Tomorrow's best available technology will be entirely different than today's. Just as Smart Phones evolved from two tin cans with a piece of string between them, mining as we know it today will change as we get smarter. Just as high-tech transportation evolved from the model T, we'll develop advanced ways to protect our environment from things we don't know about today. Just as we have develop ways to scrub mercury and carbon from power plant emissions, we'll also find new ways to prevent new pollution and clean up old pollution. You know, questioning the way we do things is beneficial as this leads to new and better ways to do them. It's always done that way. Today, the world need to the precious metals that we have under our feet. Tomorrow, the world may need something else. But for now, we have the resources to advance civilization down the path that we know best using our best available technology, which is far superior to anywhere else in the world. Fifty years ago, we would not have even been talking about the PolyMet Project as it is proposed today. That's because we weren't smart enough. Fifty years from now, the things that people are concerned about today will no longer be relevant as we will have new tools, new knowledge to deal with. We believe that this project can be done environmentally responsibly and that in the future, it will get even easier. In closing, I'd like to point out that, you know, you can't be anti-mining and pro metals. If you use electricity are indoor plumbing, if you use a computer, cell phone or drive a car, bicycle, if you use this microphone and the amplifiers and the speakers in the room to have your voice heard, you're supporting the mining industry and, specifically, copper and nickel mining. Personally, I'm glad that we have state policy that calls for responsible extraction of our mineral resources and strong laws and processes in place to ensure that we protect the people and the environment when we mine. We support the draft EIS and the supplemental draft EIS and believe they provide a solid foundation for the company to week and obtain the needed permits to operate. Thank you.

Building Construction Trades Council

54696

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Burgess Eberhardt

16181

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Burt

54903

See attachment

bwolfe

4570

I hope you have read very carefully the SDEIS with the very limited time given to the citizens of Minnesota. There are so many environmental, economic, and social costs not answered in this over 2,000 page document. If water pollution will last for a MINIMUM of 500 years this document gives generalities when it comes to COSTS ..repairs, monitoring, treatment of the water. etc Are we really going to pass all this on to future generations. PLEASE google the Berkeley Pit in Butte Montana, a super fund site and this is what we will create in NE MN. Why would anyone want to do this. Also the SDEIS document NEEDS a cost/benefit analysis of the Polymet mine. This document is inadequate and the risks are too unknown to have this type of mining in Minnesota. Barry Wolfe 1612 Jefferson St Duluth, Mn. 55812 bwolfe@d.umn-edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

bwolfe

36805

I do not feel PolyMet's SEIDS is complete enough for this project to go forward. Please consider the following that should be answered. 1) PolyMet's SEIDS needs to be more specific about the expected amounts of mercury that will be released into the surrounding watersheds. 2) PolyMet's SEIDS needs to include the effects of mercury emissions and the exposure to asbestos and arsenic on the health of humans living in the area or visiting the area, as well as the animals and vegetation. 3) PolyMet's SEIDS needs a cost analysis on the indirect harming of wetlands, air pollution, and redirecting of water in the Partridge River headwaters. Water is our most precious resource. We have worldwide water wars and the US will possibly see more of this type of war inside this country with the effects of climate change. Fresh, clean water is more precious to human beings in this state and this nation than any copper so why is this state so eager to poison this natural resource. Once the water is contaminated there is no way to purify the water to make it safe for human consumption or it would cost billions and decades. Why would any state want to EXPERIMENT with a copper sulfide mine such as the PolyMet proposal. I hope the public will see in writing all their questions answered. We cannot vote on this issue so please understand the concerns. You must weigh what is best for Mn. and future generations and this may mean looking at the entire picture and not segments of the PolyMet proposal. And this takes courage to speak out. Let's not EXPERIMENT with NE MINNESOTA's resources. Mrs Barry Wolfe 1612 Jefferson St Duluth, MN. 55812 218-728-2465

Byron Kuster

16074

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing in regards to the Polymet SDEIS. I believe it has overlooked one important matter, the possibility of a terroristic action directed towards the mercury that is planned to be stored on-site. This mercury is a byproduct of the reverse osmosis and other mining related processes. Most people would agree that there are people who will create havoc and chaos as a way to get attention or as a way to express anger. Examples of this would be the Boston Marathon bomber brothers, the shooter at Sandy Hook Elementary School, or Chris Christie's staff who ordered the blockage of traffic on the Geo. Washington Bridge. My concern is that a terrorist, foreign or domestic, could create an improvised explosive device (IED) and direct it to the Polymet's on-site stockpile of mercury. If accomplished, the explosion could disperse mercury in all directions in a manner that would be extremely difficult to clean up quickly and thoroughly. The un-recovered, toxic mercury could then cause serious pollution to the watershed and underground aquifers. Preventing such a terrorist act would be nearly impossible because an IED could be dropped from a small aircraft or helicopter. An attempt at prevention would likely include a double row fence with razor wire between such as found surrounding a prison, 24/7 armed guards, and a no-fly zone above the Polymet site for as long as mercury is stored in the area. If the mercury were to get moved, similar mobile safety precautions would be needed from point to point. If I can think of this act of terrorism, others more sinister than me can also. A plan of prevention needs to be included in the SDEIS. Currently, it isn't. I am asking you to reject the SDEIS until this threat has been evaluated and a viable plan of prevention has been established. This plan should include an estimate of its cost, its duration, and its likelihood of success. Thank you. Sincerely, Byron Kuster 4761 Coffee Lake Road Moose Lake, MN 55767 218 485-8511

byron paulson

20178

I wish to make one brief comment regarding the EIS for the proposed PolyMet mine in northeast Minnesota. There is discussion that any monitoring and possible cleanup of the site may be in the 500 year timeframe. To put this in perspective, 500 years is as long as the elapsed time between when Columbus "discovered" America and the present. Think of all the events and turmoil which have occurred in the past 500 years. Project this into the future, and then ask yourself if it is reasonable to expect that vigilance in monitoring and potential cleanup will really occur centuries from now. Thank you. Byron Paulson 10822 Oxborough Ave Bloomington, MN 55437

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Byron Quinn

39067

---Original Message--- From: quinnb@upstel-net [mailto:quinnb@upstel-net] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 9:37 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Byron Quinn 709 SE 2nd St Little Falls, MN 56345-3503

Byron Rice

39876

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I don't want my grand children having to pay for cleaning up Northern Minnesota because we thought it would be a good idea to get jobs up there for a 20 year stretch. Let's come up with a jobs program to help the people of Northern Minnesota. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Byron Rice 6310 Russell Ave S Richfield, MN 55423-1004 (612) 866-8286

Byron Richard

8

Representative, I have two responses: 1) The process presented is blind to an informed consideration of impacts that could extend from 200 to 500 years into the future. The process is inadequate and represents either our cupidity or cowardice, or both. 2) Geological asset extraction yields short-term financial benefits while expending social, health and other economic resources a score of generations or more into the future. Does that sound like a good exchange to you. I look forward to the day when this kind of proposal is immediately recognized as criminal activity too shameful for anyone to voice in public. Erin Thompson Byron Richard 4609 Lyndale Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Byron Richard 45463

I'm registering my profound opposition to the Polymet mine proposal and to any sulfide mining in Minnesota. Your assurance, though possibly legal, do not adequately equip the state and future residents to maintain the mitigation of water pollution. I'm looking at Mine Site Version 5-0 Model, Annual Average of Concentration Statistics, CU in the long-term WWTF Influent. This chart ends at year 200 with almost no change in concentration. 1) what kind of fraudulent representation is this. At that slope how long does it take to achieve acceptable mitigation, 2000 years. 2) the parent company of Polymet can cash out and leave Minnesota high and dry. Your assumptions call for best case scenarios for rainfall and assume no leakage in the containment facility. Both of these assumptions are on the wrong side of caution. There is no sulfide mining mitigation that has been successful. The Polymet reserve osmosis plan doesn't have the capacity, never mind the funding for 2000 years. I wouldn't wish this on your children, so don't compel it on mine. What kind of cost are you willing to incur for 3 years of 200 jobs from this low-employment density project and open season on further mining proposals. It makes no sense. NO to Polymet. Byron Richard 4609 Lydnale Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55419

C Bach 54472

See attachment

c carlson 18943

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, c carlson boulder creek drive 16025 boulder creek drive mtka mn minnetonka, MN 55345 952 934 5357

Alphabetical by sender's first name

C Dodd 22967

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, C Dodd PO Box 1110 Monterey, CA 93942-1110

C Goustin 8128

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, Five hundred years. At least The United States is not yet 250 years old. Who will be here to treat the wastewater in five or six hundred years. Do you think PolyMet will be there. What is the average life of a polluting corporation in our modern era. Even if reverse osmosis is the miracle that the mining companies claim, who will be here to do it. In fact, we know it won't happen. This is permanent destruction of our home planet for short-term corporate gains. The pressure is on you to sell the citizens out to a dirty, greedy corporation. Do the right thing. Say no. Thank you, C Goustin 6029 Dupont Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55419 US

C Jean Kilgour 42634

See attachment

C Johnson 9697

To Whom It May Concern: I am an Environmental Health Specialist in the State of Minnesota and a planning and zoning commissioner. I hold a bachelor of science degree from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. I am adamantly opposed to the proposed PolyMet nickel mine in Northern Minnesota. If reasons for my opposition to the project are needed, please contact me via email reply to this address. Sincerely, Caleb Johnson Lexington, Minnesota

C Lee Beaty 39870

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms C Lee Beaty 2801 42nd Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1817 (612) 721-7108

Alphabetical by sender's first name

C Peterson

10825

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs C Peterson 7 Bainbridge Ct Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-6067

10829

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs C Peterson 7 Bainbridge Ct Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-6067

11437

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs C Peterson 7 Bainbridge Ct Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-6067

Alphabetical by sender's first name

C Quast 48168

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, C Quast xxxxx xxxst Ave Henderson, MN 56044

C Stephens &/or L Olson 38855

The SDEIS is inadequate. It does not and cannot provide reassurance that this mining will not result in irreparable harm to the watery environment in Minnesota's Arrowhead. PolyMet's proposed mine threatens the state's clean water, wild lands, and public health. These valuable resources must be protected and not sacrificed for short term employment and profits. Charlotte Stephens, 23 Pandolfo Place, St Cloud MN 56303

c. dino pappas 4006

Dear Sirs, The state of Minnesota needs more jobs and must increase its tax base. The environmental issues will be answered with a cleaner state that which exists now (remember this is an old iron ore mine). The community is desperate for jobs, this area has some of the highest unemployment in the state, with this project there will be thousands of new jobs. The fact is that PolyMet is going to be using reverse osmosis as its topping of its water treatment. Good enough to drink, and yes I would drink it. Minnesota is very rich in natural resources lets use these gifts, and we have a very well educated population. I think that we have a chance to keep more of these people in the state by creating these new jobs. I have been an investor and a frequent visitor to Minnesota all of my life. I use to go to Lake Vermillion as a youngster and think highly of keep Minnesota clean and I know that is just what PolyMet will be doing. Oh and just one more thing to think about is that these are strategic materials which we currently get from other countries which are not all that friendly. Please approve the PolyMet application. Thank you. C. Dino Pappas C. DINO PAPPAS Vice President for Development @ PyroPhase, Inc. The Future of US Energy .. and President of P.S. Consultants, Ltd. Technology Transfer and Licensing Insurance, Pensions and Finance //:\ MAIL: POB 652, SKOKIE, IL. 60076-0652 STREET: 8453 N. LAWNSDALE Ave SUITE 1, SKOKIE, IL. 60076 847 676 4169 VOICE /// 847 361 3160 CELL c.dinopappas@usa-net // c_dinopappas@yahoo-com The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

C. Morgan McNeil

25624

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Re: PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. To: Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers, Tim Dabney, US Forest Service, Lisa Fay, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Susan Hedman, Environmental Protection Agency PolyMet doesn't have a history to consider. Glencore does. The company founded by Marc Rich, a financier, who if pardoned for his involvement by President Bill Clinton, has nevertheless been implicated in environmental disasters, as well as labor violations and human rights abuses around the world. To date there has been no Sulfide mining in Minnesota. Sulphide mining now threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Renal tubular malfunction and pulmonary emphysema from Cadmium, Arsenic, Mercury are on offer to local residents. A corresponding threat to the health of wildlife will result in species decline. Virtually every environmentally responsible person who knows about PolyMet Mining says no to this project. We, they, do not want acid mine drain water. Those who do, live elsewhere and profit. Nor do those people who will be affected want to lose local wetlands or wildlife to this mining scheme. Specifically, lynx and declining moose populations are threatened by the cumulative impact to an even greater degree than are local residents. The animals are defenseless. Residents can, and do however, say no. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest decision to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest while those who will profit will in any exigency hide behind corporate law and not be held responsible for the harm they knowingly cause to wetlands, residents and wildlife. C. Morgan McNeil 9876 Wilshire Boulevard Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Sincerely, C. Morgan McNeil 9876 Wilshire Blvd Beverly Hills, CA 90210-3115

Cahrene Dimick

57968

I understand the need for employment, however I am completely opposed to jobs that will place at risk and harm our natural resources. The area on the PolyMet Mining Corp NorthMet is pristine and vulnerable. Please do not let this project occur. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnninage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Caitie Ryan-Norton

45112

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. As a Minnesota native who is spending a year living in southern Colorado I have a new perspective on our water sources as vital components to our livelihood. Listening to the struggles of southwestern water rights and priorities I know that it is essential for us to protect our water. Participating in a mine that has even the most remote chance of polluting our waterways is not worth it. Our water is an incredibly valuable resource that should not be taken for granted. Sincerely, Ms Caitie Ryan-Norton 307 Laurel Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102-2105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Caitlin Bellis 42444

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, The proposed PolyMet mine is a dangerous beginning to the degradation of lands and waterways we have fought hard to protect for decades. There is a precious amount of off-limits land in this country, and something we as Minnesotans are proud of maintaining. generation after generation. Understandably, there is profit to be made by mining. However, money has a finite existence, whereas the natural beauty and resources of the BWCA are infinite, so long as we protect them. Just because something is profitable, does not mean it is acceptable. For example, the sale of illegal drugs and prostitution. Also, we have the responsibility of protecting the headwaters of the Mississippi River, a water source that cuts through our country and supplies water to millions of Americans. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Caitlin Bellis 325 Runge Ln Saint Paul, MN 55118-2913 (612) 816-3671

Caitlin Kelley 54864

See attachment

57189

The PolyMet proposal represents unjust risks to our natural resources and the public health. Do not allow this to go through and threaten Minnesota's water quality and native and state resources. Mines like the mine proposed have never been operated without contamination of the environment. Please, oppose PolyMet's proposal. Caitlin Kelley 10155 150th Street East Nerstrand, MN 55053

58117

The Polymet/Northmet proposal should be rejected. The environmental costs of the mining project being proposed are not worth temporary jobs supporting a temporary industry. I believe Minnesota's natural woodlands and wetlands need to be protected and respected. A proposal that suggests cleanup of hazardous materials produced by the planned mine could take 500 years is not an acceptable proposal. Reject this proposal to protect our natural resources.

Caitlin Pedracine 41930

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Caitlin Pedracine Coon Rapids, Minnesota

Caleb DeGolier 47695

My name is Caleb DeGolier. I oppose the PolyMet mine. The possibility of an accident that could drastically affect Minnesota's wilderness and habitats of our wildlife is definitely not worth the relatively few number of jobs the mine will provide. Furthermore, there is no company that can be trusted to provide clean-up for contamination for hundreds of years. What if they file bankruptcy for instance. The tax payer and the environment will end up paying the price. Sincerely, Caleb

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Calee Malvasio 33555

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, It would like to believe that there are still some good people out there who are willing to do what is right and in the best interest of all that inhabit this planet. We need to find a balance between use of resources and raping the land. In a time when fresh water is becoming ever more scare we should be protecting the valuable resource we have in the Great Lakes Basin. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Calee Malvasio 414 McMillan St Marquette, MI 49855-4809

Cali Mellin 57192

The mining project would damage Minnesota's Boundary Waters, a very important part of the environment; due to this I do not support the mining effort. Calin Mellin 405 N Ray Street

Calista Small 42416

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I do not even think there is a choice: the PolyMet mine must be rejected. Thank you Sincerely, Ms Calista Small PO Box 200625 New Haven, CT 06520-0625

Calvin Cloutier 41901

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Calvin Cloutier Saint Paul, Minnesota

Camilla Illegible 58001

Keep the Boundary waters clean! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Camille George

40202

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

41910

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. As an engineering professor, I want you to know that we DO NOT possess the technology to do this mining safely. Please do not allow us to pollute this beautiful land. Sincerely, Dr Camille George 679 Lincoln Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-3529 (651) 962-5763

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Candace Keskitalo 39613

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Candace Keskitalo 4341 Channel Rd Spring Park, MN 55384-9734

Candace Smolich 44677

As a small business owner in Aurora, Minnesota I am in full support of the PolyMet project moving forward. The dramatic impact this mining operation will have on my business will be the difference in just existing and trying to keep my doors open to making updates and creating jobs. I look forward to creating a part time job(s) which will help our area economically overall. There are always students and others looking for part time employment and at this time I am unable to support a paying position. I believe once the PolyMet mining project begins this is something I will be able to offer. I see PolyMet as keeping our mining jobs alive on the Iron Range. And jobs with decent living wages which will keep our future families stay in our area and grow our population overall. Mining today is not the same mining created a hundred years ago. I have no doubt that the SDEIS gives regulators the information they need to issue PolyMet Mining permits to operate while protecting natural resources. I am ready to see PolyMet Mining be issued their mining permits. Candace Smolich 216 W 2nd Ave N Aurora MN 55705 218-229-3317
s, ^) s, . *) . ^ ^ » « . ^ * . , , , * have a great day. * , , . * ^ ^ » « . ^ . (, . (, . * * . ,) ^ .) . ^ ^ »

Candice C Pierce 54823

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Caree Gordon

37752

Dear Ms Fay, 3/1/2014 Dear Regulatory Agency: I reside in Duluth, MN and am very passionate about the pristine wilderness and quality of clean water/air we are so fortunate to enjoy in Northern Minnesota. I am deeply concerned about the possibility of PolyMet's copper-nickle sulfide mining project. One of the reasons so many people vacation in MN is to enjoy the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and the beautiful lakes in Northern MN. If PolyMet wants us to believe their mining won't pollute the rivers, lakes and water shelf, then they need to take inspectors to past mining sites they have constructed and actually demonstrate that the waters have not been polluted. I doubt very much if they can demonstrate this, as mining has always resulted in pollution. I have heard that before an inspection, the EPA trucks in water to put in the rivers/lakes to dilute the pollution level. Of course as an average citizen, I can neither confirm, nor prove this happens. It's really quite distressing to me to think that our lakes and rivers could become as polluted as others have become in the Southern US Many well established businesses in Northern MN that depend on clean water for fishing, as well as the survival of our wilderness and wildlife will be in jeopardy if PolyMet's mining initiative is allowed to begin destroying the land in Northern MN to extract minerals. People from all over the world visit the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, as it's one of the last wilderness areas on the planet. People right now so rely and need places like the Superior National Forest to get away, rest and recharge themselves. I hope people of MN are paying attention, because the Superior National Forest borders are in jeopardy of being changed. If a border is changed it is geographically a small change; however, the polluted and/or fresh water that runs underground cannot observe a man-made boundary. If our great lakes, rivers and drinking water are polluted, aware people will stop visiting MN for their summer vacations. I realize more jobs will be created by PolyMet, but at what coSt In 15-20 years when PolyMet has extracted all the copper and minerals from the Earth, they will pull out and leave a wasteland that will take 100s of yrs to rehab. This will create jobs too, but not the kind anyone wants. I don't even need to mention the health risks people will face when the water is polluted from the carcinogens that are used in the chemical buffers added to the waste before being dumped into the rivers (that eventually run off and enter Lake Superior (ie water shelf). It's too late for Northern WI, but not for MN. Perhaps we, our water and wilderness still have a chance to protect our natural resources. Please represent me and all of the other people who love the wilderness, clean lakes and rivers MN has to offer. I am absolutely sick at heart to think our precious watershed and land could become a receptacle for toxic waste due to sulfide mining. Glencore-Xstrata, you need to know we totally care about our environment, land and water in the beautiful State of Minnesota, and are prepared to defend it against the likes of corporate sulfide mining. Caree Gordon Caree Gordon 1201 Mississippi Ave Duluth, MN 55811

Carey Hartman

44361

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carey Hartman 3666 Roundtree Ct. Boulder, CO 80304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carey Hartman

44363

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Carey Hartman 3666 Roundtree Ct. Boulder, CO 80304

Carl and Jean Stueland

47082

We are property owners on White Iron Lake. This is our comment. Mining should be allowed only if the mining companies are held to the current Minnesota environmental laws and standards without giving them variances. Mining isn't a problem as long as the mining companies aren't given variances which weaken the laws and standards already in place. Carl and Jean Stueland ; 3081 Elm St; Lindstrom, Mn 55045 Sent from my iPhone

Carl Anderson

43112

Mining companies have shown again and again they are not responsible. They should not be allowed to have it. When something goes wrong, they'll pay the environmental fine and we'll be left with the mess and contamination for eons to come. Don't let them do it. Carl Anderson 2150 Mailand Road St Paul, MN 55119

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carl Grandstrand

36613

Mar 2, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. With many states now wondering where are we going to get water for our daily use I just think it would be wise to not allow a risky business adventure like this to come in and produce another Sudbury, Canada, mining area. I remember seeing pictures of that mined area and it was devastating to the country side with it's sulfuric acid waste. If it were up to me I would like keeping that area clean and pristine along with preserving the water that we do have in our state. We need to preserve it. I would take clean water over digging up a whole bunch of rock to gain a few tons of copper nickel ore that they might get, and then leave that area in mess of mining taillings. Don't let them destroy our beautiful state and its water supply. Sincerely, Carl Grandstrand 2411 Island View Dr Albert Lea, MN. 56007 Sincerely, Mr Carl Grandstrand 2411 Islandview Dr Albert Lea, MN 56007-1302 (507) 373-3340

Carl Helke

14590

mining is a lot more improved and more closely watched so start mining --Original Message-- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) To: carl4369 Sent: Wed, Feb 12, 2014 2:18 pm Subject: RE: Please protect Minnesota's future from centuries of treatment Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

14754

water can be protected and still mine safely now days let them mine --Original Message-- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) To: carl helke Sent: Wed, Feb 12, 2014 1:00 pm Subject: RE: Please protect Minnesota's future from centuries of treatment Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

14756

500 years from now who knows what will be up so lets get the mining going haven't seen pollution yet --Original Message-- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) To: carl helke Sent: Wed, Feb 12, 2014 12:59 pm Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carl Helke

14776

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carl Horstmeier

16275

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carl Johnson 16285

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Carl Kuhl 54682

See attachment

Carl Pilegaard 54167

As a shareholder of Allete I do NOT agree. AR Hodnik CEO of Allete is on the board of Pollymet a conflict of interest do not permit Polymet Mining. DO NOT SUPPORT!! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Carl Unger 42691

See attachment

Carl Wright 22053

-- Forwarded Message -- From: Carl Wright To: "NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2014 10:44 AM Subject: I support PolyMet Mining I am totally in favor of Polymet going forward with the Northmet project. They have done an excellent job on the SDEIS and will make a positive contribution to the state. The economics of this project could not be better; all will benefit. Carl R Wright FWG 19510 Ventura Blvd, Ste 211 Tarzana, CA. 91356 mailto:mcwright@FWG-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carl Wright 22060

I am totally in favor of Polymet going forward with the Northmet project. They have done an excellent job on the SDEIS and will make a positive contribution to the state. The economics of this project could not be better; all will benefit. Carl R Wright cmailto:cwright@FWG-com

Carla Arneson 9536

This is the comment (letter attached below) that I was going to read at the PolyMet SDEIS hearing at the RiverCentre in St Paul, but my name was not called. If you have kept the cards filled out by those wishing to speak, you will have the one that I filled out. I am sending my remarks as a comment now. Sincerely, Carla Arneson P.O. Box 336 Ely, MN. 55731

15740

See attachment

19520

My name is Carla Arneson, C-A-R-L-A, A-R-N-E-S-O-N, and it's PO Box 336 in Ely, Minnesota 55731. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources is lying to the public. PolyMet's NorthMet Project will require perpetual water treatment for its solution. This project, by law, must not be permitted.

42512

Perpetual PolyMet By Carla Arneson Minnesota cannot legally permit a mine that requires perpetual water treatment. In the Preliminary SDEIS, the consulting firm Environmental Resources Management (ERM) -picked by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and paid for by PolyMet- succinctly stated, "For purposes of this SDEIS, the WWTF (wastewater treatment facility) is considered a permanent facility and would be discharging treated effluent for perpetuity." (Duluth News Tribune) Perpetuity is perpetual. Released to the public on December 6, the final version of PolyMet's SDEIS is a fabrication, morphing from ERM's determination of water treatment for "perpetuity" to a watered-down version, "Modeling predicts that treatment activities will be a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site and a minimum of 500 years at the Plant Site. While long term, the time frames for water treatment are not necessarily perpetual;" then that weaker version morphed too, essentially disappeared. By the time the general public saw PolyMet's SDEIS there was no mention of perpetual. Vanished. A redacting magic act! And by then the public's right to know had been emasculated even further. "Minimum" had been cut, no longer delineating water treatment of "200 years at the mine site and 500 years at the plant site." Water treatment "for the very long term" became "long term." But one telling word survived, it concerned closure, and "transitioning from mechanical to non-mechanical/passive water treatment if or when proven effective." (SDEIS 3.1.1) IF. If, or when, proven effective! Sophistry. During the April 9, 2013 panel discussion on nonferrous mining at the University of Minnesota-Duluth, MDNR Commissioner Tom Landwehr was asked whether the MDNR could issue a permit if it received a plan that called for long-term treatment. "Landwehr replied that treatment would need to be passive (such as water being filtered through a wetland) or not active at closure." (Cook County News Herald) Minnesota Administrative Rules concerning closure and postclosure maintenance (Minnesota Rule 6132.3200) states: "The mining area shall be closed so that it is stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." Perpetual water treatment is not maintenance free. The permitting process for sulfide mining needs to stop in Minnesota. It is not only delusional in Minnesota's water rich environment, by law it is over. Carla Arneson P.O. Box 336 Ely, MN 55731

42925

42962

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carla Arneson 43989

<http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/news/2014/03/12/community-voices-it-s-whopper-polymet-s-myth-9938-tailings-seepage-collection> I wrote the above article and I am sending it as a separate SDEIS comment. Carla Arneson P.O. Box 336 Ely, Mn. 55731

44010

I apologize for any inconvenience. I realized that I did not have my full address on the comment I just sent. This one is corrected. Carla Arneson P.O. Box 336 Ely, MN 55731 POLYMET NORTHMET SDEIS COMMENT These were some of my Hardrock Comments (concerning exploratory drilling) to the US Forest Service; With a few alterations I am adding them to my PolyMet SDEIS Comments. I believe they are vital when considering proposed sulfide mining. An intensive, cumulative impact assessment needs to be done for both the Lake Superior and Kawishiwi Watersheds as part of PolyMet's SDEIS. Its NorthMet mine would be in the Duluth Complex; all very "foreseeable" sulfide mines to follow would also be in the Duluth Complex. I am respectfully requesting that the public be informed, as part of a cumulative impact study for PolyMet's NorthMet Project, of the total number of exploratory borings that exist in the Duluth Complex – including the approximate number of undocumented borings and the number of borings that will be added by further proposed exploration. I also ask that a thorough inspection be done of all borings, that all borings be sealed properly, and that all borings be sealed the full length not just 250 feet (change the law if necessary). And, that exploratory borings no longer be allowed to remain merely capped, not sealed, for ten years. Drilling is not only exploration for mining - it is turning our National Forest into a mining pincushion. No one knows what is happening within our aquifers. If the inherent belief is that it doesn't matter because it will be mined anyway that rationale needs to stop. There has been inadequate oversight of just what happens in our water rich environment at these drilling sites. If Minnesota does not properly supervise exploration, it will certainly not be able to control massive sulfide mining operations. Minnesota does not hold taconite operations to standards, instead issuing variances. The issue with the first photo below is not how it happened, but that it was left that way for weeks/months without anyone finding it or doing anything about it. I dropped a line with a weight to see if it was an open hole – I stopped at a hundred feet – when I pulled it up it was covered in stinking, oily slime. I have a collection of similar photos that show lack of oversight. The photos below give you the idea – uncapped boring hole, loose pipe that is oozing substance into the middle of a wetland, a broken off pipe that has a beer can stuck down it. I have found other borings that are loose and oozing, broken off, or just holes in the ground and I didn't get a chance to look at that many. There was also debris left at sites. Orange fencing was left around an open pool at one boring. There were borings too close to the lake (under the Shipstead-Newton-Nolan Act). One wetland drill pit was going to be buried the next day. It was covered with slime and smelled like something dead - the DNR said it should not have been that way and it would get soaked up and then buried. I can only assume that it was. If I hadn't said something it would have been buried, as is. It was interesting to note that right after I reported the detached pipe (above) the borings nearest to roads were all cemented around the base of each boring pipe – I question why they were not done that way in the first place - or if it is just for show and ineffectual. The pipes off the road - that you had to hike to - were not cemented. I have attached photos of some of the cemented borings and some of the borings that were not cemented. Oozing fluids from boring Beer can inside broken off boring pipe Newly cemented drill site . Newly cemented Cemented Not cemented Not cemented Not cemented These borings are conduits to our aquifers. The following is info from research on Picher, Oklahoma: "Beneath approximately 2,500 acres of this site lie around 300 miles of underground tunnels, and mo

44093

I wrote this. It is one of my comments. <http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/news/2014/03/12/community-voices-it-s-whopper-polymet-s-myth-9938-tailings-seepage-collection>
Carla Arneson P.O. Box 336 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carla Jentoft

40993

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes unsubstantiated claims. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells, nor explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands, nor examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of positive predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Carla Jentoft
Carla Jentoft 38 Varner Rd Grand Marais, MN 55604 763-784-8630

Carla Johnson

13351

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, As a proud Minnesotan, I carry on the tradition passed down from my ancestors to enjoy the outdoors, always leaving the environment in better condition than I found it. If I see garbage while kayaking, I pick it up. Polymets plans run counter to my values, and to the values of most Minnesotans. They want to strip away all the resources of our state, then leave stinking, polluted, lifeless pits in place of a vibrant, sustainable ecosystem. An animal will not defecate in their lair, so it makes sense that Vancouver based PolyMet; infamous "I want my life back: Tony Hayward, and Swiss Glencore are the financial backers. They will not drink the water, hike the scarred, barren of life land, or raise their children in a toxic waste dump, They are fine with doing it here in Minnesota, because they don't live here, and it is about profit and cutting corners, Why do I have concerns. For one, Tony Hayward is involved. He promised, he glossed over and mostly he lied day in and day out for each excruciating day of the Deep Water Horizon catastrophe, one of the worst man made disasters to hit this planet, Secondly PolyMet is going to pollute the water for 500 years. Enough said. Of course, PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. They will directly destruct the habitat and sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. This is what they do. They pollute the environment. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be SOL, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl can pack their meager bags and head nowhere, as this is their suitable home. They will be part of the "overburden" that is culled, carted away and dumped. I urge decision-makers, and those with common sense, morality and humanity to reject this disastrous proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Carla Johnson 3175 Cuneen Trl Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-4539 (651) 554-0807

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carla Norris-Raynbird

41561

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carlen Lovejoy

16153

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

carlie volbrecht

41870

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, carlie volbrecht quodbury, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carlos I Vasquez 54210

Please do not build a mine in the boundary waters. I feel that there is a high chance that the water will become polluted and that the poor innocent fish will die. I feel that if a mine is built by the boundary waters, by people with big names and lots of money and power will feel like it's okay to destroy beautiful places such as the boundary waters just for a quick buck. Please leave the Mother Nature and her home alone, thank you.

Carlsons 42936

Daniel L and Ann M Carlson 902 Timberline Lane Duluth, Minnesota 55811 Phone: 218-726-0325 Dear Department of Natural Resources: We are property owners on Clear Lake, along Highway 169 between Tower and Ely (GENE GAZELKA PLAT T OF EAGLES NEST LOT 11 BLOCK 1). We would like to express our strong support for the PolyMet project. We have lived in Minnesota all of our lives, being born on the Iron Range and currently living in Duluth. We chose to live and raise a family in northern Minnesota because we enjoy the environment of forests and lakes and felt that northern Minnesota was a great place to raise a family. The mining industry has provided a good living for our parents and generations of other northern Minnesotans. PolyMet will provide an opportunity for satisfying and productive careers for many young people who wish to be able to remain on the Iron Range and raise their families in northern Minnesota. Thank you for your consideration, Dan and Ann Carlson

Carly Coulson 11332

To the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I oppose the planned PolyMet Mining Inc Project because the location is within the Lake Superior watershed and puts our clean water resources at risk. Our clean water resources are more valuable in the long-term than the short-term economic benefits of the mine. A 500 year commitment to mine waste water treatment is far too great. No matter what regulations imposed and funds received from the mine company to meet this 500 year commitment, it is foolish to think we can plan for anything that far out. The 300 or so jobs created by the mine is such a small number in comparison to the high environmental and regulation risks that will go on for 500 years. 300 jobs can be created in so many other ways that are easier to create and have no environmental risks. We should be turning this conversation into one about jobs and other ways to create 300 jobs in the northland. The State of Minnesota should not trust that the PolyMet Mining Inc company will take its environmental responsibilities seriously. The project has in its planning, investors, and management team individuals with very poor records regarding environmental damage. Bill Williams is being charged with Crimes Against the Environment in Spain. Tony Hayward was responsible for the BP disaster in the gulf. These leaders should not be trusted to operate such a high risk mine in Minnesota. I am not opposed to mining in general. I have an iPhone and use many products with metals which I fully understand must be mined from somewhere. I would likely support a mine if it were in a safer location in Minnesota, did not impact Lake Superior, did not require 500 years of water treatment, and had mining leaders involved that had a clean record regarding environmental damage. Kind regards, Carly Coulson 10 west first street apt 105 Duluth, MN 55802

Carly Hawkinson 9474

Please see the attached letter for comments regarding the PolyMet sulfide mining in Minnesota. Thank you, ~ Carly Hawkinson

Carly Hicks 38760

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Miss Carly Hicks 2424 Crosby Rd Wayzata, MN 55391-2316

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carly Steel 42417

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Carly Steel 1809 Cross Draw Trl Leander, TX 78641-8681

Carly Wagner 38795

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Carly Wagner 2405 Lyndale Ave S Apt 2 Minneapolis, MN 55405-3336

Carlyle Conrad 42599

See attachment

42600

See attachment

Carmelita Banks 22766

I did not provide comments on the project or land exchange - Carmelita Banks (773)492-1979 On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 6:27 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carmen Oprea

40399

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Carmen Oprea 4106 Brooklyn Ave Cleveland, OH 44109 US

Carol A Sandstrom

57246

Quit destroying our water and our wetlands. By removing our minerals you are also causing all these sink holes. I don't want the pipeline from Canada coming down here. Let them keep their crap up there. Why in the Hell are we allowing B/P in our country. We kicked the Fricken British out of our country. Don't let them back in!! We don't want them.

Carol A. Overland

42955

All - Attached please find my comments on the PolyMet/NorthMet SDEIS. Thanks for the opportunity to Comment. Carol A. Overland - "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about the things that matter." Dr Martin Luther King, Jr. Carol A. Overland Attorney at Law Legalectric - Overland Law Office 1110 West Avenue Red Wing, MN 55066 612-227-8638 overland@legalelectric-org www.legalelectric-org www.nocapx2020-info www.not-so-great-northern-transmission-line-org -- This email is free from viruses and malware because avast. Antivirus protection is active. <http://www.avast-com>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol and Doug Damberg 43020

P.O. Box 121 Cold Bay, Alaska 99571 HYPERLINK "mailto:cd_damberg@hotmail-com"cd_damberg@hotmail-com (907) 947-8088 March 12, 2014 To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Ecological and Water Resources Division Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay I've been watching the debate about the PolyMet mining proposal in northern Minnesota for a long time. You'll see from my address that I can't vote for folks who are either for or against the proposals. My career choice in conservation and resource management has afforded me the opportunity to move around and live in many communities over the years, some of these that bear the scars of significant past or ongoing resource extraction efforts. Despite my wanderings, Minnesota will always be home for me. My family roots are in the iron range, I graduated from high school near St Paul, and I visit the family cabin near Ely for extended periods every year. In ten years or so I will be thinking of retiring from my current job. I've often thought of Ely as a place that I would settle. I strongly oppose the proposed mine based on two primary factors: first, and most importantly, the significant long-term environmental impacts that would undoubtedly result, and second, the associated social impacts that could significantly alter the fabric of significant parts of northern Minnesota, and not for the better. These impacts would be at the expense of our most treasured public resources, including surface and groundwater and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The trade-off for a limited number of jobs and short-term economic boom is simply not worth it and a disservice to not just to the State of Minnesota, and all those that love and treasure these resources around the country. The technology that mining interests claim will protect water quality is untested and unproven. It's just not possible that the proposed mine, particularly with the anticipated sulfide impacts, can be put in place without significant long-term environmental damage, particularly to surface and ground water quality. To say that a mine won't impact the areas water quality is like the smoking industry claiming that secondhand smoke doesn't have health impacts on folks sharing the same airspace. Both arguments have been made and both are equally irresponsible. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a national treasure. It is one of the most pristine and unique locations not just in the lower 48 states but anywhere in the world. There's nothing else like it and once it is trashed, it can't be repaired, fixed, or mitigated for. We're already seeing changes of unknown cause to the Kawishiwi drainage, where our family cabin is located, even without additional runoff and contaminants from a new mine. Over just the past few years alone wild rice stands in the North Kawishiwi have declined by over 50%. I lived for 7 years in the Rock Springs/Green River, Wyoming area and during that time experienced the take off of the latest natural gas boom. Anyone who has driven through western Wyoming can see first hand the impacts and scars of this crush of gas wells on the landscape. If you've lived there, like I have, you've seen the significant social impacts of transient workers – folks who work hard but play hard too and don't have a vested interest in the long term viability of the area. In Wyoming this is a boom and bust cycle, and it's not hard to see the complex social issues of both the boom, and the bust, on the local economy and lifestyle. On the sidelines, the predicted significant impacts to wintering mule deer, migrating antelope, soon-to-be-listed sage grouse, and other species is quietly occurring much to the chagrin of sportsman and wildlife viewers alike. The vast sea of sage plains surrounded by glorious mountains has become a tangle of roads, weeds, gas wells, drilling towers, and dust trails l

Carol Atchley-Mashuga 19826

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS plan. I believe that sulfide mining in Minnesota will have a damaging and permanent impact on the environment. Sincerely yours, Carol Atchley-Mashuga Carol Atchley-Mashuga 754 Havenview Court Mendota Heights, MN 55120

49558

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS plan. I believe that sulfide mining in Minnesota will have a damaging and permanent impact on the environment. Sincerely yours, Carol Atchley-Mashuga Carol Atchley-Mashuga 754 Havenview Court Mendota Heights, MN 55120

Carol Bogart 27021

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please do not issue permits that will allow this threat to one of the world's largest freshwater resources. Please also initiate testing of feeder rivers to Lake Erie such as the Sandusky River so as to ascertain the impacts of upriver discharges to the river. Example: the unremediated Tiffin, Ohio-owned landfill in Seneca County on CR 90- The landfill, active in the '50s and '60s, has never been issued an NPDES permit, yet extensive industrial toxic waste has been documented in leachate and aquifers that discharge into the Sandusky River. (See Ohio EPA file) Sincerely, Carol Bogart 760 Dorothy Adamo Ln Apt 921 West Sacramento, CA 95605-2167

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Bolin-Abrahamson

10743

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Get your priorities straight. We we cannot live without clean water-Just ask the people in West Virginia who are now left holding the bag of externalities of the company "Freedom (to pollute) Industries, which has now declared bankruptcy. CLEAN WATER, NOT COPPER, IS WHAT IS GOLD. We need clean water to survive. But corporations don't care, because they profit most when they create scarcity - and there is movement underway in Washington to encourage state and local municipalities to privatize water resources. CONNECT THE DOTS. How dare we pollute such a precious resource that is necessary for crop production. California, in the midst of a drought of historical proportions is stupidly proceeding with fracking, even though it requires millions of gallons of water and pollutes water at the same time. THIS IS SHEER AND UTTER MADNESS. WHEN WILL WE STOP BOWING TO CORPORATE INTERESTS AND INVEST IN THE SURVIVAL OF THE HUMAN RACE. WE CANNOT UNDO THE DESTRUCTION ONCE IT STARTS - NO COPPER / SULFIDE MINE HAS OPERATED THAT HAS NOT POLLUTED WATER. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." PolyMet has stated that it may not have insurance available to cover liabilities for environmental pollution; (and the pollution would be for OVER AT LEAST A 500 YEAR PERIOD). PolyMet has received significant financial backing from Glencore, a multi-billion dollar privately-held foreign company founded by pardoned US tax exile, Marc Rich, has been named by European NGOs as the "Worst Corporation of the Year" – globally; Glencore has cut jobs at the Mopani copper mine in Zambia, Africa when copper prices fluctuated, creating a boom and bust for the local economy. Observers report that infrastructure in the host community has been left derelict; Environmental problems at Glencore's Mopani mine have resulted in fish kills and drinking water contamination resulting in hospitalizations of 800 people; Glencore's Prodeco coal operation in Columbia was fined \$700,000 in 2009 for numerous environmental violations; its Cerrejon plant is notorious for displacing indigenous peoples and razing their villages; Glencore's South American operations have also been criticized for systematic firings of union workers and intimidation through the use of armed guards; Glencore's Metaleurop copper processing subsidiary removed corporate resources, leaving workers uncompensated and imposing on France a \$411 million unfunded pollution liability. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Carol Bolin-Abrahamson Carol Bolin-Abrahamson 5009 Quail Avenue North Crystal, MN 55429

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Brandenburg

47177

To the People of the DNR, As a teenager and young adult I canoed our beautiful Boundary Waters many times, and still have precious memories of that unique area – the crown jewel of our state. My brother Rick Brandenburg - a former US Forest Service Ranger in the BWCA - still lives with his family in the Superior National Forest. We are all committed to seeing the BWCA protected, in perpetuity. But as we know, the BWCA's future is now in grave jeopardy. Here is the short list associated with copper-sulfide mining operations - the ecological, social, and economic legacy that would impact our state for hundreds of years, if proposed mining operations go forward. That is a truly terrifying prospect, when Polymet, Northmet and their cohorts will be long gone by the year 2040 or so. I implore you to consider their existing track records: Water pollution Fresh water, the world's most precious natural resource, is now threatened in many places. · Loss of pristine wetlands and forest · Negative impact on three separate watersheds, and all wildlife in the area · Climate change due to carbon emissions · Serious health threats, including cancers and respiratory ailments · Mercury poisoning People who live in the Superior Basin are already exhibiting dangerous levels. · Loss of public lands · Devastating aesthetic impact · Loss of northeastern economy based on eco-tourism · Loss of wilderness jobs Thousands of people depend on ecology and wilderness for their wages (compared to an estimated 300 mining jobs that may last a couple of decades—and then where will the miners go when the last traces of mineral are gone.) · Superfund cleanup to the tune of billions of dollars for hundreds of years Once our priceless Boundary Waters area has been destroyed, it can never be restored. Please, PLEASE stop the mining companies before any more damage is done. Thank you for your consideration of this most urgent issue. Sincerely, Carol Brandenburg 2950 Dean Parkway #705 Minneapolis, MN 55416 612 353-4847 Executive Producer/Project Manager Conrad Productions [HYPERLINK "mailto:carolb@conradprod-com"](mailto:carolb@conradprod-com) carolb@conradprod-com

Carol Buelow

44052

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carol Buelow 4206 Doncaster Dr Madison, WI 53711

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Buelow

44054

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carol Buelow 4206 Doncaster Dr Madison, WI 53711

Carol Dallman

18278

My name is Carol Dallman and I live in St. Paul. I am here to oppose the mining because I do not believe that we have done enough to recycle and conserve resources and now is not the time to mine an area that has such potential for long-term environmental effects. We know where it is. If we choose not to mine now, we know where it is, it will still be there, if there is a way to do it in a more environmentally responsible way in the future. So I guess that will be it.

Carol Frechette

17039

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is an open-pit sulfide mine that will ruin ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever and must be rejected. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Recent DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated and confirms this. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on unsupported assumptions to minimize threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health.

- Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts wetlands and streamMs
- Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no scientific real support, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unproven assumptions, conceals facts, and won't allow the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or routine violations of water quality. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in long-term, potentially permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carol Frechette 1511 W 6t1h Ave Shakopee, MN 55379

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Frechette

50312

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is an open-pit sulfide mine that will ruin ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever and must be rejected. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Recent DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated and confirms this. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on unsupported assumptions to minimize threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. • Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts wetlands and streams • Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. • The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no scientific real support, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unproven assumptions, conceals facts, and won't allow the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or routine violations of water quality. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in long-term, potentially permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carol Frechette 1511 W 6t1h Ave Shakopee, MN 55379

Carol Gisselquist

17697

Feb 15, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. As someone who values life and the clean water that supports it, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Carol Gisselquist 29 W Governor Rd Hershey, PA 17033-1723

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Greenwood

40124

From: carolgreenwood2@gmail-com [carolgreenwood2@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:58 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Carol Greenwood 2615 38th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406-1751

carol haasl

7631

Greetings, Keith Haasl 215 W. 4th Ave N. Aurora, MN. 55705 1-218-750-2366 I attended the meeting at the DECC last week and would like to add. I heard a lot of talk about responsibility. Responsibility to our water, responsibility to the 9000+ acres of wet land, responsibility to the environment, responsibility to the next generation. No one address out responsibility to provide a way for us to acquire the metals we need in a responsible manner. We live in a world economy and will get the things we want. Is it ok to buy the copper from a source that has no environmental controls or concerns as we do. Are we responsible for the damage that happens in another part of the world. I believe that you cant have it both ways, if we choose to use the things PolyMet will provide we need to find a way to let them produce them, or continue to buy them from questionable sources. I heard more about the study, most opponents stated that it was incomplete or incompetent I don't think either. I believe that it was responsibility prepared by people that have a genuine concern about this matter. Thank You

Carol Hedberg

4185

Minnesota's greatest assets are our natural resources: ground and surface water, soils, and, yes, metal deposits. But water is what we are known for and have the most of, and the need for that will increase the most in the coming decades. There will always be a need for copper and nickel, too. Its value will only increase over time. Minnesota needs to focus on - and invest in - our pristine spaces and relatively unpolluted fresh water as our biggest asset. Watch the value of a protected Minnesota soar. Don't vote to lose it forever for a very-short-term gain that really helps only a very few. There is no rush. Keep our copper, nickel, forests and waters for the future. In even 25 years, they will be ten times as valuable as they are today. Sincerely, Carol Lewis Hedberg 6150 St Croix Ave N, #312 Golden Valley, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Iwata

45040

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: As a citizen of Minnesota who is concerned about environmental safety hazards, I ask that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected as inadequate and that a permit not be granted to them for mining. These are the reasons for my position: 1- Copper and nickel mining (from sulfide ores) is not like other mining but far more polluting. Sulfide Mining—everywhere it's been done in the world—has caused serious pollution, even in dry environments like the American WeSt Northern Minnesota is wetlands (the Hundred Mile Swamp) where pollution spreads even more easily. 2- Polymet's first Environmental Impact Statement was in 2010; the US Pollution Control Agency gave it the lowest possible failing grade. (Only 0-3% of projects are graded this low.) This revised draft (SDEIS) is still very inadequate and makes optimistic promises based on speculation: no consideration of alternate methods (like underground mine, putting liners under the waste dumps), no guarantees of who pays for even routine monitoring/treatment after mine closes—and no consideration of spills, etc 3-The computer model for treating wastes and handling pollution is based on poor data, not even good science: sparse water data from dry years. (MN has had 4 “100-year” floods in the last 9 years.) 4-Knowledge about this bad data has been available to the DNR for years. Native scientists (from the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission) have been trying to draw it to their attention, and have very different data. 5-PolyMet says they will guarantee the water treatment for “however long it takes.” But PolyMet is a shell company. Their chief investor, Glencoe Xstrata, is not on the hook for any guarantees. Glencore Xstrata, is a Swiss mega company with a truly terrible environmental record that is international in scope. 6- “However long it takes”: PolyMet's own EIS is working with figures like 200 and 500 years. It is completely unrealistic to expect that PolyMet or their owning company will be around that long with the resources to clean up environmental waste. 7-Taxpayers will end up paying for environmental damage. The single biggest Superfund costs have been cleaning up sulfide mining. 8- The Iron Range needs jobs. But these mining jobs come at too high a coSt There are other jobs that depend on a clean natural environment, such as for tourism, hunting, fishing etc these jobs would be loSt 9-Pollution will affect everyone. Mineworkers. Babies. People who drink water. Lynx and moose and bears. Wild rice. Fish. Therefore—people who rely on the tourism economy. The waters at risk include the Partridge Cree and the Embarrass River. The St Louis River basin, to Duluth and Lake Superior. (Already 1 in 10 babies born in St Louis River mouth and the North Shore has an unacceptable level of mercury.) Next to be affected—perhaps from Polymet, for sure from the next projects—the Boundary Waters. 10- PolyMet is just the first of the companies that will be mining in this environment. If they are granted a permit, there are numerous other copper-nickel projects targeting the BWCA watershed) that are waiting for the outcome of this process. Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, Carol Iwata Carol Iwata PO Box 395 Afton, MN 55001

Carol L Weber

9655

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: PLEASE reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. The PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. Recent findings from the Department of Natural Resources' documents show that the base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. The SDEIS and the sulfide mine project are based on seriously flawed, unrealistic and inconsistent assumptions, not accurate science. PolyMet is using these improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats and impact of sulfide wastes on drinking water, surface water and, ultimately, the health of all Life that would be touched by this waste. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts and does not allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS. This experiment would violate water quality standards for generations to come, bringing unwanted and unnecessary harm to Minnesota. Sincerely yours, Carol L Weber 5223 Silver Maple Circle Minnetonka, MN 55343

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol L Weber

18526

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: PLEASE reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. The PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. Recent findings from the Department of Natural Resources' documents show that the base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. The SDEIS and the sulfide mine project are based on seriously flawed, unrealistic and inconsistent assumptions, not accurate science. PolyMet is using these improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats and impact of sulfide wastes on drinking water, surface water and, ultimately, the health of all Life that would be touched by this waste. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts and does not allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS. This experiment would violate water quality standards for generations to come, bringing unwanted and unnecessary harm to Minnesota. Sincerely yours, Carol L Weber 5223 Silver Maple Circle Minnetonka, MN 55343

50602

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: PLEASE reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. The PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. Recent findings from the Department of Natural Resources' documents show that the base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. The SDEIS and the sulfide mine project are based on seriously flawed, unrealistic and inconsistent assumptions, not accurate science. PolyMet is using these improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats and impact of sulfide wastes on drinking water, surface water and, ultimately, the health of all Life that would be touched by this waste. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts and does not allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS. This experiment would violate water quality standards for generations to come, bringing unwanted and unnecessary harm to Minnesota. Sincerely yours, Carol L Weber 5223 Silver Maple Circle Minnetonka, MN 55343

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Mason Sherrill 58059

Our natural resources are the most important aspect of our lives - NOT money - not politics - not business run in this manner - We can live w/o money, politics, water - we CANNOT live w/o our water, creatures, air, land - STOP THIS MINE! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Carol Michealson 42869

See attachment

Carol Mockovak 39975

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Carol Mockovak 4300 W. River Parkway #407 Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Neumann

39621

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There are not only too many "unknowns", there are way too many "cannot take backs". We cannot take back the human errors that are inevitable. We cannot undo, either financially nor physically, the death of fish, the extensive pollution of our water (from one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world), nor can we unpollute the air. The toxic waste from this antiquated idea should not proceed. We are the caretakers of all of these resources. If a better way cannot be found, this mine proposal should not go forwaRd We do not own the earth, we merely caretake the earth. So do your job as a caretaker. Our communities in the great north country of Minnesota should not perish at the hands of greed, backwards thinking in the mining industry, or a bad decision by our lawmakers. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Carol Neumann 694 Oakdale Ave Saint Paul, MN 55107-3024

48821

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There are not only too many "unknowns", there are way too many "cannot take backs". We cannot take back the human errors that are inevitable. We cannot undo, either financially nor physically, the death of fish, the extensive pollution of our water (from one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world), nor can we unpollute the air. The toxic waste from this antiquated idea should not proceed. We are the caretakers of all of these resources. If a better way cannot be found, this mine proposal should not go forwaRd We do not own the earth, we merely caretake the earth. So do your job as a caretaker. Our communities in the great north country of Minnesota should not perish at the hands of greed, backwards thinking in the mining industry, or a bad decision by our lawmakers. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Carol Neumann 694 Oakdale Ave Saint Paul, MN 55107-3024

Carol Reamer

24316

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. No pollution, by water or air, should be permitted to infiltrate Minnesota wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As a Minnesota resident I demand ZERO pollution, zero water runoff and zero air pollution be proven beyond doubt and if not proven this mining activity must be rejected by the State and Federal agencies. No pollution of any kind is acceptable in this sensitive region of the State. As a State resident I value our natural resources above corporate profits. If they can not provide PROOF of Zero pollution, both now and future, from their project it must be rejected. The requirement of providing proof and reimbursement of all governmental cost to verify their proof is valid must be 100% their responsibility. Minnesotan's can not afford to damage our waters or absorb the risk of any future costs for loss of resource or cleanup of pollution, no mater how insignificant it may appear now. Burden of proof for zero pollution and zero future risk to Minnesota must be provided. Failure of either zero threshold requires project rejection. Businesses come and go. States can not afford to participate in corporate risks. ALL COST and Elimination of ALL RISK must be paid for by the business. Additionally, the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Carol Reamer 4159 Primrose Path Saint Paul, MN 55127-6141 (612) 720-2922

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Reschke

42931

comments from: Carol Reschke 869 Shoreview Heights Road Two Harbors, MN 55616 HYPERLINK "mailto:cr3@frontiernet-net"cr3@frontiernet-net 13 March 2014 to: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: I have reviewed portions of the SDEIS for the NorthMet Project proposed by PolyMet Mining, Inc. I have three major concerns about the adequacy of the SDEIS: 1) inadequate discussion of cumulative effects of all proposed sulfide mining projects located in northern Minnesota; 2) inadequate resolution of major differences of opinion (MDOs) expressed by cooperating tribal agencies; and 3) inadequate models and data for addressing the effects of sulfates on growth of wild rice in light of recent MPCA findings. I previously mentioned my first two concerns in comments on the DEIS that I sent on February 3, 2010 to Stuart Arkley, EIS project manager at MNDNR, and to Jon K. Ahlness at USACE. I will reiterate those comments here in hopes that they will be taken more seriously by the co-lead agencies (MNDNR, USACE, and USFS). I am a resident of Lake County, Minnesota and I live on property I own near the city of Two Harbors. These comments reflect my professional opinion. I have 30 years experience as a professional plant community ecologist; and my current research is related to restoration of fish and wildlife habitats within the St Louis River Area of Concern (AOC) in Duluth, Minnesota and Superior, Wisconsin. 1) My first concern is that I have found no suggestion or discussion that a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) may be needed for sulfide mining projects in northern Minnesota. PolyMet's NorthMet Project is anticipated to be the first of several proposals for sulfide mining of precious metals in northern Minnesota. The SDEIS lists eleven projects they consider "Speculative Actions" in section 6-2-2-1-21 that "have not been mapped or considered in the cumulative analysis". I understand that there are numerous mining exploration permits to search for precious metals in the Duluth Complex rocks. I understand that if ore containing small percentages of precious metals is found, mines would be proposed which would presumably utilize similar sulfide mining processes to extract precious metals from the rocks. I suggest that a GEIS for sulfide mining on the Iron Range would be an appropriate document for addressing cumulative impacts of multiple mining projects currently being planned. A Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) is a specific form of environmental review that can be used to study certain types of projects not adequately reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The authorization for conducting alternative forms of environmental review, such as a GEIS, is found in Minnesota's Environmental Policy Act, MS 116D.04, Subd. 4a. Specific criteria for determining the need for a GEIS and the unit of government most appropriate to oversee its preparation, and the general process and content of a GEIS are identified in Minnesota Rules, part 4410-3800-Although only the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) is authorized to order a GEIS, any person or government body may request the EQB to consider the preparation of a GEIS. I suggest that MNDNR, USACE, and USFS ought to be requesting the EQB to order a GEIS for sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. According to Minnesota Rules, part 4410-3800, a GEIS may be ordered by the EQB to study types of projects that are not adequately reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Subpart 5 lists twelve criteria to be considered in determination of the need for a GEIS. I think at least nine of the twelve criteria are relevant to sulfide mining projects in northern Minnesota. Those criteria are listed below: A. if the review of a type of action can be better accomplished by a generic EIS than by project specific review;

Carol Sayres

44690

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. nds as well as due to air and water pollution. The PolyMet SDEIS is an inadequate assessment of human health impacts and the PolyMet sulfide mine and mine wastes proposal poses an unacceptable risk to the health of fetuses, infants, children and adults in Minnesota. Please reject both the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet mine. Very truly yours, Carol Sayres 23783 Clarissa Haven Dr Henning, MN 56551

Carol Schafer

26584

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have grave concerns about the PolyMet project of an open pit sulfide mine on Nat'l Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. This proposed project has potential impacts on our Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Carol Schafer 19227 N 29th Pl Phoenix, AZ 85050-2533

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carol Selmason 57216

Until they can prove otherwise, sulfide mining is a destructive process. The permanent rape of our environment is not worth the profit of a few (Big Business). We all need jobs, but not at such a price. Let them prove they can mine safely, until then sulfide mining has no business in Minnesota. Carol Selmason 924 South 72nd Ave West Duluth, MN 55807

Carol Smith 52228

Hello, This is a request for the powers that be to deny Polymet Mining and all companies like the opportunity to mine nickel and other various metals from the Mesabi Iron Range. The location of the anticipated mining is too close to the BWCA, Superior National Forest, and other natural wilderness. The inevitable water pollution, the loss of the natural land, the mitigation of wildlife and fauna is too high a price to pay for any benefit from mining - including jobs the opposition argues for. Once the land is compromised, it is lost forever. As stewards of nature, please protect this region from this invasive action as devastating as any war may be. Please do not allow the exchange of land for Polymet, do not allow the reopening of the shuttered processing plants. Thank you. Carol Anne Smith 11093 Branching Horn Eden Prairie, MN 55347

Carol Vopatek 41865

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Carol Vopatek Minneapolis, Minnesota

Carol Wahl 42965

Please see attached letter. THIS IS NOT A FORM LETTER.

Carol weber 47291

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Again I am asking you to say "No" to the proposed PolyMet mine. The risks of sulfide mining are unacceptable as they place the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area and the Great Lakes in serious jeopardy. We cannot afford to lose the multifaceted Life that these sources hold. Sincerely, Ms Carol weber 5223 Silver Maple Cir Minnetonka, MN 55343-4308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

carole blaska 11889

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, carole blaska 589 rice creek terrace fridley, MN 55432

Carole Carlson-Bursch 57228

The project should move ahead.Carole Carlson-BurschBabbitt, MN 55706

Carole M Megarry 54739

See attachment

Carole Megarry 47795

From: Carole Megarry [mailto:carole.megarry@gmail-com] Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:08 AM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: Public Comment on Polymet Mine Mr Periman: I am directing to you this copy of my comment mailed today to Lisa Fay of Minnesota DNR based on a auto reply from Mr Dabney indicating that he has retired. If you are not the individual in the US Forest Service who is to receive these comments, please let me know where I should direct it. Thank you. Carole M. Megarry

carole nelson 9458

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carole Rust

39052

---Original Message--- From: Larry-Carole-Rust@msn-com [mailto:Larry-Carole-Rust@msn-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 1:13 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Carole Rust 1826 Alameda St Saint Paul, MN 55113-6532

Carole Zanardi

42704

See attachment

44365

I am not a chemist, however could there be a positive use for the sulfide acid that might be created. Could it some how be harvested and used in industry or in consumer products so that it would be reclaimed from the start instead of being wasted. Kind of like motor oil is a waste product of making gasoline. Just a thought. Carole Zanardi 1916 W. Kent Road Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Caroline Roetzel

43039

Members of my church's Caring for Creation Committee at Macalester-Plymouth United Church have discussed the proposal for a large scale copper-nickel sulfide mine near the BWCA, to be conducted by PolyMet. We have shared our concerns about the long-term and destructive impacts on this special area of Minnesota. We are concerned about: 1. The major loss of wetlands, primarily bogs, that cannot be replaced. The SEIS already makes it clear that wetland "restorations" will not take place in the Lake Superior watershed and are highly unlikely to replace bogs. The wetlands at the site have been rated as "having high wetland quality." How can they possibly be "replaced?" 2. Predictions of chemical pollution, not just from sulfate and its acceleration of toxic mercury conversions, but also heavy metals like nickel and aluminum, that kills fish. 3. The long term need to clean up water from pollutants, possibly for 200 years. How can that be assured, especially with more mines ready to ask for permits in that area? 4. The questionable suggestion that a company, that plans to mine the proposed site for 20 years, could possibly provide "financial assurance" to cover the expensive costs of water treatment for 200 years or more into the future. And can such treatment truly control all the sorts of pollutants that will come from the mine site? The SEIS predicts the company will excavate 307 million tons of bedrock in 20 years, at 70,000 tons per day. 5. We are concerned that a lot of the proposed PolyMet site area has been designated by MN DNR as "Sites of High Biodiversity Significance" and support eleven state-listed species of plants. Destruction of such an area cannot be rectified, nor justified. We urge our government officials to take courage and SAY NO to this mine and to others waiting in the cue for permits. There are other ways to secure jobs in this fragile and unique area of Minnesota than this. One suggestion is to create metal recycling facilities and hire people to work on recovering the metals we need. Please reject the PolyMet mine. It's a short term venture with long term harm to MN.

Carolyn Blaso

40274

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Carolyn Blaso 3301 Sardis Bend Drive Buford, GA 30519 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carolyn Chalmers

39258

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential permanent destructive impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health. I also have grave concerns about the project's delivery on the economic benefits it promises. I have grave concerns about relying on DNR to monitor. DNR monitoring resources are not guaranteed and its independence from the companies' influence not assured. DNR has squandered resources fighting an Ely researcher who has collared a dozen bears-but seems to have no problem saying "yes, yes, yes.." to mining permits. The permit should require the companies to pay for independent experts to do monitoring if DNR's resources and independence fail the test I have grave concerns about relying on the slow judicial process to remedy pollution when it is discovered. There needs to be agreement on an expedited process so that pollution is stopped immediately. Carolyn Chalmers 4148 Edmund Blvd Mpls, MN 55406 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Carolyn Chalmers 4148 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406-3646 (612) 722-9116

48663

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential permanent destructive impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health. I also have grave concerns about the project's delivery on the economic benefits it promises. I have grave concerns about relying on DNR to monitor. DNR monitoring resources are not guaranteed and its independence from the companies' influence not assured. DNR has squandered resources fighting an Ely researcher who has collared a dozen bears-but seems to have no problem saying "yes, yes, yes.." to mining permits. The permit should require the companies to pay for independent experts to do monitoring if DNR's resources and independence fail the test I have grave concerns about relying on the slow judicial process to remedy pollution when it is discovered. There needs to be agreement on an expedited process so that pollution is stopped immediately. Carolyn Chalmers 4148 Edmund Blvd Mpls, MN 55406 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Carolyn Chalmers 4148 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406-3646 (612) 722-9116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carolyn Clements

18961

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Carolyn C Carolyn Clements 601 Sunset Dr Sunset Dr Minnetonka, MN 55305

Carolyn Crooke

6067

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, As a Minnesota resident, I am HORRIFIED by Polymet's proposed NorthMet mining project. And really mad. We're seriously going to let them dig massive holes in the ground, destroy wide swaths of wetland, and count on them to treat the water for hundreds of years after. Let them create another Superfund site. This is insane. I get that we need jobs but not at the cost of unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts. We've lost enough wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. Can we not sacrifice our environment to line people's pockets. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. And the mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. Everybody knows the land exchange is just a sham and won't be in the public interest. The SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Carolyn Crooke 3657 Grand Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409 US

Carolyn Merrill

54765

See attachment

Carolyn Porter

42816

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carolyn Wessels

40093

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carolyn Will

15989

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

carriageguy@yahoo.com

46294

I am opposed to copper mining in Minnesota. It is nearly impossible to obtain guarantees sufficient to protect future generations from the damage and expense of the resulting pollution. Requiring deposits sufficient to forestall future environmental damage will probably scare investors away. Either way we win. If they want to dance they must pay the fiddler. Scare them away, or make them pay the exorbitant sums necessary to protect our land and non-mining livelihoods. [HYPERLINK "https://overview.mail.yahoo.com/mobile/..src=Android"](https://overview.mail.yahoo.com/mobile/..src=Android)Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Carrie Evans

44282

The metals to be mined by Polymet are an integral part of modern living. There is no denying that the demand for these metals will require finding and extracting them for years to come. I believe that Polymet has shown that they will mine the metals in a way that is the most environmentally safe for air, water and land. Foreign production of these metals will not meet the strict environmental codes and practices that are required by Polymet. If we do not allow Polymet to mine the metals it will be done by foreign suppliers in which case there will be a greater chance of global environmental impact. By allowing Polmet to extract the metals, that are critical in so many key areas of our everyday life, I feel that not only will the environment be protected to a greater extent but it will also benefit the state of MN economically. We again must realize the demand for the metals worldwide. Wouldn't it be beneficial to MN to have the creation of jobs and income at the same time as demanding strict environmental safeguards. If we do not allow Polymet to mine in MN we lose economically and environmentally. Carrie Evans 19996 Rendova St Ne Cedar, MN 55011

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carrie Olson

39010

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carrie Reay

38784

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

carrie shanahan

40956

I am opposed to this project- when I moved to Minnesota 9 years ago, one of the factors that drew me in was the beautiful unspoiled areas within the area, particularly up north. It's a treasure we should protect. 500 years to clean up the toxic mess this would leave behind. Too much risk. I don't trust these people to clean up ANY mess they make. Please protect our natural resources and the people of Minnesota, as it was my understanding was your job. Thank you, Carrie Shanahan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Carstens Smiht

41911

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Carstens Smiht Minneapolis, Minnesota

Cary Anderson

9345

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cary Anderson 3848 45th ave s Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cary Anderson

18812

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cary Anderson 3848 45th ave s Minneapolis, MN 55406

46079

Cary Anderson 3848 45th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406 We have an amazingly beautiful state and very unique area in all the world that is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It is the most visited wilderness in the United States. It is a vast network of watersheds - ground water and lakes, ultimately, Lake Superior and beyond. All Minnesotans benefit from it. A multinational resource extractor with no allegiance to the United States, much less Minnesota, wants to dig gigantic pits there, to take out copper and other metals from rock, ship it out of the country, and leave sulfuric acid in it's place, fully expecting and admitting pollution cleanup will be necessary for 200 years in the surrounding area, and 500 years on the site. WHAT What in hell's name are you considering here. Are you being paid off. I really believe you must be. Polymet is basically owned by Glencore Xtrata. They are famous for private profit and public pollution. They buy mining rights in the first years of production, then sell to Chinese companies. They also have a terrible record of labor rights violations. These jobs they promise do not take that into account, nor account for how long they would even be there, or who takes care of workers when they get illnesses from the mine. There has never been a sulfide mine anywhere that has not polluted. I don't want large chunks of watershed in northern MN to be their quick profit and my sulfuric acid waste dump. Minnesotans will be paying for the clean up in so many more ways than just \$\$ for as long as we are living and our descendents. How much fresh water is pumped up from the ground to be used in the mining process. Lots. We don't have any to spare. We don't get the product from the mine. It is shipped overseas. Copper mining is so much different than the traditional iron mining that has been happening in MN. The difference is sulfuric acid. Fewer than 20% of computers are recycled in the US Why mine when we can recycle. Because Glencore Xtrata wants gobs of \$\$\$. Recycle computers by choosing e-Steward certified recyclers

Cary Gilbert

54121

I do not support PolyMet. Thanks to MN Power for paying for this postage. NO POLYMET! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Casandra Ladas 17273

Feb 17, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Dear Lisa Fay, I sincerely urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. The water will take hundreds of years to clean itself if we mine sulfur. Lake Superior is the prominent feature of Minnesota and almost every Minnesotan goes up to visit it. It's one of the only places that has been untouched by humans for years and the beauty which has grown as a result of that is marvellous. Please don't take away something we value and can never get back. I want to be able to take my children to her glistening lakes and it's completely unfair of you to take that opportunity away from everyone so that there can be a profit for some billion dollar company. Support our state by not putting out all the local boundary waters camps and business' as well as the beauty where we can't find anywhere else in our state. Don't destroy what is not yours. Sincerely Casandra Ladas Roseville Minnesota 55113 Sincerely, Ms Casandra Ladas 1766 Alta Vista Dr Roseville, MN 55113-6553

Casey Betts 42588

See attachment

Casey Deschampe 41981

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Casey Deschampe Grand Marais, Minnesota

Casey Jo Remy 38889

Mar 11, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mrs Casey Jo Remy 1472 Days Creek Rd Days Creek, OR 97429

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Casey Lebens 9484

DNR, These facts have been brought to my attention recently: Glencore Xstrata, the primary owner of PolyMet, which [reportedly] will buy the rest of PolyMet once all the permits are in place for the copper mine in northern MN. So, who is Glencore Xstrata. Glencore Xstrata is a Swiss-based firm known for its ruthlessness. It is the fourth-largest mining company in the world. It controls 50 percent of the world's copper through its ownership of more than 100 mines around the world, and its commodities trading operations. Glencore Xstrata has run up a long list of labor and environmental abuses, including 58 mining fatalities between 2008 and 2010, over twice the number reported by any other mining company over that period. Just in 2012, their environmental and labor record includes dumping raw acid in waterways in the Congo, failure to provide a vapor barrier to keep an acid mist from descending on 3,000 people in Zambia, utilizing child labor as young as 10 years old in mines in Congo, and causing environmental damage at its McArthur River mine in Australia. These facts are alarming and scary. I would like to know what I can do in order to convince the public to not support this mine. I am scared the boundary waters will be an unsafe place to bring my children when they grow up. Thank you for your time, Casey Lebens

Casey Stepien 18355

I would like to give my time.

cass kane 6716

I read a lot about sulfide surface water contamination. What is Polymets plan 2 keep sulfide pollution from the groundwater table. I live in the country and get potable water from a drilled well and am concerned about the possibility of this event. Pat Kane 1337 Shoreview Rd Two Harbors, Mn. 55616

Cat Griffith 41877

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Cat Griffith minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cat Thompson

19024

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Cat Thompson PO Box 7851, St Paul, MN St Paul, MN 55107 612 616-6298

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cat Thompson

19025

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Cat Thompson PO Box 7851, St Paul, MN St Paul, MN 55107 612 616-6298

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cat Thompson

40916

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Catherine Anderson

15249

Hi, I have been reading the pros and cons regarding the proposed copper/nickel mining operation being considered. I am opposed to this mining proposal, as I believe that environmental consequences outweigh the benefits. I firmly believe that we need to be good stewards of our natural resources, and one of the most precious of these resources is clean water. The stakes are just too high to gamble with our water supply, even if the chances are small of it being contaminated for possibly hundreds of years into the future. Our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, etc, will thank us for having the wisdom to do what is right rather than bow to the pressure of the almighty dollar. I realize the economy is suffering, but why risk an already fragile economy with the added burden of environmental disaster. Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion. Sincerely, Cathy Anderson 949 Oakcrest Dr Sauk Rapids, MN 56379

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catherine Apostle

39889

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Catherine Apostle 6808 Gleason Rd Edina, MN 55439-1601 (952) 941-0642

Catherine Coult

32643

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. And, as time slips by, as we all know, the challenges will become even greater. With our worldwide population on the rise and the shrinking of habitable land resulting from global warming, we must fight to maintain not only our own health but the increasing threat to the wonderful wild animals that increasingly must struggle simply to stay alive. Just because we humans have the big brains and prehensile thumbs that have enabled us to take charge of the world, we have done so to the disadvantage of our fellow beings, be they four-legged, six-legged, or leg-less, like the whales and snails and snakes, and on and on. Thank you. Sincerely, Catherine Coult 4300 W River Pkwy Apt 602 Minneapolis, MN 55406-3682 (612) 721-1829

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catherine Griffith

16070

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catherine Harrison

16279

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

41604

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Catherine Harrison 27242 Crooked River Rd Pine City, MN 55063-4947

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catherine Hegg 36439

I understand the economic considerations in wanting to approve this project, but I think past history should teach us that once pollution occurs, it is extremely difficult and costly to clean it up - and the pollution could become an issue long after PolyMet ceases to exist as a company. Of course, then you and I would not be here either, so we can leave the mess to a new generation. we are still dealing with other mining pollution and significant pollution by 3M that no one even thought about. There are also known and unknown health issues to consider. Do I have an answer. - No. But I cannot help but think the costs to the environment outweigh the gains to the current economy.
Catherine Hegg

Catherine Johnson-Thomson 39994

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Catherine Johnson-Thomson 676 Arcadia Dr Mendota Heights, MN 55118-1802 (651) 552-0234

Catherine Nicholl 39330

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Nothing is more precious than our water resources. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Catherine Nicholl 4300 W River Pkwy Apt 177 Minneapolis, MN 55406-3677 (612) 331-5565

Catherine Nicholson 58132

We do need more jobs, but we need clean jobs that don't create a long term cost. Soon we could have jobs mining the pure clean fresh Lake Superior water/ but not if we have contaminated it by allowing acid based mining in an upstream watershed. What irks me is that this company is not even an American company. They'll make their money and the few jobs they'll provide Minnesotans and then leave and go bankrupt, leaving us with the mess. We are being mined like we are on the frontier, Canada's frontier. We aren't a third world country welcoming resource harvesting mining jobs as our only income. But that's what we are doing in this case. Thank you. I do not support the proposal.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catherine Reece 10806

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Catherine Reece 8155 Cameo Cir Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-4518

Catherine Wright 42702

See attachment

Catherine Yamoor 42808

See attachment

Catherine Zimmer 42978

Dear Ms Fay, Please find the above referenced comments attached. Sincerely, Very truly yours, Catherine Zimmer, MS, BSMT Zimmer Environmental Improvement, LLC St Paul, MN Ph: 651-645-7509 [HYPERLINK "mailto:zenllc@usfamily-net"](mailto:zenllc@usfamily-net)zenllc@usfamily-net

Cathi Koenig 39696

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. My family spent some time in this region in October and we were told that they have some of the purest water in the country. As a Minnesota resident, I want to retain my RIGHT to experience this pristine environment. I also want my children and grandchildren to do this. This is our treasure, and I fear development will destroy it. Let's follow Wisconsin. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Cathi Koenig 902 10th Ave S Moorhead, MN 56560-3549

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy Botha

40332

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Cathy Botha 13 Hilary Street, Gillview Johannesburg, 1450 ZA

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy Curtis

16041

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy Finley

16231

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy Gagliardi

9587

Hello. I urge everyone to please look into "Flambeau Mine Exposed"(FMC) that was in operation back in the 90's (Rusk Co., Wisconsin), before making a final decision on PolyMet Mining here in MN. PolyMet's website boasts about FMC's successful mining project although years after the mining was completed and the plant shut down, not only did high levels of toxins (most notably manganese) show up in groundwater, but also a tributary/stream of the Flambeau River was polluted with copper and zinc toxicity. As of 2012, the WI DNR has recommended to the Environmental Protection Agency(EPA) that the stream be listed as "impaired". I've included the boastful comment from PolyMet Mining's website below after talking with a representative from PolyMet at the meeting last night about this success slogan, I'm guessing this will be disappearing soon. By meeting Minnesota's strict environmental standards, we have the opportunity to mine metals we use every day without harming our air and water quality. In fact, it's been done before at HYPERLINK "<http://www.flambeaumine.com/>"Flambeau Mine. In its four-year life, the mine, located in Rusk County, Wis., successfully produced essential metals while creating local jobs, benefiting the economy and most importantly, protecting the surrounding environment. Flambeau Mining Company now operates under the tagline "Promises Kept." "Promises Kept" is far from the truth - and even after lawsuits were filed back in 2011, FMC appealed the decision and the US Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit proceeded to let the mining company "off the hook" in Oct. 2013- The appellate court did not dispute the district court's finding that FMC had violated the Clean Water Act on at least 11 counts. But, what's truly disturbing is that groundwater pollution at mine sites in WI has been legalized by the WI DNR and State Legislature (see NR 182-075 - WI administration code), so even the Clean Water Act did not protect the streams around the Flambeau River, nor the people and wildlife near the Ladysmith community. While it is now known, that Wisconsin actually "shields" mining company's from ever being prosecuted proves that this loop-hole also allows the mining industry to avoid cleanup and absolutely nothing has been done to clean up the toxins surrounding the Flambeau Mine. If cleanup ever does happen now, it will most likely be at the WI tax payer's expense. I urge the powers-that-be in Minnesota to take a long, hard look at what toxins could possibly be in our Lake Superior someday. Especially since the safe long-term storage of metallic sulfide waste depends entirely on complete isolation from air and water. What if their containment fails. Is this PolyMet Mine really worth it, with probable long-term affects. Thank you for allowing me to share my concerns, Cathy Gagliardi 1735 Sheridan Ave St Paul, MN 55116

16340

The man who heads a Hedgefund project to open an alleged open pit mine in the Penokee Range south of the Bad River Ojibwe Reservation in Northern Wisconsin, and over the objections of all eleven WI tribes has been indicted. <http://wcmcoop.com/2014/02/19/gtacs-bill-williams-indicted-in-spain/> I hope MN looks into this too with the proposed Polymet Mine. Cathy Gagliardi St Paul, MN

Cathy Geist

47656

Hello, I am writing to express my strong concern about, and opposition to, the NorthMet mining proposal. I attended the February meeting in St Paul and also read much of the Executive Summary of the SDEIS. As a conservation biologist and environmental science instructor, I am extremely concerned about the long-term ecological impacts of this project and also the serious ecological "unknowns". In addition to the likelihood of long-term pollution, I am particularly concerned about the probability of not being able to successfully restore the impacted wetland areas. In my graduate study of ecological restoration, I learned that successful wetland restoration (both restoration of species diversity and ecological processes) is tentative at best. The required restoration in the proposed area seems more like an experiment than a known process. This is simply not OK to do in our precious northland areas. I am certain that many people have written about their concerns for the long-term effects on the waters of the area (including groundwater) and the effects on endangered species (eg lynx) and their habitats. I echo these concerns. I request that this mining project be cancelled. Thank you for considering my concerns, Cathy Geist 3428 34th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406 Cathy Geist Biology Instructor Minneapolis Community and Technical College HYPERLINK "<mailto:Cathy.Geist@minneapolis-edu>"Cathy.Geist@minneapolis-edu Phone: 612-200-5239 "Come forth into the light of things . . . Let nature be your teacher." -William Wordsworth, English poet

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy Hanson

39778

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. 500 years to treat the water from the mine so it's safe. I've seen some of the devastation from mining - there is no wildlife, no fish, not even weeds grow near that toxicity. I don't want this in the state I live in. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Cathy Hanson PO Box 582474 Minneapolis, MN 55458-2474

Cathy Klegstad

11193

To Whom It May Concern: I support PolyMet Mining and believe they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS, it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts have been completed. As a person who lives, works and plays in the area, I understand the need to balance use of resources like minerals and preservation of resources such as water and air. I feel this SDEIS lays the proper groundwork for developing an environmentally and economically sustainable project and I wholeheartedly support it. Polymet can produce these metals in an environmentally sound manner and create hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. PolyMet and its vendors will provide our young people with multiple opportunities for challenging and exciting careers. Enough is enough. Let's get on with permitting this mine. Mining is our bread and butter. Cathy Klegstad Cathy Klegstad Clerk-Treasurer City of Babbitt 71 South Drive Babbitt, MN 55706 (218)-827-3647 cathy@babbitt-mn-com

Cathy Silvern

22782

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We cannot afford short-term jobs at the expense of long-term environmental degradation. Our precious few natural resources must be preserved, unpolluted, for all future generations. Once having destroyed our water, it cannot be restored. Look what is happening in West Virginia, for heaven's sake And that chemically poisoned sludge is flowing toward major metropolitan centers, impacting humans, wildlife, natural environments, all manner of agriculture and beyond. The long term effects are incalculable and won't be known for at least a generation; by then it will be far too late to help those impacted and to clean-up the toxic stew that fouls the water. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. These are major camping and family areas. If you dump on them, they disappear forever, destroy communities, economies and especially, the natural habitat and beauty which can never be reclaimed. Where is the benefit to communities. to wildlife. to our air and water. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is most definitely NOT in the public interest. Sincerely, Cathy Silvern 4618 Washington St Apt 3b Skokie, IL 60076-2591

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cathy von Euw

45185

I am opposed to the NorthMet copper nickel mining plan. Here are some reasons why: 1) Project Does Not Comply with the MN DNR Mission Statement - This project does not reflect the MN DNR's mission statement: The mission of the is to work with citizens to conserve and manage the state's natural resources, to provide outdoor recreation opportunities, and to provide for commercial uses of natural resources in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life. The MN DNR is considering the start up of copper nickel mining in Minnesota. This is a type of mining has never been conducted in Minnesota and the environmental record of sulfide mining in other areas of the United States has shown that releases of sulfuric acid to the surface water and groundwater are prevalent. Based on the fact that sulfide mining has never been conducted without negative environmental impact, the proposed NorthMet mine is not expected to create a sustainable quality of life within the area of Hoyt Lakes and the Lake Superior watershed. 2) PolyMet Lacks Mining Experience - PolyMet does not have a proven track record of successfully operating a copper nickel mine. In fact, PolyMet has absolutely zero experience in operating a copper nickel mine. I believe that the MN DNR should not allow a company to undertake such a huge mining operation without a record showing that they are a qualified company to safely operate the proposed NorthMet mine. 3) Financial Assurances - Glencore will be providing funds to PolyMet for the mining operations. Glencore should be identified as the lead company in this effort. PolyMet does not have the resources to provide financial assurance for environmental clean-up. 4) Establishing a Precedent for Copper Nickel Mining in Northern Minnesota – I am concerned that if the PolyMet mining EIS is approved by the MN DNR and mining permits are issued that it will allow copper nickel mining to proceed in other areas of the state, such as near the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area. The MN DNR should be very aware of how their decision on the NorthMet mining project will affect other proposed mining plans in the state. 5) High Likelihood of Environmental Contamination – Even with the best intentions and plans, accidents can occur. This is also the case with the proposed NorthMet mine. If there are any releases of sulfuric acid to the soil, surface water and/or groundwater, then long-term significant environmental clean-up will be needed. I do not feel that the MN DNR should use the proposed NorthMet mine as a pilot project for copper nickel mining. Until PolyMet can provide evidence that they have successfully operated a similar-type mine for at least 15 years, I don't think that the MN DNR should grant approval for this project. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I feel very passionately that the MN DNR should not move forward with the NorthMet mining plan at this time. My contact information is as follows: Cathy von Euw 4740 Wentworth Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55419 cathy_voneuw@yahoo-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

catina spann

41602

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Catlin Spargo

40383

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Catlin Spargo 1290 Hall Ave Lakewood, OH 44107 US

ceceile hartleib

41056

Hello, I am a concerned Minnesota citizen. I oppose the sulfide mining project submitted by PolyMet Mining Co. because these ventures have damaged water supplies in other areas of the country and I do not think it is worth it to do it here. I have read some of the comments by those who are going to profit from the mining and am not convinced that they are telling the whole truth. I think they want to make the money and then pull out and let the state pay for the clean up. Thank you. Cecelia R. Hartleib 2034 Selby Ave St Paul, MN 55104 Call Send SMS Add to Skype You'll need Skype CreditFree via Skype

Cecelia Newton

9331

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I testified at the hearing in St Paul but run out of time and am not sure if this got in the minutes. Climate change caused by rising greenhouse emissions will be affecting Minnesota's natural habits, agriculture and our health. The Polymet project should not be permitted without substantial change to reduce emissions. The SDEIS should be redone to compare alternatives that reduce Carbon Dioxide emissions, starting with changes in vehicle fuel and reduced reliance on coal power. Cecelia Newton 5516 Irving Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55419 (612) 929-0372

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cecelia Newton

18143

My name is Cecelia Newton and it's spelled differently than a lot of people spell it. C-E-C-E-L-I-A, and then Newton, N-E-W-T-O-N. I am from Minneapolis, Minnesota. I also was a girl scout. I'm a Minnesota citizen. I'm concerned about climate change and the effects it is having on Minnesota. I know this sounds weird, but Minnesota is the third fastest warming state in the USA. We are being affected. I know you want to laugh, but you go talk to a metrologist. The CO2 emissions from the PolyMet sulfide mine and/or processing facilities would greatly increase Minnesota CO2 emissions. The greenhouse gas emissions from the PolyMet Mine, the processing facility, including the fossil fuels burned to run the vehicles on site and the plant on both places would be potentially -- now I know this is 107,342 metric tons per year. The statistic I'm giving is stated in this Supplement Draft EIS, Chapter 5, 405. That's why I'm giving the specific numbers. For perspective, in the city of Duluth in 2011, that includes commercial, industrial, transport, and waste, they emitted 2.7 million tons of CO2 equivalent gas, greenhouse gases. So in one year PolyMet alone would emit one-fourth of the CO2 equivalent pollution of the whole city of Duluth. That's one plant. Over a 20-year mine plan PolyMet will emit 15,790,750 tons of CO2 equivalent pollution from burning coal to run its processing. That also is from the draft statement, Chapter 5, 406. Climate change caused by rising greenhouse gases will be affecting our natural habitats, our agriculture, and our health. Our natural habitat would include fewer lakes -- not the land -- it wouldn't be "The Land of 10,000" anymore. More dried up lakes. Less or no moose. No pine forest. Less good fishing and walleyes. More ticks. So I propose the PolyMet project should not be permitted without substantial change to reduce emissions. The SDEIS should be --

18892

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- Sincerely yours, Cece;ia Newton 5516 Irving Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55419 612-929-0372

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cecilia Lieder

39999

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cecilia Lieder

40002

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cecilia Lieder

41702

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

43228

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Cecilia Lieder 318 N 14th Av E Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Celeste Birkeland

17116

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Celeste Birkeland 4036 Zenith Avenue North Robbinsdale, MN 55422

50384

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Celeste Birkeland 4036 Zenith Avenue North Robbinsdale, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Celeste Kawulok 54906

See attachment

Celia Hallan 42445

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Celia Hallan 1901 W 49th St Minneapolis, MN 55419-5225

celia poehls 15867

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I urge you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. I also urge you to acknowledge the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan has unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality. These impacts will persist for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan deserve a less than a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents show that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats the sulfide mine plan and wastes will have on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish. All of these present extreme risks to human health at a time we can no longer ignore them. The SDEIS must be redone. It "methodology" is faulty and conceals, rather than analyzes environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •No use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. NOTE: Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined the real base flow is at least two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Base flow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •No use a reasonable range of probabilities polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles collection. NOTE: The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no "real-world" support. •No use of accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. NOTE: Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •No inclusion of a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance toxic mitigation treatment for hundreds (or more) of years (ie, how we can be assure this will not become yet another SuperFund site). The PolyMet SDEIS is not a scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document relying on unjustified assumptions. It conceals important facts and does not allow the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. It should be noted that we only need to look to West Virginia and North Carolina to see immediate and real threats to our earth from bad management strategies for treating the byproducts of these methods. Sincerely yours, celia poehls
celia poehls 14765 Wake St NE Ham Lake, MN 55304

Center for Biological Diversity 43001

From: Marc Fink [mailto:mfink@biologicaldiversity-org] Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 10:42 AM To: Stine, John (MPCA); Brist, Jim (MPCA) Cc: 'JE Reyer' Subject: Section 401 Certification for Proposed NorthMet Mining Project Mr Stine and Mr Brist, Please see the attached letter concerning the Section 401 Certification for the proposed NorthMet mining project on the Superior National Forest I will also be sending you a copy of the letter by regular mail. As stated in the letter, also attached are copies of comments that we are submitting today concerning the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and Section 404 permit application for the proposed NorthMet mining project. We can provide you with hard copies of these comments upon request Upon request we can also provide you with a CD that contains all of the exhibits cited to within our SDEIS and Section 404 permit application comments. Please let me know if any questions, and thank you for your consideration. Marc Fink Center for Biological Diversity 209 East 7th St Duluth, MN 55805 218-464-0539 HYPERLINK "mailto:mfink@biologicaldiversity-org"mfink@biologicaldiversity-org

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Center for Biological Diversity 52183

[open file to view](#)

Chad Brown 16495

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Based on the environmental damage from this type of mining in other states, I ask that you please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Chad Brown Chad Brown 2713 Glenwood Ave Minneapolis, MN 55405

49954

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Based on the environmental damage from this type of mining in other states, I ask that you please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Chad Brown Chad Brown 2713 Glenwood Ave Minneapolis, MN 55405

Chad Jurgens 16272

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chad Sahr

22037

I fully support the PolyMet project. The agencies have done an excellent job preparing the SDEIS. I fully trust the agencies expertise in making sure that this will be done in a safe and responsible way. I was able to attend all 3 public comment sessions. To me this is cut and dry . We can have both clean water and jobs in northern MN. PolyMet has demonstrated it and will prove it when they get their permits. Sarah Sahr 204 S 6th St E Aurora, MN 55705

57490

I fully support PolyMet, the DNR, and all of the other agencies on mining safely in northern MN. I have lived here my whole life and mining is critical to our area. I trust that all of the agencies will ensure that PolyMets mining will be safe for the environment. I also know the huge economic impact that this could provide for the whole state of MN. I also know that all of these metals that they will be mining, will still be mined elsewhere. So why not have it done here .. Where we already have the strictest standards. PolyMet has proven that they will meet all of the standards and I hope that the regulators won't let the environmentalists delay this any longer. I feel that the groups that are against this are not pro-environment, they are anti-mining. If these groups were pro-environment then they would want this kind of mining here where we know it will be regulated and watched closely. Not in another country where standards are lower. Sincerely, Chad Sahr

Chad Trebilcock

21879

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. It's time to move forward as people want and need jobs in the area. Chad Trebilcock 7805 South Jackson Road Lake Nebagamon, Wisconsin 54849 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Chanda Welch

44726

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Miss Chanda Welch 670 Ockley Dr Shreveport, LA 71106-1249

char

7639

I'm very supportive of Polymet's efforts to start a mine in Northeastern Minnesota. The SDEIS outlines what has to be done to ensure that the mining process is done in an environmentally responsible manner. It has taken 10 years of study to get where we are today. It is time to move forward with the Polymet project. We desperately need the good paying jobs and to be independent from foreign suppliers of these minerals. Thank You, Charlotte Colarich 1011 east white street Ely, MN. 55731 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

char colo

40315

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, char colo jamieson St louis, MO 63109 US

Charlene Blake

40909

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Charlene Blake 40 Elizabeth Street Corner Brook, NL A2H 5Z6 (709) 388-0425

Charlene Maertens

57244

All of your mining is destroying our water, the wetlands for animals, and causing more pollution. To top off your handi-work with your mining. You are also partial to blame for formations of sink holes. You take away the ground, but you don't replace it. Shame on you - this planet is dying. Charlene Maertens 1641 - 20th Ave, #314 International Falls, MN 56649

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles And Mary Weaver

40023

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Charles And Mary Weaver 1245 Karth Lake Dr Saint Paul, MN 55112-5714 (651) 631-3021

Charles Baribeau

18127

Thank you, Dave, and members of the Committee and the groups here. The first thing I'm going to do, I'm going to be putting on two different hats here. I'm putting on my hat -- I'm a Virginia City Councilor from the City of Virginia. My name is Charles R. Baribeau, last name is B-A-R-I-B-E-A U. With that, I'm going to introduce for the record, two resolutions we passed on PolyMet. One for the original draft EIS and we'll be putting together another resolution in next Tuesday's council meeting for this current supplemental EIS draft that's out at the present time. I've been a pharmacist for 40 years throughout the community of Virginia, and we support the PolyMet from a City Council perspective, and we support it 100 percent. These resolutions were a 7-nothing vote and a 7-nothing vote with two members absent. The PolyMet Project will increase, and as already mentioned, jobs in this area by about 400, from 1,000 1,000 to more. The Iron Range unemployment rate right now is higher than the state average, so This will help to increase the employment in this area. There will be high-paying jobs. There will be an increase of younger families due to subsistence of everything on the Iron Range. There will be an increase in school enrollment, an increase in real estate values of homes and businesses if this project goes through. There will be an increase in all types of sales. Now, I'm going to put on my hat as a pharmacist. The water process with reverse osmosis has been in the business as long as I've been a pharmacist, for 40 years. The quality of water coming out of this system will be better than the water that they're drawing from whatever streams, and et cetera, that they draw the water from. The process will be pure; all the minerals, all the chemicals, the mercury, everything you've heard, them talk about will not be available to go back into the downstream system of the Lake Superior watershed. We in Virginia are held to a standard of mercury that will be identical to what the environmental system requires of the mining industry. That standard is based on a brand-new sewage treatment plant we just put into operation here in Virginia this past year. So it's a brand new standard that the mining company will be held to. Just a couple other things. Reverse osmosis is used in drinking water purification. Food industry, food and juices. Your household water industries. Your sewage treatment plants. Your desalination of fresh -- for fresh water from the ocean. The pharmaceutical industry has used reverse osmosis with purity of water for many years. One last thing. It also extracts bacteria and pathogens- from the system, depending on the membranes you use, so the water will be more pure than what went in.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Borden

16936

Dear Ms Fay, Dear DNR Friends: I'm a lifelong friend of the boundary waters and I am writing to tell you that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality now and long into the future. This mine would work fine in Nevada or other states with the minerals where the water table is not rich and pristine. But to do this mine at the top of the Laurentine divide where its effects would not just damage local water tables but run off into Lake Superior, the Mississippi River and hundreds of other smaller rivers and lakes is simply foolhardy. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Charles Borden Charles Borden 9 Delos Street W, # 3 St Paul, MN 55107

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Borden

50229

Dear DNR Friends: I'm a lifelong friend of the boundary waters and I am writing to tell you that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality now and long into the future. This mine would work fine in Nevada or other states with the minerals where the water table is not rich and pristine. But to do this mine at the top of the laurentine divide where its effects would not just damage local water tables but run off into Lake Superior, the Mississippi River and hundreds of other smaller rivers and lakes is simply foolhardy. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Charles Borden
Charles Borden
9 Delos Street W, # 3 St Paul, MN 55107

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Dayton

43340

Comments of Charles K. Dayton. January 28, 2014 1666 Coffman St St Paul, MN 55108 651 341 2049 HYPERLINK "mailto:chuckdayton@gmail-com"chuckdayton@gmail-com Regarding the Draft Supplemental EIS for the Polymet mining operation at Hoyt Lakes Minnesota. My experience as a retired environmental attorney with over 40 years of practice includes some lessons relevant to this issue. We can't predict the future very well. Pro-mining interests keep urging us to trust the agencies to do their job. I don't doubt that the agencies will act in good faith, but as a lawyer for environmental groups on the Reserve Mining case I learned that State Permitting agencies are not adept at predicting what will happen in nature in the future, even using the best available scientific information. The then Commissioner of DNR, in issuing the original permit allowing Reserve to dump taconite tailings into Lake Superior, found that there would be no harm to water supplies and that the tailings would stay within a mile of plant. But, the tailings turned out to be carcinogenic, they polluted Duluth's water, and were found across the lake in Wisconsin; 20 years later the discharge stopped. The lesson for this EIS is that potential changes in climate, particularly rainfall, should be evaluated. Economic analysis of future treatment costs is required by law. As a lobbyist for the Sierra Club in the 1973 session, I worked on the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act requiring impact statements. That law clearly requires that the potential economic cost of treating the water that will be affected by the waste rock must be evaluated in the EIS: 116D.4, Subd. 2a. provides: "The environmental impact statement shall also analyze those economic, employment, and sociological effects that cannot be avoided should the action be implemented." This failing is an obvious flaw in the Supplemental EIS. The EIS must evaluate scenarios that include an increasing incidence of heavy rainfall events. Three years ago, I co-authored a chapter of "Water Policy in Minnesota" published by Resources for the Future, together with Don Pereria, the head of fisheries research for the DNR. In working on our chapter, entitled, "The Impact of Climate Change on the Distribution and Use of Water" I learned that the severity of heavy thunderstorms has increased and will continue to increase in northern Minnesota as the climate warMs The research cited shows that the incidence of heavy rainfall events is now double the rate of a century ago, and that climate change forecasts show that current increasing trends will continue into the future. Id. at 206- This research is confirmed by the report of an inter-agency task force in Minnesota, Adapting To Climate, 2013, Report of the Interagency Climate Adaptation Team, which included representatives of the PCA and DNR, November 2013- <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html.gid=15414>- The report shows a 45 percent increase in "very heavy precipitation events," from 1958 to 2011 in the upper Midwest, including Minnesota. P. 8, figure 6- The report forecasts more frequent extreme weather events as well and notes, significantly for our purposes: "Higher peak intensity rainfall events may result in bypass of wastewater treatment facilities or sanitary sewer overflows, leading to the release of minimally treated or untreated wastewater." My understanding is that the waste basins and treatment facilities for the water polluted by contact with waste rock will be designed for a hundred year rain event of 5-2 inches of rain in 24 hours. This is insufficient. The flood that plagued Duluth and Northeastern Minnesota in June of 2012 with 8 to 10 inches of rain was the worst in history, so far. Mark Seeley, climatologist with the University of Minnesota, observed, "This type of storm reminds us that climate is changing in Minnesota. Not only in terms of quantity of precipitation, but in the character of precipitation

Charles Derry

33513

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Maybe you don't seem to understand that the Lake Superior waters are pretty much a closed system and, as I have heard, have 300 year turnover. The lake may look big, but, it really isn't and this type of mining, shows the potential of killing the entire lake and its surroundings. You are playing with fire here and it is time the fire was put out. Do not allow this mining to take place and pollute the entire Great Lakes. We take so much care in not letting lead from the Mackinaw Bridge get into our lakes, when the sulfide mining contamination is going to be far greater and far worse. Make sure your priorities are in the right place as you drink your filtered city water. You are playing with 1/5 of the world's fresh water here. Don't take a chance like this that could be fatal for our lakes and our children. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Please stop this greed and insanity before you kill the greatest of the Great Lakes and maybe all of them down the road. Thank you. Sincerely, Charles Derry 8660 Merkel Rd Dexter, MI 48130-9655

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Lahti 18061

My name is Charles Lahti. The question that I have relating to this particular permitting system is what happens to permitting after the product leaves the property? In other words, when it's in transportation we have hazardous materials that's in a liquid solvent state or a dried state going across all the water aquifers between here and the location. I'm afraid a train accident or something like that will put it into our water system, the Great Lakes, the Red River, going up the Hudson Valley or the Mississippi. And we are talking thousands of tons of hazardous material. How do we handle that? And why isn't the Department of Transportation involved in this permitting? And the other thing is on these routes we have to look at the hazardous characteristics for the emergency people and the fire responders. Those first responders are they going to be aware and properly equipped to handle the hazards that this brings forth to their towns.

Charles Lehn 36610

Please consider the attached letter regarding Polymet Mining. cl Sincerely, Charlie Lehn Morningstar Exteriors, Inc. 4991 165th Ave NW. Andover, MN. 55304 763-286-9792

Charles Madsen 39765

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Charles Madsen 90 13th Ave SW New Brighton, MN 55112-3438 (651) 724-8593

41840

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Charles Madsen New Brighton, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Marsden 20173

I sent an email on this subject moments ago, but was unable to determine if it went through, so I am sending in a different manner. My apologies if this turns out to be a duplicate message. Please make this a part of your file of comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. Charles Marsden

36906

Attached is an analysis of the size of a Trust Fund required to provide adequate Financial Assurance as well as some suggestions on dealing with the issue. Charles Marsden

42819

See attachment

43029

Your task is complex. The attached letter includes some suggestions about how not to lose sight of the big picture. Charles Marsden

54574

I am writing to you regarding the application for mining permits for the NorthMet Project and the SDEIS currently under review by the DNR. I am a retired chief financial officer of a chemical company listed on the NYSE and have had many years experience buying and selling properties that involve complex environmental issues, and, as a result, believe I can offer some informed opinions about the issue of Financial Assurance which is a major consideration in the PolyMet proposal. The main points of this letter can be summarized as follows: •Copper-nickel mining in Minnesota involves a significant risk of groundwater contamination. •Taxpayers need to be protected from the potentially very large cost to clean up environmental damage resulting from this type of mining. •The time to get the necessary financial guarantees to protect taxpayers is now, before permits are issued. •The best protection would be a large initial cash deposit supplemented during mine production by a tonnage charge. As you know, hard rock sulfide mining, unlike iron mining, has potential severe environmental impacts on ground water, and the challenges of dealing with toxic runoff from tailings impoundments are substantial. This is evidenced by the fact that no sulfide mining operation anywhere in the world has yet succeeded in containing the toxic runoff and avoiding pollution of groundwater (drinking water) in surrounding areas. PolyMet claims in its SDEIS that it knows how to solve this seemingly intractable problem. However, the most optimistic way of looking at this issue is to view it as a bold experiment to be conducted in Minnesota. The state needs to protect itself and the taxpayers if it allows this experiment to take place and serious environmental damage does occur, as it has in every other sulfide mine. The PolyMet SDEIS acknowledges that treatment of runoff from tailings impoundments will need to continue for hundreds of years. The net present value cost of that alone is huge, and not really addressed in the SDEIS. Scientists, engineers, and other technical experts can argue about the relative merits and likelihood of success in containing toxic runoff and treating whatever escapes impoundments. But there are other important evaluations to be made that are of a business and financial nature. How can we be assured that Minnesota taxpayers will not be stuck with an enormous bill for cleanup of the mining sites and ongoing treatment costs? Minnesota Rules, part 6132.1200 is supposed to provide for that, but the rule is only effective if (1) the future financial liability is forecasted realistically and (2) PolyMet is capable of providing financial assurances to the extent required to meet their potential obligations for both mine closure and reclamation and environmental damage. Section 3.2.2.4 Financial Assurances of the SDEIS for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange is the only place where this issue is addressed. Having reviewed that short section (3 pages), I can say with confidence that no businessman would consider the statements made and assurances suggested to be anywhere near adequate for entering into an agreement with PolyMet. The section consists solely of generalities and future intentions to address the issue in a more comprehensive way during the permitting process. Given the extensive time and work that went into preparing the voluminous SDEIS, it is surprising that no more definitive estimates of future costs to reclaim the sites and deal with long term monitoring of ground water are available. Further, there is no indication that the possibility of substantial contamination of ground water due to failure of impoundments or other issues has even been considered. Costs to deal with this kind of issue could far exceed the general estimates of closure costs (\$120-\$170 million after 20 years of mining) and post-closure monitoring and maintenance costs (\$3.5-6 million annually) that ar

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Moore

57343

My name is Charles Moore. I live at 4320 London Road, Duluth. I am opposed to the proposed mining for the following reasons. One, I think that the proposed or postulated cleanup has not been adequately tested on a large enough scale at other such mines. Secondly, I am opposed because I think underground mining hasn't been given a – I don't know how much that has been looked into. And thirdly, the cost of the cleanup for hundreds of years seems to be -- how is that going to be guaranteed? Okay. That's it.

Charles Morrison

41740

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Charles Pacholski

41757

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Charles Pacholski 2312 Marshfield Rd Lawtons, NY 14091-9781

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Pfannenstein

16062

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Charles Plumadore

4781

DNR, I am writing you with my concerns about the proposed Polymet sulfide mining to be done very close to the BWCA. After reviewing the information from the recent environmental impact analysis, I have no confidence that the Polymet company can keep the surrounding watershed safe from pollution caused by the mine. As an avid user of the BWCA and resident of the state of Minnesota, I am urging you to reject Polymet's proposals for sulfide mining in our state. Sincerely, Charles Plumadore 5965 195th Ave Foley, MN 56357

Charles Renner

18263

Charles Renner, Ely, Minnesota. I just wanted to say I have lived on the Iron Range for 50 years. The mining industry is what brought us to the Range during the mining business in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota during the sixties and seventies. The town was full of miners, full of kids, full of schools. Now we have no miners to speak of, a handful of miners. The schools are all closed up and boarded up. And I am for the mining industry and I am looking forward to it starting. They have studied it for years, eight years I believe, possibly ten. They have spent millions of dollars studying this. I believe they are capable of doing it safely and I am looking forward to them getting it started as soon as possible.

58141

Lived on range for 50 years supported by mining. We've studied this for years, spent millions of dollars. Lets start mining!

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charles Schaedler 3049

The fact that this company will provide so many good jobs for Minnesotans, is by far the most important thing to remember. I also believe that conservationists have too much say in what happens in our state. We all want to keep our planet livable, but we have to remember that our population is constantly growing. We have to do something to create jobs for the expanding job force.. The fact that this can be done with no appreciable effect on the environment, is all the more reason to promote this project..
Charles F Schaedler

Charles Skaudis 41915

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Charles Skaudis Woodbury, Minnesota

Charles Sugnet 48670

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am a property owner in Cook County and an outdoor sports/environmental writer. The news media keep framing the mining question as a question of jobs and the economy versus the environment, completely forgetting that a clean wilderness will produce jobs over a much longer haul. From a strictly economic point of view, it is a question of a large number of jobs that last for a short time and destroy the resource (the capital) versus a smaller number of jobs that are sustainable over the very long haul because they do not destroy. I've seen what the area around Sudbury looks like after copper-nickel smelting. Nothing in PolyMet's approach (leaky test wells, misleading public communication) leads me to believe that northern Minnesota will be spared serious and long-lasting damage if PolyMet is allowed to mine. Charles J Sugnet 2312 30th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Charles Sugnet 2312 30th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1444 (612) 655-9700

Charles Wick 54568

Cu-Ni mining is too risky so close to priceless watersheds. Minerals are too toxic in parts per billion to ensure safety. Monitoring of water quality has to be done way past the life of the mine and the corporate owners. Its too close to the BWCAW to risk such a major intrusion.

Charlie Elowson 38947

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Charlie Elowson 2515 Burnham Rd Minneapolis, MN 55416-4333 612 729

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charlotte Anderson

10158

To the Minnesota DNR: I am strongly opposed to the sulfide mining proposal in northern Minnesota. From the reading I have done in the media and portions of the prepared environmental statement, it is inconceivable that sulfide mining can be anything but disastrous for our northern water and land environment. Our natural resources in Minnesota have always been a defining part of our state's economic health and culture, and they MUST be protected. I do not believe that human progress and economic need should be held to be more valuable than our beautiful lakes, trees, land and wildlife. We need these places of quiet, clean air and water, these places of refuge. I have visited the BWCA the past 5 years and will continue to visit as long as I am physically able. The history of previous sulfide mining projects elsewhere in the country tells the story of ongoing pollution, bankruptcy of the mining companies, and cleanup burdens left to taxpayers. Why would we expect it to be different in Minnesota. Minnesota has been a leader in protecting the environment-do not stop now, do not change this now. Please say no to this mining project.. Sincerely, Charlotte Anderson 2909 40th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55406 Sent from my iPad

Charlotte Egler

39707

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Charlotte Egler 10898 Daylight Dr Camby, IN 46113-9180 (317) 966-5852

Charlotte Kerelko

41812

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Charlotte Kerelko Floodwood, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Charlotte Quiggle

16201

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Chase Carter

54178

The boundary waters is a beautiful place with many aquatic and non-aquatic animals. There is a lot of people who frequently visit the boundary waters. People also own businesses on and around the waters. If you start to mine for precious metals you will destroy so many great things. Sulfide ore mining will kill thousands of innocent animals. It will also turn the water yellow and pollute the little wilderness we have with acid and lower the pH so fish will die. The mining will bring jobs but it will also destroy many family businesses. Tourists won't come to visit because the wilderness won't be there. You think you will get profit from precious metals but it's not worth destroying so many great things. If you mine their I guarantee you will regret it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chase Root

41924

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Chase Root Lindstrom, Minnesota

Chelsea Helmer

19942

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Firstly, I want to express disappointment that the ninety day comment period has not been extended. Ninety days is insufficient for proper public analysis of this SDEIS given its length and complexity. I concur with the Tribal Comments and Supporting materials related to hydrological monitoring and models conducted on the Partridge River. I concur with MDO #1 that "the natural variability in precipitation would be more adverse than reported in the SDEIS." It appears that these models to again quote "characterize the groundwater hydrologic system as moving an unrealistically small quantity of water." Predications of future water quality cannot be based on flawed statistical data related to current water quality. The agencies response states that if "actual NorthMet Project Proposed Action effects were found to be higher than predictions that steps could be taken to reduce those effects." What these steps would be needs to be specified. I request that the SDEIS needs to be redone to accurately reflect quantities of water in this hydrological system. Polymet's proposal would destroy 913 acres of high-value wetlands in the St Louis River watershed according to the SDEIS. The proposal would indirectly affect up to another 7,351 acres. There is NO PLAN to compensate for these thousands of affected wetlands. Additionally any compensatory mitigation, an undefined term, does not affect the St Louis River watershed or Lake Superior resident. As a citizen of the Lake Superior Basin, I believe that the Section 404 permit must require "compensation" for loss and injury to wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Additionally the SDEIS reveals that PolyMet would not build a reverse osmosis plant for water treatment at the mine site for approximately 40 years. Contaminants in the permanent waste rock and tailings will require treatment for hundreds of years, and admittedly mine pit pollution would continue in perpetuity. The mine itself will only be in operation for 20 years. It is extremely unlikely that the PolyMet Corporation would survive the years that are needed to mitigate this pollution. Costs and a plan necessary for funding this treatment must be sufficiently developed and provided to the public. The SDEIS should explain exactly what would ensure how the treatment of mine pit pollution will be funded for hundreds of years. Sincerely, Chelsea J. Helmer 302 Hawkins St Duluth, MN 55811 (218) 341-4407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chely Tverbeg

11452

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Chely Tverbeg 4294 Munger Shaw Rd Cloquet, MN 55720-9252 (218) 591-4750

Cher Johnson

16056

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl and Mark Wilke 54912

See attachment

Cheryl Dannenbring 6111

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In the SDEIS from PolyMet, it is claimed that the tailings piles resulting from the mine project won't cause pollution(p5-159- However, this unlined tailings site will be on top of the existing LTV tailings piles, an area exceeding two square miles. The tailing site already leaks pollution. Now there will be even more toxic tailings added, and they will be there forever. Polymet claims that all but 21 gallons of seepage per minute (out of 3,380 gal. per minute) will be contained via pumps. That is a 99% collection rate. Nowhere is there an example of this almost perfect result at the edge of an unlined tailings pile. Simply saying it will happen does not mean that it will. As with many other points in the SDEIS, PolyMet makes claims that are not backed up with hard evidence or scientific review. Nor do they explain what will happen when PolyMet is no longer there to keep the mechanical form of reclamation going - some 50, 200, or 500 yrs. down the line. The SDEIS needs to be redone to analyze water quality outcomes/risks IF the tailings pile collection rate is not what PolyMet projects. It also needs to detail Polymet's financial guarantee to back up its claims Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

6121

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: I am writing regarding the US Forest Service's willingness to accept Land Exchange on behalf of PolyMet. The Forest Service claimed that the purpose of a land exchange was to unify ownership of federal lands so federal forests would not be on top of mineral leasing. But the proposed land swaps do not fill that purpose. Almost all of the land proposed for the swap have split ownership and severed mineral rights. (SDEIS, p. 3-163) In other words, the land swap will allow PolyMet to take lands from the Superior National Forest—lands currently available for multiple-faceted public use—wildlife habitat, forestry, and recreation—and turn them into a single use (mining) parcel. It is not the Forest Service's job to make land available for a foreign corporation's economic benefit. I ask that the proposed Land Exchange be rejected since it does not serve a public interest PolyMet should have to find lands where the public would have unified ownership with no split mineral leases to sell off. Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

7548

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 1997 the MNDNR and the MNPCA, along with several other agencies developed a Minnesota Wetlands Conservation Plan. To quote from this project: "The goal for wetland conservation in Minnesota is to maintain and restore the quality and diversity and increase the overall quantity of wetlands in the state . . ." According to the DNR's own document, the benefits of wetlands are many. They include: erosion control, fisheries habitat, flood control, ground water recharge and discharge, natural filter for pollution, rare species habitat (almost 50% of threatened or endangered species in the US live in wetlands), general wildlife habitat, recreation, sources of income and food, and educational opportunities. Being aware of these critical roles that wetlands play in the ecology and culture of Northern Minnesota, I am extremely concerned about PolyMet's proposed impact on such lands. By its own admission, PolyMet will destroy 913 acres of wetlands directly and another 7,351 acres will likely be destroyed due to fragmentation, pollution and changes in hydrology. However, the Polymet's EIS details no plan to mitigate this huge loss within the Lake Superior Basin. Furthermore, the Army Corp of Engineers has no record of requiring wetland compensation or mitigation after a project is built. Polymet's SDEIS shows a disregard for the ecological and public value of wetlands. I ask that the EIS be deemed unacceptable and that the DNR does not permit the mine on the basis of its own stated goals for preservation and improvement of wetlands in Minnesota. Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring Duluth, MN Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl Dannenbring

10742

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: There appear to be many inadequacies in Polymet's new EIS, with limited plans for protecting ground and surface water topping the liSt The mine will open a pit reaching below the presently used aquifer, thereby making a permanent connection between all geologic zones that are mined through. There is no plan to create a permanent barrier from the toxic mining byproduct to the water, either during mining or after by-product disposal. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: Sincerely yours, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

10931

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Polymet's SDEIS, section 3-40 paragraph 2 states "There is no mine plan for any material that lies outside of the proposed open pit; as such, mining material located beyond the proposed pit outline would be evaluated as appropriate if proposed in the future." As in many sections of the EIS, this vague language opens the door to future environmental assaults without having a plan 'on the books' to deal with those eventualities. This EIS should cover all possible known variants of the mining plan, not just the one proposed at the time being. I am concerned that the mining company could start with a small operation and thus be grandfathered into a larger operation without needing to go through all review processes. This is only one of many shortcomings that has become clear on the public's scrutiny of this document. The SDEIS needs to be redone to address all such concerns, without the 'smoke and screen' language it currently employs. Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

15263

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The amount of water that the proposed PolyMet mine would require for operations is of great concern to me. On pg.3-102, paragraph one states that 'make-up water' drawn from Colby Lake would average 275 gallons per minute. (and we, as good citizens, worry when our taps are leaky.). After twenty years of use, this would mean removing a significant portion of the lake's total volume. No study was done to measure the effects of this lake drainage. For instance, the Whitewater Reservoir could become tainted from the City of Hoyt Lakes' sewage discharge. Any number of unintended consequences could arise from using such large volume of water, and polluting much of it to the point that it cannot be discharged from the plant. Furthermore, as with the issue of pollution, the effects will be greatly multiplied with each additional mining operation permitted for the Arrowhead region. I believe the people of Minnesota should have priority use of our waters, not foreign mining companies. I reject the 'we'll deal with that if it arises' solution which seems to be an integral part of this SDEIS. Plans for such eventualities must be in place before the operation is permitted. Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

18407

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: There appear to be many inadequacies in Polymet's new EIS, with limited plans for protecting ground and surface water topping the liSt The mine will open a pit reaching below the presently used aquifer, thereby making a permanent connection between all geologic zones that are mined through. There is no plan to create a permanent barrier from the toxic mining byproduct to the water, either during mining or after by-product disposal. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: Sincerely yours, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

42711

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl Dannenbring

50526

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: There appear to be many inadequacies in Polymet's new EIS, with limited plans for protecting ground and surface water topping the liSt The mine will open a pit reaching below the presently used aquifer, thereby making a permanent connection between all geologic zones that are mined through. There is no plan to create a permanent barrier from the toxic mining byproduct to the water, either during mining or after by-product disposal. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: Sincerely yours, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

51205

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Polymet's SDEIS, section 3-40 paragraph 2 states "There is no mine plan for any material that lies outside of the proposed open pit; as such, mining material located beyond the proposed pit outline would be evaluated as appropriate if proposed in the future." As in many sections of the EIS, this vague language opens the door to future environmental assaults without having a plan 'on the books' to deal with those eventualities. This EIS should cover all possible known variants of the mining plan, not just the one proposed at the time being. I am concerned that the mining company could start with a small operation and thus be grandfathered into a larger operation without needing to go through all review processes. This is only one of many shortcomings that has become clear on the public's scrutiny of this document. The SDEIS needs to be redone to address all such concerns, without the 'smoke and screen' language it currently employs. Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

57152

ES-24, paragraph 3 states that the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility will be capped and double-lined for the duration of the estimated 500 years of toxicity. No know man-made structure can retain its original and viable properties for such a length of time, especially concrete or geomembrane, which are known to degrade. Thus any claims which count on this system to contain polluted material must be discounted. Until this very crucial point is addressed in a scientific, valid manner, the project should not proceed. Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

57153

I am wondering how the MN EPA can approve and permit the Polymet copper-nickel mine (or Twin Metals, or any other perspective operation) when many MN water ways are already polluted by old iron mining operations. The Clean Water Act clearly states that no new source of pollution can be added to already polluted water. PolyMet's permit must be denied until old pollution problems are dealt with. Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

57154

Mining proponents keep claiming that sulfide pollution will not be a problem due to the low percentage of sulfide in the rocks (less than 1%). The Brohn Mine (SD) produced acid mine drainage, although the same claims had been made. The company declared bankruptcy (after done extracting) and the site was declared a Superfund Site in 2000, to be treated perpetuity at taxpayers expense. The same thing at the Zortman-Landusky Mine in Montana. Thus all "estimations" for pollution assumed by the SDEIS must not be accepted. Simply saying Polymet won't produce water pollution does not make it so. Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

57155

I am concerned about pollution from the open pit Polymet mine. There has been no study that proves or disapproves that water pollution will migrate via natural permeability or existing fractures. Any pollution could dangerously seep into the local fresh water system. (ES-5 and 4-43 through 4-44) Until independent studies are conducted (not connected to the agencies authorizing the SDEIS) regarding water seepage (sub-terrain water migration) to give a clean understanding of where pollution may travel, the SDEIS should not be approved. Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermillion Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl Dannenbring

57492

Dear MN DNR: What I would like to see in Polymet's EIS draft, is: 1- a clear explanation of how they are going to prevent pollution from leaking out of holding ponds that are designed to leak. 2- how they plan to keep the leaking pollution from seeping into surface and groundwater. 3- whether accurate water samples are being taken now to determine the pre-mining sulfate levels in surrounding ground and surface water. 4- whether Polymet is making financial commitments to be responsible for 'clean up' of pollution that appears 20, 50, and 100 years from now. (as it is known that this type of pollution often takes that 20 years to manifest itself-hence the need for accurate pre-mining samples-and that it can be expected to linger indefinitely. 5- whether they will be held responsible for restoring deforested areas with the biodiversity that presently exists, and continue to finance that restoration until the forests regain their former health. 6- whether the economic impact of the loss of tourism-related jobs, jobs related to our present resources of clean water, forests, and wilderness, have ben figured into the scenario. I am sure there are many other areas I would like to see addressed in the EIS, but these seem pretty basic. Since I don't believe heavy-metal mining has any justification in comparison with maintaining our clean water, questions regarding water should be the priority. Sincerely, Cheryl Dannenbring 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803 218-730-9973

Cheryl Gerth

48563

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. AS A FORMER STOCKHOLDER in Polymet, I felt great pangs of conscience when I learned of the potential for disastrous natural consequences to sulfide mining. I have several friends who still have a financial stake in Polymet's future, but their small economic loss is nothing compared to the threat to the clean air and water which is Minnesota's best legacy. For them it is a small economic game; for everyone else, it spells foreboding and the future loss of a healthy environment is NO one's gain. I sold my stock, not wishing to participate any longer in this dangerous risk. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS. It is time for the world to learn to live on less. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Cheryl Gerth 10122 Uplander St NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433-4655 (763) 862-8050

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl Lawrence

41633

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl McCrory

39727

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Cheryl Olivanti

3139

During this public comment period I would like to support the issuing of permits necessary to allow Polymet to begin mining in Minnesota. Northern Minnesota has been dependent on mining for over a century and another employer would be a great benefit to the area. Our young people need another employer in the area to help them be able to make this area their home for life. This area has seen far too many layoffs and the mass exodus of young people and now we need a reason for them to say or come back. As a small business owner, the higher paying jobs would bring customers to my business. With more business comes the possibility of having to hire more employees and hopefully lower the unemployment rate in northern MN. I am proud to be an investor in Polymet and I have confidence in the company that they will do whatever it takes to run a clean operation now and in the years to come. Sincerely, Cheryl J. Olivanti 727 15th St N. Virginia, MN 55792

Cheryl Pearson

4274

Please do not allow PolyMet degrade thousands of acres in NE Minnesota. Cheryl Pearson 6559 West Hunter Lake Rd Duluth, Mn 55803

Cheryl Stanek

21258

I would like to express my support for approval of the PolyMet North et project in Hoyt Lakes, MN. I urge the DNR to grant permission to PolyMet to build this mine. This would be an excellent opportunity to boost the economy of Minnesota in all aspects. Thank you very much for your time. Cheryl Stanek 18561 183 Street Little Falls, MN. 56355 Cheryl "Every day's a Good Day (especially when you're retired)."

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cheryl Storm

43285

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cheryl Storm 6068 Murphy Lake Road Brimson, MN 55602

47822

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cheryl Storm 6068 Murphy Lake Road Brimson, MN 55602

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cherylyn C. Kelley

45323

March 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Protect Water from PolyMet Dear Ms Fay, I study Environmental Science at the University of Missouri, which is where I first heard of the plan to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota. Naturally, the consensus of the class was one of concern. Though I cannot speak for my peers, I would like to express to you why I think sulfide mining in this delicate area should not be approved. The Superior National Forest is home to many plants and animals, including two endangered species and 11 rare species. It's also the largest designated Important Bird Area. The mine would dig up roughly 1000 acres of peat and bog but its effect would be felt for more than 4000 acres. These areas will be difficult to restore and monitoring plans in these areas is decidedly insufficient. Downstream from the PolyMet site are wild rice beds, which are sensitive to sulfates and will die at even low levels. Much of my concern stems from insufficient or inaccurate information provided by PolyMet. There was very little information about the water treatment systems that would be used. How will it be paid for in the years after the mine is profitable. Will taxpayers be held responsible for the treatment costs. The SDEIS also mentioned that the cut off wall would extend down to the bedrock, but what will they do if there are cracks in the bedrock. The SDEIS also does not include information about potential influence on the endangered species in the area. Those in favor of the mine claim it will boost the local economy and create jobs, but is there no middle ground between jobs and environmental protection. PolyMet boasts the creation of 360 jobs and others that wouldn't be local, so I fail to see how that will help a great deal. I feel certain that transitioning to wind, water, and solar energy could produce more jobs than that while protecting the future of the environment. Do we want to leave a legacy of pollution and expenses for future generations. Or could we give them a beautiful, healthy national forest that provides numerous ecosystem services. Approving this proposal by PolyMet is an unnecessary risk that will surely result in damaging ecosystem, polluting water, and further endangering fragile species in the area. Sincerely, Cherylyn Kelley 2500 Old Highway 63 South (816) 510-7780 [HYPERLINK "mailto:KelleyCh@Missouri-edu"](mailto:KelleyCh@Missouri-edu) "KelleyCh@Missouri-edu"

Cheyenne Kopp

41612

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Cheyenne Kopp Saint Cloud, Minnesota

Chiara Race

41845

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Chiara Race Eagle Bend, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

chiara testi 40290

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, chiara testi via nazionale 980 s. gemignano di moriano lucca, ot 55100 IT

Chipper Johnson 19892

I have reviewed the draft EIS and believe PolyMet has done a great job addressing the issues. I support this project. Peter G. "Chipper" Johnson, PE President Hoover Construction Co.

Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority 42954

To Minnesota DNR: Please accept this submission of comments regarding the NorthMet SDEIS on behalf of the Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority (CORA) provided as a letter in PDF format. Please contact me if there is any problem opening or reading this file. Respectfully, Mike Ripley Environmental Coordinator Inter-Tribal Fisheries and Assessment Program Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority 179 West Three Mile Road Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783 Tel. (906) 632-0072 HYPERLINK "<http://www.1836cora-org>"www.1836cora-org

chooch karton 45067

Please don't let Polymet take our state's true legacy away from the people who live here. What a dreadful shame it would be for corporations from other countries to damage our beautiful state for short term gains. Short term gains with disastrous long term consequences Nature that is timeless and rewards each generation with its lessons as well as guides us towards a healthier earth and more enlightened future: this is what we stand to lose. No amount of money can possibly be worth what would be lost. Please close the door to the Polymet future and we can proudly share in this beautiful state that we are lucky to live in Very Sincerely, Christian Langheinrich 5032 Bloomington Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417 (612)867-6903 Choochkarton@gmail-com

Chris A Norman 42660

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Adams

41554

Lisa Fay, We are writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. First, we want to express our confidence in your agency to thoroughly evaluate the project and its ability to mitigate potential environmental impacts. We trust the multiple State and Federal Agencies involved in preparing the document. Minnesotans trust the DNR to study copper-nickel mining and keep our communities safe. We believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough; the supplemental draft EIS addresses potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. Additionally, we'd like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out – all the more reason to support it. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws – some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country. Minnesota is home to a world-class deposit of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium, and gold. This is an economic opportunity right below our feet that will benefit the state's economy for future generations. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. This project would mean 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state needs. Copper-nickel mining will contribute to the local and state economy at a time when we really need the jobs and economic benefit. Copper-nickel mining will provide millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support our communities and education system. Enough is enough; let's get on with permitting this mine. We want jobs and it's time to put people to work. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts has been completed. We live and work in the area that will be affected by allowing PolyMet to get the needed permits to begin operating. We feel that PolyMet has done their due diligence in providing a safe environment for our family and other families in the area to live in. We would like to see the permits needed to begin production provided to Polymet. Sincerely, Ronald and Christine Adams Makinen, MN 55763

Chris and Catherine Pranskatis

54688

See attachment

Chris Bangs

36657

I was born and raised on the Mesabi Iron Range in Chisholm, MN. It was a fine town to grow up in and has been through the highs and the lows that come with any mining operation. I've owned businesses across northern MN for the past 40 years and I have owned recreational land on the Littlefork River north of my hometown since the 70's. I am pro-business and I understand the need for jobs. But I also have a great love and appreciation for the land and waters of our famous "Up North". The costs for these copper mining jobs will come at far too high a price for all of the people of MN. The industry's track record of environmental damage is long and damning. Too many abandoned mines have been left for other state's residents to clean up at obscene cost levels. Furthermore, this mine is located much too close to the jewel of northern MN- the BWCA, which is a treasure we cannot risk to lose. On its eastern flank lays Lake Superior, the continent's largest source of clean water-which in time may prove to be far more valuable than all the copper below our state's surface. From a business economics viewpoint I'm surprised by how little study has been done on this project. With only 350 jobs being proposed over 20 years and with environmental reparations costs projected to be in the hundreds of millions-why are we even considering this one-sided fiasco of a proposal. I, and many other businessmen, would be happy to propose far less damaging options for 350 jobs at a fraction of the cost to the state that these will become. Please deny PolyMet's permit until a far safer and less intrusive methodology is found and verified to work. Chris Bangs 8846 Pheasant Run Rd Woodbury, MN 55125 Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Bollis

46047

DNR I urge you NOT to accept the SDEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage a

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Bollis

46055

DNR I urge you NOT to accept the SDEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perp

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Bremer

43566

Dear DNR staff, Having reviewed the NorthMet proposal and followed much of the reporting on this issue, I would like to offer the following comments: The EIS states: "Mining would be conducted in three open pits. The East Pit and West Pit would be mined simultaneously through the first 11 years of the mine life. Mining would cease at the East Pit at approximately year 11 and continue at the West Pit until year 20. The Central Pit would be mined between years 11 and 16 and would ultimately be combined with the East Pit." This is not a long-term jobs program. It only delays the need for development of good, new jobs in that part of the state. We would not offer to have a nuclear waste storage facility in Minnesota just for the jobs - we would want the strongest assurances of safety and even then we might see the risk as too high. And such jobs would last for centuries, not 11-20 years. This is not a safe plan. The plan does not seem to adequately address the consequences of failures of primary water protection mechanisms. Numerous disasters in the US and elsewhere have shown that these systems cannot be trusted to behave as promised, or even as designed. As someone with a child who lived through the earthquake and unnecessarily disastrous Fukushima consequences in Japan, I don't want other parents to have to worry about their children's safety due to the poor decisions of others. Even now, my son (still temporarily in Japan) has to worry about the food he eats. I urge you to take the long view and turn down this application. In addition, this mine would damage the tourism business, including hunting and fishing, reducing long-term jobs in the region and our sense of being connected as Minnesotans by our commitment to our beautiful land and clean, productive waters. The proposed mine is a bad deal for Minnesota, even economically. As someone who is very concerned about the future of middle-class jobs in this state, I urge you to take a pass on this flash-in-the-pan. The EIS states "The monitoring of water, wetland, vegetation, and other resources would continue. Adaptive management would be implemented, if necessary, to protect the environment for the long term." There are no examples of good environmental outcomes related to copper-nickel mining. The checkered history of environmental care on the part of PolyMet's parent company has been terrible. They have not lived up to their promises and they do not inspire trust. I urge you to be the trustworthy ones, and turn this down. As a parent of three young adults who will have to live with the decisions you make, I strongly urge you to do what is best for the future of our land, water, and people. Do not approve the PolyMet application. Sincerely, Christine D. Bremer, Phd 6001 Ewing Ave S Edina, MN 55410

Chris Chiappari

16972

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Chris Chiappari 1937 Fremont Ave S. #2 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Chiappari

50258

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Chris Chiappari 1937 Fremont Ave S. #2 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Chris Commers

57229

How do we sustain water treatment for 200 years? 500 years? Who will pay for this? I'm trying to find answers to many questions unanswered in the PolyMet proposal to exploit the resources NE of Hoyt Lakes, MN. At this point the DNR should deny the permit application. Do we Minnesotan's really want Glencore (parent co of PolyMet) to bring their show here? Please reject SDIS! Chris Commers 14380 County Road 51 Norwood, MN 55368

Chris Dahlberg

18175

I'm Jim Hofsommer from Aurora, Minnesota. And I'm ceding my time to Chris Dahlberg, St. Louis County commissioner right where this project is taking place. Good evening, or as we say in Finish (speaks foreign language). My name is Chris Dahlberg. I am St. Louis County commissioner. I'm also the current chair of the natural resource committee. St. Louis County is on record of supporting precious mineral mining. I'm a Finlander-Swede. I'm a fourth-generation Minnesotan. My daughter there is in the back, Mia O'Leene. And one of the things is we have a long tradition of mining up on The Range, and families that are involved in that. And so my great-grandfather Andrew Maki was farming up there 100 years. What I want to say is that it's not only a workplace and play place, but it's our home. And we take care of our backyard, including the environment. And we support mining. We have a process here, it's a solid process, science over emotion. The process needs a resolution. It needs a decision. The reality is that there is some here that just oppose mining. Period. No matter what we say or prove, they're against it. I fear that this process is becoming unreasonably lengthy and burdensome. It has taken longer to get a permit for mining on the Iron Range than it took us to get a man to the moon. And that was 1960's technology. We are allowing nations to hand us our own lunch. We need to unleash America's great workforce, including such people as our building and trades out there and jobless today. In my own district we have a foundry called ME Global. And recently they had an expansion. Great in my district. 50 new jobs. And not only that, how would you like to have an expansion where you had the business ready to go into the future years in? But you know the sad part where that turns, all of those grinders that they're making in that foundry are going off to Mongolia, China. We are letting countries such as China and India take us over. And we need to turn this around. So I'm asking today let's get the permit issued. Let's get jobs going in Minnesota. And let's get precious mineral mining going on the Iron Range for the next 100 years ahead of us. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Davies

39601

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Chris Davies 7087 Eldorado Ct Cannon Falls, MN 55009-5255

Chris Engel

18294

My name is Chris Engel, E-N-G-E-L. My address is 11615 Northgate Lane, technically Pine River, or Cross Lake, Minnesota. We have owned property in central and northern Minnesota for many, many years. I have traveled extensively in the Iron Range area, and particularly as kids. I spent time in the Babbitt/Ely area, and have studied the nearly 2,000 pages of the SDEIS. And for the greater good of Minnesota, including the propagation of new jobs and a more vital northern Minnesota economy, we are absolutely in favor of proceeding with the PolyMet project. We believe it will be a great benefit to the State of Minnesota. Albeit, maybe not to the level of shale oil in North Dakota, but in fact Minnesota needs to start generating our own jobs and generating our own new economy, and revitalizing that northern part of Minnesota. I think it would be of great benefit for us to do it in-house. I think that the Minnesota DNR, Army Corps of Engineers, along with the US Forest Service, and along with the EPA, have done an extensive study. And I believe from what I've read and what I understand, I believe that the project can be done safely and with a minimum amount of negativity towards the environment. So thank you.

42831

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Erickson

1776

Dec 10, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

chris fastner

15405

I would like to express my opposition to the Polymet and Twin Metals mine development being considered near Ely. The proximity to the federally-protected Boundary Waters Wilderness makes this project clearly and simply too risky. Given the track record for this type of mining and the proximity to the BWCAW it would be unconscionable for the state of MN to allow this development to proceed. Sincerely, Chris Fastner 303 Second Ave NW Aitkin, MN 56431

Chris Fleege

47663

I fully support this project and I ask for the state and federal regulators to approve this and move it to the next level. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. As a person who lives, works and plays in the area, I understand the need to balance use of resources like minerals and preservation of resources such as water and air. I feel this SDEIS lays the proper groundwork for developing an environmentally and economically sustainable project and I wholeheartedly support it. Chris Fleege 4031 Regent Street Duluth, Minnesota 55804 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Gordon

19962

To Whom It May Concern, I am resident of the state of Minnesota. I oppose the development of the NorthMet Mining Project. The potential impact on waters that flow into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area as well as into Lake Superior, one of the largest bodies of fresh water is too large to risk. No amount of money can guarantee this protection. In fact, every other mine similar to the one being proposed by PolyMet has left pollution in its wake. Other mines of this nature have destroyed the water habitat and left the land worse off than before it was mined. Even in a water rich state like Minnesota, there are already serious problems with our water table depletion. We cannot risk this incredibly valuable fresh water for a mere 360 temporary jobs. The jobs are here until the mining company depletes all the metals and moves on to the next one. The 5-379 million people of our state and the over 250 million people of our nation far outweigh the 360 permanent jobs created by this mine. This mining company will do what many other companies have done. They will take the resources and destroy the land and water in its path and then leave when they have nothing left to take. This company has no allegiance to our state, our resources, the animals that reside in the area or our people. They care about the money and their bottom line and their shareholders. We need to protect the BWCA and Lake Superior as if they are the precious resources that they are and this means keeping PolyMet away. Please deny PolyMet the right to mine. The costs outweigh the benefits. I oppose the North Met Mining Project. Thank you, Chris Gordon 1240 Thomas Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104 651-338-1493

Chris Haenisch

58104

I understand that we need to mine to get resources and it's important to find safe and sustainable ways to do that. This proposed project does not sound safe with the 500 year hitch to contain the pollution. What would have happened is the big flood last year occurred after the mining had started, or what will happen when the next 100 year flood occurs. I think Polymet will declare bankruptcy and walk away from any responsibility like they have in the past. I will not support any of the politicians who are supporting this effort.

Chris Hanson

20066

--Original Message-- From: chris@thedatabank-com [mailto:chris@thedatabank-com] Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 2:53 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is fatally flawed, and needs to go back to the drawing board to be fixed. You should not burden the next fifteen generations with toxic water pollution and cleanup costs from a sulfide mine that hasn't been properly planned. Sincerely, Chris Hanson 10 E Oaks Rd Saint Paul, MN 55127-2511

Chris Heesch

54186

I don't think the mining project is worth it because it can damage the water. It can also potentially take away camping and canoeing areas. Being an outdoorsy person I would hate for it to damage or take away any of that because those are things I love to do when it's nice. Thanks for taking your time to read this.

Chris Heeter

38266

Mar 6, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, We are looking at hundreds of years-by PolyMet's own reckoning-of recovery needed in order to re-gain the water quality that we now have This is not something we can risk, not a resource that we can replace in any way. Yes, the lure of jobs is strong, the needs are great. And, the jobs that would be created are not from a long view. Not from a place that is sustainable, even for mining in the long run. Please protect us from that place in all of us that wants a quick fix for our economy. Help us stand for something that looks beyond a few decades and on into preserving a treasured area of wilderness that may not ever recover from this meddling-most certainly not in our lifetime or many generations to come. Be bold. Be wild. Protect what speaks to our greater selves. This is not worth the risk. Thank you. Chris Heeter Sincerely, Chris Heeter 1835 Meadowview Rd Bloomington, MN 55425-2455 (763) 479-3954

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Leier

41607

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Chris Leier Minneapolis, Minnesota

Chris Lian

15450

To whom it may concern - As a citizen of northeastern minnesota I am vehemently opposed to copper mining. The fact that waste water will need to be treated indefinitely(never) to avoid polluting our waters is a very scary proposition. This project should get rejected due to that fact alone. This is a bad deal for minnesota not only environmentally, but also from a business standpoint. Polymet plans on processing the metals in another state costing jobs in minnesota. This project threatens tourism and property values in the region. I purchased a lake cabin a few years ago and refused to look at property anywhere near this area because of the extreme environmental threats, machinery noise, etc I know I'm not alone. Lake Vermillion has very low calcium levels making it unlikely zebra mussels will have the ability to colonize in its waters. Calcium could leech into this lake via numerous waterways tied to the mine allowing calcium levels to increase to a level that zebra mussels could possibly thrive. This type of mining has never been done safely. There will be contamination. All of this water flows into the St Louis River watershed and into Lake Superior poisoning the water I and tens of thousands of other people drink. Th risk of an environmental catastrophe vs. the creation of a couple hundred jobs is a risk minnesota can't affoRd Please protect this precious area of our state and our basic need of clean drinking water and REJECT this irresponsible mining project. The average Minnesotan is counting on it. Christopher Lian 308 Kenilworth Ave Duluth, Mn 55803 218-724-4763

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Lish

48504

Thursday, March 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Subject: Send the PolyMet Mine SDEIS Back for Further Analysis as "Incomplete" Dear MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay, Regional EPA Administrator Susan Hedman, USACE Regulatory Branch Chief Tamara Cameron, USACE Regulatory Program Manager for Mining Projects Douglas Bruner, and USFS Deputy Forest Supervisor Timothy Dabney, As someone who values clean water and as a former resident of northern Minnesota, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine copper-nickel (sulfide) ore in northeastern Minnesota wetlands at the headwaters of streams flowing into Lake Superior as described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I am also concerned that this risky proposal will set a precedent for how other mines in the Upper Great Lakes will be evaluated, including some within the watershed of the world-renowned Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. "Our duty to the whole, including to the unborn generations, bids us to restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose and method." - Theodore Roosevelt This mine proposal does not meet the highest and most protective standards for our water and I urge the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to send the SDEIS back for further information and analysis. The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for—information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. I also urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. "Our government is like a rich and foolish spendthrift who has inherited a magnificent estate in perfect order, and then has left his fields and meadows, forests and parks to be sold and plundered and wasted." - John Muir The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest Not surprisingly, acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. "As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris McGreevy

46853

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments describing what I think are several substantive deficiencies in the Polymet SDEIS. These are my own comments prepared after reviewing the SDEIS.

1- Land Exchange. The proposed land exchange is key to the overall project. I believe there are several problems with the land exchange that are either not addressed or are addressed inadequately in the report.

a. The map in the study does not seem to accurately reflect the Hundred Mile Swamp. It does not show the full dimensions of the area and the drainage through Langley Creek. This has several implications for the overall SDEIS. The main one of course is that there is a connection from the Polymet project to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness as Langley Creek flows through the Dunka River to the Kawishiwi and on to Birch Lake. Water monitoring and remediation at Langley Creek is not mentioned in the study. The fact that this has been missed, intentionally or unintentionally, call in to question quality of the entire SDEIS. The connection to the BWCAW watershed should also mean increased federal scrutiny of the project.

b. The Hundred Mile Swamp which is proposed to be exchanged for is an important wetland supporting wildlife and plant life. The various parcels proposed to be exchanged for the Hundred Mile Swamp are not the same quality of environment or even equivalent wetland. Therefore if the proposed exchange were to go forward, as project runoff flows into the wetland, the result would be an overall degradation of the environment in Minnesota.

2- Air Quality. The portion of the SDEIS that considers air quality impacts considers only direct effects of air quality from the mining project from grinding and tailings pile duSt It does not consider the effect of power generation needed to operate the plant in this area and what effect that would have on the Superior National ForeSt Certainly the amount of power needed to operate this project for Polymet and for expected use of excess processing capacity by Twin Metals would far exceed anything needed for the current population of the area and would have a negative impact on the Superior National Forest and the health of the population.

3- Reclamation. The portion of the study that addresses reclamation states that is “uncertain how long” water treatment would be needed but that modeling shows that at 500 years of treatment, water quality would be within acceptable levels. The section also says that Polymet “would be held accountable”. Later the SDEIS explains, without details, that financial assurance instruments would be created. There are several problems with the lack of specificity in this section.

a. There are currently no financial institutions capable of guarantees extending to 500 years.

b. Polymet could legally declare bankruptcy at any point in time and could no longer be held accountable in any way.

c. Given that the current length of time needed for remediation is unknown, how can any financial assurance be made that could cover any unexpected increase in the amount of time needed for remediation and take into account Polymet’s ability to declare bankruptcy and walk away, leaving the taxpayers of Minnesota to pay for clean up.

4- Unusual Weather Events. The report fails to consider the increasing likelihood of unusual weather events including large volume rainfalls, high winds equivalent to the 1999 blow down, as well as extreme winter temperatures, all of which could cause equipment failures, water runoff surges, and retaining wall failures.

5- Comparative Studies. The SDEIS fails to study the project in the context of other sulfide copper/nickel mines and the overall historical environmental impact as well as the general regulatory compliance history of the companies involved,

Chris Mortenson

7065

I am continually dismayed that our intelligent and technologically savvy society still holds to arcane mineral extraction techniques. This debate is only a replay of the same debate since the inception of environmental impact statement: how much do we need to tweak our outdated mining techniques. Why is there no one in this debate saying we need to develop and implement different mining practices instead of making small changes to outdated techniques. An open pit mine with toxic tailing reservoirs. Really. Is it 1950- If the there is truly the amount of copper and nickel Polymet thinks there is, they should be willing to invest in the research and development necessary to extract the ores in an innovative and environmentally safe manner. Doesn't this also add R and D jobs as well. Chris Mortenson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Nelson

35947

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. My demand is that a NO VOTE is needed in this issue. How can we continue to trade off our national treasures to allow pollution and to add to a corporation's profit. It is not acceptable to allow this mining for PolyMet Mining Corporation. Just another accident waiting to happen. When our water is polluted we have to then attempt to clean it in order to make it potable. Fish and wildlife die because they have no other access. Our lands have been pillaged and raped by big business. Enough is enough. This is a NO VOTE so Vote NO.. Sincerely, Chris Nelson 1848 Vassar Dr Naperville, IL 60565-9265 (630) 527-0872

chris nordstrom

41784

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Chris Norman

54819

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris O'Brien

47310

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Chris Perry

40135

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Chris Perry 447 E Sheridan St Ely, MN 55731-1455 (218) 248-1431

Alphabetical by sender's first name

chris raynr

10703

Dear Sirs: My name is Chris Rayner in Red Wing, Minn. 55066 (651-388-4447). I am in favor of the Polymet mining operation. I think the State has done a good job in vetting this proposal and now it is time to let the company proceed. People who are against the mining have said someone will have to monitor the water for 500 years. I don't think that is true but let's say it is true. Don't we as a society monitor or test water where- ever people settle I know communities around the world test water on a ongoing basis. Look how towns and cities treat their sewage. I feel that Polymet will operate their mining operation in a prudent manner. Sincerely, Christopher Rayner

Chris Robinson

39220

Dear DNR, The maps are wrong and the environmental impact statement is inadequate until the maps have been corrected. While the true One Hundred Mile Swamp is over 10 miles long and drains out of its east end to the BWCA, PolyMet's environmental impact statement maps draw a much smaller swamp less than 6 miles long that cuts off the eastern portion of the swamp, creating the illusion that the mine and BWCA are not connected. Sincerely, Chris

Chris Spenningsby

18129

Hello. My name is Chris Spenningsby, S-P-E-N-N-I-N-G-S-B-Y, and I'm a resident of Duluth, Minnesota and I support PolyMet Project as outlined in the SDEIS for three primary reasons. The first reason I believe the PolyMet Project should advance to the permitting phase is my faith is in the environmental review process. Our country and in particular our state have among of the highest standards for air quality and water quality in the world, and our regulatory and permitting process works as designed. One example of this improvement is the improvements made in the underground containment in water treatment since the original draft impact statement in 2009. The regulating agencies at PolyMet identified an improvement in the process, tested and implemented this new design and now they're able to reduce the projected sulfate level in the wastewater discharge to less than 10 milligrams per liter, which by the way, is 25 percent -- 25 times less than the standard required for discharging water. The second reason I support the PolyMet Project is that mining minerals in our state under our very strict regulatory control is the ethical thing to do. We have already decided as a society that minerals such as copper-nickel are required for modern conveniences and we've collectively have chosen to produce and use them. These conveniences include indoor plumbing, electricity, as well as the 64 pounds of copper and 32 pounds of nickel in a Toyota Prius. If the PolyMet Project were not to advance, the world-wide demand for copper that fuels our improvement in the quality of life will still be filled but not under the strict and open environmental review process we're seeing here tonight. Finally, I support the PolyMet Project for the economic benefits documented in this study by the University of Minnesota-Duluth referenced in the environmental impact statement. Economic development in this area creates a future where young people can stay in this area and afford to raise a family and it's not only for the workers and mine, but supporting contractors and those who operate businesses in the area. The economic benefits will also trickle outward to areas such as Duluth, where I live, and down of St. Paul in the form of taxes and because of the strong environmental regulations and oversight in our state, these jobs can exist with the existing jobs in our tourism sector. I would like to thank the DNR, Army Corps of Engineers, US Forest Service, as well as everyone who showed up tonight. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, "Wherever the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government." Thank you.

Chris Swensen

42726

See attachment

Chris Timm-Hughes

44060

I am opposed to any new mining in Northern Minnesota. I believe the land should be preserved. Chris Timm-Hughes

Chris Vreeland

5996

I believe the co-agencies have done a very complete job on the EIS. You can't determine all the problems, but I believe they have all the tools in place to take care of any problems that come up. Citizens of Hoyt Lakes have coexisted with mining for 60 years with no problems and with very good working relationships with the companies. I believe the same will be true with Polymet. We need to move forward with precious mining, these are metals we use every day and we need to mine them in a environmentally friendly way. I believe Polymet will do it the right way and this EIS proves that. Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chris Waltz

18242

My name is Chris Waltz. That's spelled C-H-R-I-S, W-A-L-T Z. And my question would be specifically on EIS report. I'm wondering, and I'm not fully sure about the process, but I'm wondering why the MPCA is not involved in that process, and specifically were they excluded from that process? And then the other agency that I was surprised wasn't involved in that process was the US Fish & Wildlife Service, so I'm wondering why those two organizations weren't in that draft EIS report.

18260

My name is Chris Waltz. I had a question specific to the DNR. I'm wondering what assurances they could provide where tailings and other pollutants from the copper-nickel mine would not flow into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area? I didn't feel that was fully addressed in the EIS statement or in at least the executive summary that I read. So, some clarification there on, you know, what pollutants, if any. So far it doesn't seem like any, but just assurances that pollutants won't be running into the Boundary Water Canoe Area. And then a follow-up to that is if the potential would exist that pollutants could run into there, could we have assurances through the financial assurances mechanism to properly fund those pollutants, if they do discharge into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area?

Christeen Stone

16288

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christeen Stone

39783

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Christeen Stone 2727 Hazelwood St Saint Paul, MN 55109-1158 (651) 777-4864

Christey Sharpshair

41617

Hello, My name is Christey Sharpshair, and I'm taking part in a conference at Gustavus University concerning environmental justice. I have heard about the proposed plan to possibly build and maintain a mine in northeastern Minnesota, and I would like to say that I am against such a proposal. After what I have learned of the effects this project will inevitably have on the environment-and eventually the people-the negative consequences far outweigh any positive benefits on the economy the project might have. Please look further into ecological ramifications and weigh these damages with the benefits carefully. Again, I propose a stop to this mining project. Thank you so much for reading. Christey Sharpshair

Christiaan Petersen

40273

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Christiaan Petersen PO Box 66926 St Petersburg, FL 33736 US

Christian Nelson

37313

To Whom it May Concern, The proposed Polymet mine has unacceptable risks and therefore should not be approved. 1 generation of jobs is not worth 19 generations (500 years) of clean-up efforts. Not only is this just outright wrong, it's likely not feasible that the money will exist to cleanup something whose value was cashed in 480 years ago. A time-span of 500+ years means catastrophe is not a question of 'if', but rather 'when'. Without clean water an area is uninhabitable. Forever. The risks are simply too high and the gains too small and for too few people. Sincerely, Christian Nelson 910 25th Street Cloquet, MN 55720

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christiana Wilke 54844

See attachment

Christie Jarmey 18339

Hi, my name is Christy Jarmey, C-H-R-I-S-T-Y J-E-A-R-M-E-Y (phonetic). I am a Hibbing native, born and raised in Hibbing and I had to move away from Hibbing to get an education and job. I was gone for about ten years and was able to get back to the Hibbing area, in northern Minnesota. The Supplemental Draft EIS provides a good portrait, a good picture of the potential environmental and economic impact of the project, but it doesn't soften the impact the project will have on the communities and on the families, and especially the educational programs throughout northern Minnesota. It (phonetic) has been working hard to allow educational opportunities and to allow residents to stay where they live and play in northern Minnesota; something that I could not do. Many of our educational opportunities, such as the science and engineering festivals, the after-school programs, the new post-secondary educational opportunities that are being developed in northern Minnesota are being funded by the area's various businesses. The PolyMet project will provide substantial additional funding to our area's educational programs, which will help the whole state. PolyMet has already been engaged in helping set forth various educational programs for the last five years. This has included the area's new engineering program, a new post-secondary program that just started in Virginia, Minnesota that enables or that allows our young people to stay in northern Minnesota. PolyMet is good for the state and I support this project and the Supplemental Draft EIS. On another note, I have a cabin in Forbes, Minnesota, which is just immediately downstream of the tailings basin. Our lake is full of wild rice. The whole area is full of wild rice. Our cabin neighbors go out and harvest wild rice on the lake and I have friends that come to the lake and harvest wild rice on the lake, before they even knew that I was on the lake. The reason I want to point this out to you is that I want to point out that responsible mining and clean water can become hand in hand.

Christie Milczanowski 58020

I support the no action alternative! The mining of copper/nickel sulfide ores is a toxic type of mining that puts our communities environment and local economies at risk... long after the profits' are spent. Please extend the no comment period to 180 days. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Christie Nelson 54818

See attachment

christie white dauphin 10728

As a resident of Minnesota and owner of cabin and 94 acres of land in Fairbanks Township I can only say: there has not yet been a copper nickle mining operation that has not severely polluted the surrounding area of land and water supply. Why not wait. Wait until the science has proven itself elsewhere. Those minerals will not be worth less for waiting. In fact, they will probably be worth more. Talk is cheap. Mining companies want to mine. The people who run them are unlikely to be affected by negative consequences. Water seeps. My recently drilled cabin water well is 40 miles from Hoyt Lakes. My daughter and son are joint owners of this land. Don't destroy the future relying on untested science. Thank you, Christie Dauphin 2853 40th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55458 1185 Gabbro Road Brimson, MN 55602

Christina 54530

You know what you're doing is wrong. Stop mining for everyone that is not you!

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Bellert

9886

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christina Bellert 17064 Saddlewood trail Minnetonka, MN 55345

18648

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christina Bellert 17064 Saddlewood trail Minnetonka, MN 55345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Bellert

47001

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this test PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams grams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untreated every year. In fact, the SDEIS predicts that many years after closure this could violate the sulfate standard to protect wild rice, requiring additional measures (5-142). The SDEIS is contradictory, on the one hand relying on mechanical water treatment for hundreds of years in order to seemingly meet the sulfate standard, but also describing possible passive treatments that may be developed that would seasonally violate the protective sulfate standards. The EIS should eliminate that contradiction. Lastly, the SDEIS inadequately characterizes wild rice waters downstream of the PolyMet sites. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Council has provided additional wild rice sites other than those included in the SDEIS. The EIS should be revised to include these additional wild rice waters. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I do believe it is important to protect all of our natural resources. Why is one cultures lively hood more important then the others. Native Americans rely on wild rice to supplement their lively hood whether they collect the rice and us it at home or sell it to generate income why is their way to make money not as important and miners. Because there are more miners. Wild rice is a delicate plant and will be impacted by the smallest change in its environment. Not only will Native Americans feel the loss of this plant but there are other impacts on our environment that will result in the lose of this plant. I believe everyone who is able and willing to work should. But we do not have the right to destroy our world to make money. Maybe not everyone can working in the mining industry and live in their home town or town they have grown to love. Maybe workers need to reinvent themselves reeducate themselves for a different career and maybe have to leave the town they love. I would love to live in Ely it is BEAUTIFUL up there but I cannot find gainful employment so I do not live there. I go where I can find work. I even had to reinvent myself because that area I would rather work in the jobs are few and far between. There are areas that and more importantly watersheds that make a greater impact on more then just the area up north. This mini

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Bellert

50723

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christina Bellert 17064 Saddlewood trail Minnetonka, MN 55345

Christina Diver

57204

I find the SDEIS faulty and inadequate because the proposed plan does NOT protect Minnesota taxpayers. Christine Diver 1605 N. Milwaukee, 9B Libertyville, IL 60048

Christina Erickson

4156

Dec 22, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please do not support Polymet's effort for sulfide mining permits. Sulfide mining threatens the areas of Minnesota that I love most; wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region. Even our fabulous Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acids and heavy metal contamination pollute waters. The industry needed to extract the ore creates garbage, and the jobs it creates aren't sustainable over generations. At that point, we won't have our tourism to turn to either. Refuse to accept Polymet today, and keep our natural areas safe, for us and for the future. Todd and Christina Erickson The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Christina Erickson 1764 Simpson St Saint Paul, MN 55113-6261

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Erickson

51605

Dec 22, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please do not support Polymet's effort for sulfide mining permits. Sulfide mining threatens the areas of Minnesota that I love most; wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region. Even our fabulous Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acids and heavy metal contamination pollute waters. The industry needed to extract the ore creates garbage, and the jobs it creates aren't sustainable over generations. At that point, we won't have our tourism to turn to either. Refuse to accept Polymet today, and keep our natural areas safe, for us and for the future. Todd and Christina Erickson The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Christina Erickson 1764 Simpson St Saint Paul, MN 55113-6261

Christina Klein

44142

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Christina Klein Place de l'Europe Esch-sur-Alzette, None 4112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Krauz

38781

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Mullozzi

42228

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Christina Munko

40899

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Christina Munko 1000 Ivy Hill Rd Philadelphia, PA 19150-3232 (724) 594-6948

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christina Rarick

39791

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Christina Rarick 424 Monroe Ave S Hopkins, MN 55343-8456

Christina Sand

45456

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, After attending the St Paul PolyMet hearing, doing research on sulfide mining as PolyMet itself, and reading some of the environmental sections of the EIS, I am deeply concerned with the risks and inevitable damages that would occur from the proposed North Met project. As a college student, I am constantly thinking of the future and the world that I someday hope to bring children into. I want them to know the untarnished BWCA as I do. I understand that we have a desire to continue to obtain the resources that reside at the proposed mine site, but hope instead we can focus Minnesota's time and energy and commitment on sustainable resources that will continue to provide for us into the future. This mine project is a risk and PolyMet's attempted promise for 500 years of tending to the site is seriously beyond their control- that promise extends farther into the future than our nation's history does into the past. I cannot trust PolyMet and neither can MN. We should not be risking the beauty and purity of the BWCA and the water that sustains many people residing there. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. This earth is not ours to destroy, and many generations to come will look to the decision that is made on this project to determine our commitment to preserving the environment and a love towards them. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Miss Christina Sand 28407 County Road 176 Freeport, MN 56331-9730

Christine

39344

Sent from my iPad Hello we are in support of the PolyMet project. This would be good for the Iron Range, by creating jobs so people could stay and work here. We believe this could be done without hurting the environment. Brad Nosie Chris Nosie 6150 Hwy 73 Chisholm Mn 55719

Christine Ahmann-Maples

38956

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Christine Ahmann-Maples 541 Warner Ave S Mahtomedi, MN 55115-6837 (612) 709-7581

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Beckwith

16399

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I grew up in Northern Minnesota near the site of this mine. I understand first hand how dependent the people of that region are on mining as a way of life. That dependency sometimes impedes good judgement as there are not many opportunities to positively impact the economy. Environmental laws exist to protect our natural resources, especially when good judgement is impeded by the prospect of short gain. So I as a former resident of the iron range, and as a current resident of Minnesota and as a US citizen, I get to have a voice on this. These mines represent reckless greed and a complete disrespect for future generations living in northern Minnesota as well as throughout Minnesota. I also urge the SDEIS to fully address the long term financial plan to treat water in perpetuity as well as incorporate a cost benefit analysis which takes into account irreversible impacts to the BWCA. Sincerely, Mrs Christine Beckwith 9243 Avalon Path Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-4431

Christine Cole

18353

I am Christine Cole. I am giving my time to Matt Tyler.

42598

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Frank

16700

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

43119

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Christine Frank 115 2nd Ave S #714 Minneapolis, MN 55401

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Frank

43190

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The lack of health impacts in the document from exposure to toxic heavy metal contamination, the inhalation of mesothelioma-causing asbestos fibers, the drinking of acidic water, and breathing fugitive dust and other forms of air pollution is inexcusable. All of these are unacceptable risks which no one should have to bear-either mine workers or those living in surrounding communities or on tribal lands. Given that the chemical body burden of the average adult in industrialized society is some 250 chemical compounds, no one can afford further contamination of their mind/body. This is especially true for children, who suffer even higher concentrations. PolyMet needs to go back to the drawing board on this point. For the sake of human health now and in the future, there should be no hard-rock, metallic sulfide mining in Minnesota whatsoever. Sincerely, Ms Christine Frank 115 2nd Ave S Apt 714 Minneapolis, MN 55401-2060

43524

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. With acid mine drainage expected to be virtually in perpetuity (Roman mines in Great Britain have been exuding acid seepage for 2,000 years), the price tag for water treatment will be practically insurmountable. Once a mine is exhausted, the usual behavior of most mining companies is to file bankruptcy, then cut and run without so much as a by your leave, leaving taxpayers to foot the bill. The EPA is now coping with numerous SuperFund Sites, costing billions in clean-up especially in the WeSt I have family in Colorado, which has 30,000 abandoned mines, affecting 1,300 miles of streams and know first hand what this is like. Additionally, the US Forest Service estimates that there are 20,000 to 50,000 mines on Forest Service land that have negatively impacted 8,000 to 16,000 kilometers of streamS The inevitable pollution of Superior National Forest land and the St Louis River Watershed would be adding to these tragic statistics. My folks reside on the Western Slope of the Rockies. When we drive up into the San Juan Mountains, we can see from the highway the yellowboy staining the streambeds bright yellow, orange, and red from the numerous mines along the way. The notorious Summitville Gold Mine is by far the worst disaster in the San Juans. Originally a shaft mine in the 1870s, open-pit mining of gold was initiated by the Canadian firm, Summitville Consolidated Mining, in the 1980s, using cyanide heap-leach techniques for extracting low-grade ores, the high-grade stuff having played out in the 1950s. The irreplaceable alpine tundra ecosystem was blasted and stripped away, now gone forever. Due to a damaged pond liner, which the sloppy, cheap-ass company failed to have properly repaired, there was a massive release of toxic metals and cynaide along with highly acidic waters into the Alamosa River in 1991- As per usual, the mine owner declared bankruptcy and bolted, forfeiting the \$3 million bond it had put up. Clearly, money is no guarantee of preventing such a cataclysm. With the pH level of 3-0 to 4-0, the water was the equivalent of vinegar or battery acid. Either way, nothing can live in that environment. The result

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Frank

43754

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Clearly, mining of any sort is a highly energy- and carbon intensive industry especially when it is powered by filthy fossil fuels. Jobs from such an enterprise can hardly be called green. To engage in this type of dirty production is suicidal. We have already passed a crucial tipping point with the extreme loss of Arctic Sea Ice, which has upset Earth's heat balance to such a degree that the temperature gradient between the poles and the equator has decreased. This has resulted in an altered Jet Stream and weather fronts that get stuck in place and last for weeks on end be they heat waves, droughts, or deep freezes. A weakened polar vortex due to human influence on Arctic conditions has resulted in prolonged periods of bitter cold in the temperate zone of North America unlike any previously experienced in the second half of the 20th century. That occurred this year while the globe as a whole just experienced its hottest January on recoRd For the sake of the climate and the security of future generations, there should be no hard-rock, metallic sulfide in Minnesota whatsoever. Sincerely, Ms Christine Frank 115 2nd Ave S Apt 714 Minneapolis, MN 55401-2060

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Harshman

16034

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Christine Huff

38904

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please protect Lake Superior. You have influence that most of us do not. Please use that influence to help protect the future for our children, and their children. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Christine Huff 1472 Minnehaha Ave W Saint Paul, MN 55104-1911

Christine Oliver

5908

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, This is not the right thing for our state. Our northern lakes and forests are the most invaluable resource we have in this state, this proposal has a high, high risk of contaminating these significantly. How are we considering letting any company, not to mention a brand new company with no formal experience in this type of mining, start a project that we already know, even barring any emergencies, would need 500 years of follow up. Who will pay the price if we cannot miraculously keep this company solvent and in charge of this for the next half millienium. Incidents such as what just occurred on West Virginia's Elk River might be a reminder to us of the potential for things to go array, and again, this situation is even at its onset problematic. Thank you, Christine Oliver 3224 Colfax Ave S Minneapols, MN 55408 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Ordemann

39978

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Christine Ordemann PO Box 68 Lutsen, MN 55612-0068 (218) 340-6773

Christine Pikala

9909

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christine Pikala 4825 34th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Pikala

18679

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christine Pikala 4825 34th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55417

50753

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christine Pikala 4825 34th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Tendle

39813

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Christine Tendle 2435 Brenner St Saint Paul, MN 55113-1002

Christine Umhoefer

44381

Dear Ms Fay, I realize all of you will most likely be long dead and gone by the time the damage to our environment because of the copper mines will start affecting the residents of Minnesota, and everyone else who loves the beauty of this beautiful place. And no one will remember your name, and that you were part of the problem, and that you abdicated your responsibility to the citizens and the environment. Maybe you do not care about future generations, including your own. Maybe you have been given rewards for caving to large corporations. Maybe you have not read the science reports detailing the damage these mines will do. Maybe you figure it's too hard to stand up to powerful corporations. The list of reasons for your supporting the mine are numerous, and I believe all of them lack credibility. I live on White Bear Lake. The lack of oversight and the DNR's obligation to protect our environment is clearly visible on this lake. It will affect thousands of people economically, recreationally, and in as yet to be determined other areas. There is a lawsuit pending because of the past failure of the people who are the face of the DNR. There are excuses and double talk. It will cost the taxpayers of Minnesota millions by the time it is finished.. This is nothing compared to the mistake the DNR is currently contemplating making regarding mining. The copper mines are an even more serious environmental issue, negatively affecting the entire state, not just one small lake, hundreds of years into the future. Please read the objective science and have the integrity and courage to do the right thing for all of Minnesota. Fight those in the state government who do not have the wisdom to make the intelligent decisions. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Christine Umhoefer Christine Umhoefer 49 peninsula road Dellwood, MN 55110 6514264040

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christine Umhoefer

44507

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christine Umhoefer 49 peninsula road Dellwood, MN 55110

Christine Underdahl

40187

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Christine Underdahl 2205 Dunedin Ave Duluth, MN 55803-2226 (218) 724-6509

Christopher Apriori-Mendoza

41154

has shown a history of environmental neglect. I used to travel the boundary waters with my father, and hope to do so oneday with my daughter. What is being proposed in unacceptable. As a student of Economics, I understand your reasoning, but think you logic in pursuing the mining project do not take the natural aesthetic and environmental resource is will at the expense of. please do not allow PolyMet to pursue mining anywhere near the BWCA/Quetico.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Berger 54529

I'm interested in learning about existing copper mines, their environmental impact statements and how successfully each has avoided environmental pollution. I believe this background should be included in the PolyMet EIS as it is representative of actual and likely outcomes.

Christopher Boyd 42080

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Christopher Boyd Minneapolis, Minnesota

Christopher Carlson 15749

See attachment

41846

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Christopher Carlson Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Childs

38645

Comment on the Northmet SDEIS; CO2e and climate concerns While the planet as a whole just experienced the fourth warmest January on record, Minnesotans froze in near-zero temperatures quite possibly the (outwardly ironic) result of imbalanced heating of the Arctic and the more slowly-warming temperate zone, a likely greenhouse-effect-related imbalance that may have impacted the strength and flow of the jet stream, sending unseasonably cold air south from Canada. And yet Minnesota is contemplating the permitting of a mining facility that not only puts both its immediate and regional environment at demonstrated risk - no sulfide-mining operation anywhere having succeeded in demonstrating that it could operate without eventually causing acidic discharge - but which all by itself, as stated in the Polymet SDEIS, is estimated to increase the state's annual combined direct and indirect output of greenhouse gases by nearly half of one percent (0-44 percent; SDEIS 5-2-7, p. 5-430). That is an enormous cumulative quantity of emissions for a single facility. It is also likely an understatement, given - to name just one reason -the potential overall damage to the biota likely to result from such a facility, and the seemingly casual, neatly rounded estimate (10,000 mtpy of CO2e; Table 5-2-7-8) given for terrestrial carbon loss. The potential loss is much higher, and it should be quantified in detail under a worst-case scenario. The industry website [HYPERLINK "http://minecost-com"](http://minecost-com)minecost-com shows values for kg of CO2 directly released onsite per kg of copper produced that run as high as 10 to 1 (<http://www.minecost-com/carbon.htm>). Polymet estimates an output of 36,000 tons (cited at <http://www.northernwilds-com/pages/Explore/perich/understanding-polymets-proposed-copper-mine.shtml>); = ~32,760 tonnes) of copper annually from the proposed mine; a precautionary approach would use the highest demonstrated value for emissions, yielding a figure of up to some 327,000 tonnes of direct onsite CO2 releases per year, compared to the SDEIS value of 196,341 mtpy (Table 5-2-7-8). Why use worst-case scenarios, and why take a precautionary approach. For the well-known reason that ninety-seven percent of credentialed climatologists are now telling us that climate shift - with the potential for medium- and longterm climate shock - is underway, is caused by anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases, and may lead to a rise in global average temperatures sufficient to cause the death of millions of people and to disrupt the very basis of human civilization. Most agree, given that most models have thus far proved conservative when compared to real-world events, that temperature rise in this century is more likely to be toward the high end of the range estimated by the IPCC - likely to run to four degrees Celsius or more - than toward the low end. Do we need a continuous output of copper. Of course we do - ironically, on one level, to continue the advance of clean energy technologies which rely on a steady supply of this metal. What we do not need is copper produced in ways that undermine a core intent of clean energy-production, and energy efficiency, methods: vastly reducing our output of GHGs. We need major advances in copper recycling and advances in technologies that allow for the replacement of copper with alternatives, and/or the use of less of a raw material that is becoming increasingly precious - and increasingly risky to produce. Polymet's plans - and the analysis of those plans - are useless in the pursuit of these essential aiMs Future generations of Minnesotans and future generations everywhere on the globe will look back upon us as either those who, in the face of overwhelming evidence that the earth was being put at gross risk by our addiction to out-of-date, carbon-emitting technologies, elected to take out an insurance policy for the planet or as those who failed to do so. We insure our homes against fire not

Christopher Davidson

16256

Feb 20, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The Boundary Waters is one of our most precious resources. Do not allow PolyMet to degrade it. Thank you, Chris Davidson Hennepin Ave, Minneapolis, MN Sincerely, Mr Christopher Davidson 3411 Hennepin Ave Apt 11 Minneapolis, MN 55408-3800 (612) 270-6635

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Delp

7733

Greetings, I am a physician from Duluth who just wants to respectfully voice my opposition to the proposed mining plans. Health issues including air born mercury and asbestos fibers were not seriously evaluated with the first draft EIS and not with this supplemental draft either. The first draft EIS was judged inadequate by the US EPA. As a physician I see first hand the increase in the cancerous mesothelioma in the taconite industry. Polymet has never run a mine-they are a fronting corporation for Glencore which has a rich history of environmental damage. Tailings will go on top of existing taconite tailings in one of the mine pits. Discharge from a number of pits on the range already exceed standards for a number of heavy metals including the pit Polymet will use. Polymet is maintaining that a limestone base and synthetic liner will contain discharge for at least two hundred years (the point in their modeling at which time the contaminated water can be expected to get no worse rather than the contamination subsiding to safe levels). Toxic levels of copper in the pit leachate are modeled to persist for 500 years. Any overflow of the pit will dump this into the Embarrass and Partridge rivers and hence into the St Louis. Groundwater flow from the pit into the underlying aquifer are not adequately addressed in terms of both hydrology studies and planned monitoring of local wells in the event the mine proceeds. I am asking you to protect all of us and the future of Minnesota in this regard Thank you Chris Delp

Christopher Lish

17366

Feb 17, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water and as a former resident of northern Minnesota, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. "Our duty to the whole, including to the unborn generations, bids us to restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose and method." - Theodore Roosevelt PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. "As we peer into society's future, we-you and I, and our government-must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow." - Dwight D. Eisenhower Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. "Every man who appreciates the majesty and beauty of the wilderness and of wild life, should strike hands with the farsighted men who wish to preserve our material resources, in the effort to keep our forests and our game beasts, game-birds, and game-fish-indeed, all the living creatures of prairie and woodland and seashore-from wanton destruction. Above all, we should realize that the effort toward this end is essentially a democratic movement." - Theodore Roosevelt I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise." - Aldo Leopold Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr Christopher Lish PO Box 113 Olema, CA 94950-0113

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Mortenson

41656

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Christopher Orcutt

42067

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Christopher Orcutt Saint Paul, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Panayi

42481

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Christopher Panayi 4 Devon Lodge Carlton Hill Brighton, None BN2 0HF 447966483031

Christopher Ruth

40881

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Christopher Ruth 1611 8th St SE Apt 304 Minneapolis, MN 55414-2373 (201) 403-5186

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher Stauthammer DVM

44608

I am deeply concerned and now motivated to express my concerns and frustrations with your organization in how the mining proposal has been handled. I have always been a proud supporter of the DNR believing that the organization really protected our environment and natural resources. I have lived in many different parts of the US, and by far MN is the best when it comes to our outdoor environment. I incorrectly attributed this to the DNR. Until now, I gladly gave to the DNR with supporting the nongame wildlife fund, environmental plates, Conservation Volunteer and supported many of the hunting and fishing initiatives. I will now be shifting my financial support to organizations that actually function to protect our environment as the DNR disgusts me. I live in the twin cities, but I travel often to the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters. These locations are truly magical and need to be protected. It is amazing to see lakes covered in wild rice and to see threatened species such as moose, lynx, fishers, etc. After reading your mining environmental statement, I believe that it will be destroyed as you do not go far enough to ensure its protection. How are we going to pay for the 500+ years of clean up needed after the mines have gone in 25 years. You know as well as I know that the mining companies are not going to, which means that the people of MN will be left with the bill. What a terrible thing to leave for the future 4-5 generations of MN. Let's think of them for once and not give into the "me" generation who only care about the here and now. The cleanup costs far out way any financial employment gain that mining will bring. My other concern is about the wild rice and sulfate. It is clear that we do not fully know about the danger of sulfate to the wild rice. I wanted to read the reports from the EPA before commenting here but they have not been released. Despite key information that will impact sulfate mining, the DNR has decided to ram this proposal through instead of waiting for the data. This action tells me that the DNR does not care about the science. We need to know what such mines will do to the wild rice. I do not understand how we can even consider such proposals until after the EPA has determined sulfate and sulfide standards. I am sure that we will get this mine regardless of the cleanup and environmental concerns. I am also sure that the DNR will act surprised when the State is stuck with the bill or when there is a major catastrophe and the BWCA is polluted. I see it all of the time when it comes to the environment, ie BP and the Gulf oil spill. To summarize my letter of concern, I request that the DNR look into identifying methods to ensure that the mining companies will pay for the 500 years of estimated clean up. The DNR should see such funds are put in place before any mining can begin. I also request that the DNR analyze the environmental impacts on wild rice, and threatened species (moose, lynx, fishers and loons). As part of this analysis, the DNR needs to look at what impacts would happen if there is a major spill of contaminated water into the surrounding watershed. What would this spill do the fragile waterfowl population. What measures will be in place to limit the damage of such a spill and what methods and associated costs will be in place to promptly address the contamination. I also request that the DNR analyze what the mining will do to tourism as no one wants to camp or visit a polluted waterway or foreSt The regional income is highly dependent on tourism both from the state and nation. What is the projected loss of tourism income when the mine opens and if there is environmental contamination. Thank you for your time. Christopher D. Stauthammer, DVM Faculty Member of the University of Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Christopher T Loch

16503

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christopher T Loch 6145 15th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55423

49957

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Christopher T Loch 6145 15th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55423

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chuck Corliss 18284

Chuck Corliss. My concern is that there is a discrepancy between the number of years that we see on the modeling of 200 or 500 years, but I don't understand why they can't do testing of the ground materials to a level where they can tell us more definitively if we are dealing with a pollution containment for 60 years or 80 years, or if in fact it could be for 500 years. And even though we have asked the questions to several people here today, the answer is they don't know. And I have a significant concern with continuing with the project if in fact it has centuries' worth of cleanup associated with it. And we would hope that the state would ask a more definitive timeline on how long the cleanup would take through some sort of testing procedure. That's it.

Chuck Dixon 17334

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a national treasure, just like the Grand Canyon. The BWCAW is the most pristine wilderness area on the planet. The residue left behind by copper mining seeps into the water, kills plant life, fish and wildlife. In a very short period of time, copper mining will ruin 500 Years Of Echo System. There are several mining companies ready to start mining in this area. As soon as one gets permission to begin mining, the other mining companies will be right behind Poly Met Mining Inc. All of these mining companies are not even US COMPANIES. They are for profit organizations and once they are given the green light, they will destroy this Pristine Wilderness Area. I implore you to take a stand, against allowing the mining companies, anywhere near, any waterway, tributary, stream connected to or running into a Boundary Water Area Lake Or Waterway. Several decades ago, one man stood up against a rich and powerful man, who wanted to dam up this area, to create hydro electric power, for the sole purpose of selling it and making even more money. Something's are worth more than money. The peaceful, pristine, soulful wilderness area, called the BWCA is one of them.. On behalf of my children, their children and your great, great, great grandchildren; PLEASE, SAY NO TO THE MINING COMPANIES SAY NO TO BIG MONEY . Carry on the legacy of the man who originally saved the BWCA. You are in a position to make a decision regarding this matter. On behalf of all of us and future generations, make it a good one. Thank you. P.S. Please forward to Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager , too. Charlie R Dixon Rochester MN 55901

Chuck Engel 54587

See attachment

Chuck Fitzer 47368

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. I'm surprised the State of Minnesota would even consider this project. It provides relatively few jobs for a couple of decades, which will not rejuvenate the economy in the area. In the meantime, the pollution will wreck the environment and not be cleaned up till long after our grandkids are gone. Sincerely, Mr Chuck Fitzer PO Box 537 Center City, MN 55012-0537 (612) 419-8006

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chuck LeGros

45349

I am writing to comment on the SDEIS. I am amazed that we would even consider something that will require careful monitoring and oversight for 500 years. I will write about 3 concerns: clean water, sustainable jobs and long-term oversight and accountability. 1- Clean Water. What is the plan for catching and monitoring all water exposed to sulfide tailings for 500 years given fractured bedrock and fluctuating water tables. How does a mine that needs hundreds of years of monitoring comply with Minnesota law that requires mines to be maintenance free at closure. Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Extend the water pollution model and account for changing water tables and fractured bedrock. 2- Sustainable Work. Jobs are so important in our state and especially in Northern Minnesota. I am concerned that the jobs generated will be short lived, largely utilize imported workers and be divisive in the communities we hope to support. Demand that Polymet and Glencore produce documentation about the numbers of local jobs they expect to produce; to describe how they will train and protect Minnesota laborers, how they will protect existing economies (wild rice, winter and summer tourism, fishing) that depend on clean water, silence, low light pollution; to describe methods for enhancing sense of community rather than creating tension and hostility that we see over and over in communities (most recently in our neighbor North Dakota) where new mining industry disrupts and does extensive damage even while providing jobs to a relatively small number of local workers. Demand that Polymet describe and include local jobs produced by the ongoing provision of water safety. Demand that the financial assurance includes funds for those important jobs. 3- Assurance. The financial assurance and contingency plans are inadequate for what we know will be needed let alone what we cannot foresee at this moment. Accidents happen everywhere and in every phase of the mining operation, every mine has had a longer window of reclamation than anticipated. There are way too many ways for Polymet, Glencore and Tony Hayward to reap the benefits, take them out of Minnesota and not assume responsibility for what is left behind for those of us in Minnesota to live with. Demand that the financial assurance is based on realistic predictions based on accurate worst case water table models and fractured bedrock; that Glencore and other large investors are named and held responsible for the financial assurance for 1) mine clean up; 2) water quality maintenance over the projected 500 years of necessary monitoring and treatment; 3) for other environmental disruptions that will occur and for accidents and inevitable problems that were not anticipated in the SDEIS. Minnesota has the opportunity to set a new standard for mining operations. This not only protects the largest body of clean water in the world but also will provide precedence- Chuck LeGros Office: 612-824-2282 Cell: 612-670-3507 EM: LeGrosSci@aol-com

Chuck Nelson

9590

PolyMet Comment We in Minnesota are fortunate to be living in a land of scenic beauty, a land with water resources second to none. For more than a century we acted as though the number 10,000, as in 10,000 lakes, was close to infinity. Only now do we understand our water resources to be both vulnerable and limited. Today we have seen the most optimistic mining and processing proposals put forth by PolyMet. They have put on them the best face that they could conjure up, and it is ugly. Twenty years of jobs for a few, followed by centuries of danger or worse. We would be fools to permit this exploitation. As an alternative to mining sulfide rock we could establish a better jobs program by fostering a metals recovery operation that would mine valuable metals from our electronics trash. Engage the electronics manufacturers in the processing, for they certainly know where the metals are to be found in the devices they have made. Locate this facility away from vulnerable water resources. May our decision makers be wise enough to understand the serious environmental threats. May they be generous enough to forgo short term gains while protecting long term treasures. May they have appreciation for the beautiful. Sincerely, Chuck Nelson 2694 Apache Road North Saint Paul, MN 55109 Sent from my iPad

18235

My name is Chuck Nelson, C-H-U-C-K, N-E-L-S-O N. We in Minnesota are fortunate to be living in a land of scenic beauty; a land with water resources second to none. For more than a century, we acted as though the number 10,000, as in 10,000 lakes, was close to infinity. Only now do we understand our water resources to be both vulnerable and limited. Today, we have seen the most optimistic mining and processing proposals put forth by PolyMet. They have put on them the best face that they could conjure up, and it is ugly. Twenty years of jobs for a few followed by centuries of danger or worse. We would be fools to permit this exploitation. As an alternative to sulfide rock mining, we could establish a better jobs program by fostering a metals resource recovery operation that would mine valuable metals from our electronics trash, engage the electronics manufacturers in the processing for they certainly know where the metals are to be found in the devices they have made. Locate this facility away from vulnerable water resources. May our decision-makers be wise enough to understand the serious environmental threats; may they be generous enough to forego short-term gains while protecting long-term treasures; may they have appreciation for the beautiful.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Chuck Spindler 42680

See attachment

Chuck Viren 58163

What was happening 500 years ago? What will the world be like 500 years from now? A little over 500 years ago, Columbus crossed the Atlantic. No one could envision what the world would be like today. No one would be willing to take responsibility for the effects of their actions 500 years in the future. Yet somehow, PolyMet seems willing to take actions that will impact the environment for at least 500 years. Are they willing to guarantee the results at their actions for the next 500 years? Is the state? This project is [ILLEGIBLE] inaccurate, [ILLEGIBLE] beyond belief. And it must be stopped.

Chuck Zeugner 43704

HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 RE: PolyMet SDEIS Response To whom it may concern: My wife and I own property near Ely, Minnesota. We spend several weeks each year in the area. We are building a home and plan to reside there year round. We are already employing several local people and our presence there will continue to increase the tax base and economic viability of the area. However, our plans are threatened by the proposed mining activity. I am strongly opposed to the proposed PolyMet project, and I believe that the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate. I share the concerns of many other people, whether residents of the North Woods, citizens of Minnesota, regular visitors or occasional tourists. There are individuals far more competent than I that have repeatedly addressed the inadequacy of the SDEIS economic impact analysis, the failure to address the consequences of creating a mechanism that will produce a permanent source of pollution in important watersheds, and absence of contingency planning in the event of accidents or unanticipated system failures. Further the SDEIS does not adequately account for opportunity costs for displaced activity, or for the value of intangible, but significant items such as tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather. I would like to address several other important issues. The first is that the Arrowhead Region is an incredible treasure in its own right. While it is easy to focus on the value of the copper below ground, it is even easier to ignore the value of clean air and water. As easy as it is for the people that live in the North Woods to undervalue these resources, it is even easier for outsiders. The history of colonization is not pretty. Historically, whenever outside entities come into areas to exploit resources, the trade is unequal. This project is no different. Copper is an important resource. However, so too are the other resources in abundance in the North Woods. However, this is not a simple trade. Mining the copper, which provides a short-term benefit will permanently diminish the value of the other resources of Northern Minnesota. Further complicating the economic analysis is that the positive economic impact of the mining will be temporary within the region while the costs will be long term. At the same time, the abundance of wealth derived from the copper extraction will be taken away from Minnesota to benefit companies and individuals elsewhere. The basic calculus of the mining project is arguable. However, assuming that there will be no accidents, system failures, or unintended consequences should be a fatal flaw in any analysis. Any list of these things would be very long, and the economic consequences would be uncountable. A third significant issue is that of financial responsibility. Even the most ardent supporters of the PolyMet project acknowledge that there will be environmental impacts, and the SDEIS purports to describe the remediation efforts that will be made to mitigate the damage from those impacts. Indeed, Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) require firms to account for restoration costs in their financial statements. However, there are three important unanswered questions. The first question is what constitutes remediation or restoration. It won't be possible to eliminate the pollution or to put the rock back. The second question is whether the ultimate cost of those mitigation efforts can be estimated, and the third question is whether PolyMet or a successor company will even be around to perform the remediation or restoration. Leaving aside the speculation about business practices in extractive industries, consider whether any major organization, business or government, can make promises about things that will happen at some point in the future. I

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ciara Cagemoe

4953

Dear sirs/ma'ams, I ask of you, please do not let them mine in Minnesota. I know you are probably getting a lot of contacts from people saying this, but I agree with this and am saying it to. Please, please please do not let anyone mine in Minnesota. We don't need to, it would harm the wildlife(they say it wont but oh...it will. And then it'll be too late.) and it would be extremely expensive, money we could use for other things. Just, please don't let them. We don't need these minerals. We think we do, but to survive, we don't need them. We just need food, water, and shelter. Our wildlife on this planet and in our state is amazing and beautiful, and in order to mine you'd have to destroy pieces of it, unique pieces of it like no other and displace tons of animals homes. If everyone keeps taking pieces of the wilderness away, some sad, horrible day, maybe it won't exist. And then we'll be doomed without oxygen. And what? All for our selfish needs and money? Money creates many unwanted emotions and behaviors that hurt people, other animals and the environment. So, please just don't mine. Not here. (Although, I'd prefer not anywhere on our planet but people obviously won't go for that. Not until we mine asteroids or something..) Also, I do not think there should be a wolf hunting season here currently. The hunting of animals for fun is...not very nice. Plus wolves just got off the endangered species list, they deserve time to repopulate and all that. In the past we over hunted wolves...we don't want to repeat that. Thanks for taking the time to read this. Yours truly, A citizen of Minneapolis

Cindy & Tom Edberg

6425

My address is Tom Edberg 34337 Forest Blvd Stacy, Mn 55079, thank you. From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 11:54 AM To: Cindy and Tom Edberg Subject: RE: I Support Polymet Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

6427

Sirs, Ladies; This type of mining is much different then ferrous mining of the past for taconite. This nonferrous mining will create no harmful permanent pollution to our waters or land in my opinion. The entire mining process and the end of the mining plan has been carefully planned and written. The more stringent regulations that have been imposed by the DNR and EPA for pollution control for this mining goes well beyond what was done in the paSt I fully support this mining process proposed by Polmet corp. and hope they get the permitting to begin. This also will greatly benefit the peoples of St Louis county financially in many ways in a area that has greatly needed it for a long time. Tom Edberg, Stacy Mn.

21763

I do very much support the new copper mine being proposed by the Polymet corp. They have gone under a relentless 8 year long attack by many groups concerned about the damage it might cause to the environment. I believe Polymet has put together a great plan that far surpasses any previous mining plan to protect the environment ever seen in Minnesota in the paSt. Minnesota really needs this mine for the economic benefits it will bring to the people of the Hoyt lakes area and also to the State as a whole. Not only will good paying full time jobs with livable wages be created but also many more jobs that will pop up to support this new (already existing mine). The economic boost for this part of Minnesota this mine will create has been sorely needed for many years Tom Edberg, 34337 Forest Blvd, Stacy, Mn 55079- .

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cindy Brausen

17411

Feb 16, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

40907

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Cindy Brausen 8301 Virginia Cir N St Louis Park, MN 55426-2447

Cindy Ilg

46880

Minnesota DNR, Please do not let SDEIS do any mining in the Superior National Forest Please save our wetlands, bogs, and swamps from being destroyed by pollution due to open-pit mines. We do not want contamination of ground water or our lakes and rivers. Once the water is polluted it will never be the same. Clean water is precious to every form of life. SDEIS is inadequate and should not be mining in a fragile eco system. Cindy Ilg

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cindy Oberg-Hauser

41879

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, The long terms dangers of this project far outweigh the short term financial gains. We need to maintain the incredible jewel that is Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Cindy Oberg-Hauser 1206 Charles Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-2514

Cindy Strong

28360

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Dear, Mr Bruner, I have spent a significant amount of time in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and on Lake Superior. Both are precious and must be treated as the such. As a youth I recall my first time seeing the northern lights in the BWCA and discovering what the word awesome actually means. We need these areas and so do our future generations. I ask you to make a decision respectful of what our children deserve from us. Please be a good steward to this beautiful planet. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Cindy Strong 329 Cleveland St Menasha, WI 54952-3402 (920) 209-7883

Cindy Swanson

41799

It is unquestionable that the vast majority of Minnesotans are strongly in favor of protecting our environment from pollution. They have expressed this desire in election and recently even voted to raise their own sales taxes expressly for the protection of clean water. Since it is simply a fact that the mining of this ore will result in sulfuric acid draining into the waters of northeastern Minnesota it is impossible for us to believe that most Minnesotans would support this mine for the short term economic benefit of a relative handful. The waters of northeastern Minnesota, in particular, have a special place in our hearts and to willfully permit their degradation is woeful governance and the abandonment of the expressed interests of the vast majority of Minnesotans. This majority may not understand that this pollution is inevitable if this mine is approved but they will learn and be outraged in time. Do your duty and reject this mine's permit. Sincerely, Cindy Swanson and Dennis Clowes 3904 Washburn AV S Minneapolis, MN. 55410 Sent from my iPad

Cindy Thomas

47030

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. I may not know you but I do understand how damaging this mine IS going to be to the ecology in the river and surrounding the river. I am a 40 year old Student at Metropolitan State University earning an Individualized Degree with a focus in Environmental Science Advocacy, and I am asking you to please reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Cindy K Thomas 1374 Edgerton St St Paul, MN. 55130 Sincerely, Miss Cindy Thomas 1374 Edgerton St Saint Paul, MN 55130-3430 (651) 280-0775

Alphabetical by sender's first name

cindy Welke 40114

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

City of Aurora 54709

See attachment

City of Chisholm 54639

See attachment

City of Ely 42902

Please find attached the City of Ely's Resolution in support of the PolyMet Mining NorthMet Project. Thank you, Claire Huisman Deputy Clerk City of Ely 209 E Chapman St Ely, MN 55731 218-226-5449

City of Eveleth 42910

Please find attached a Resolution of Support for the Polymet Mining Northmet Project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

City of Gilbert 42913

---Original Message--- From: Debra Sakrison [mailto:debrasakrison@gilbertmn-org] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 10:06 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Gilbert MN Support of PolyMet EIS Please accept the attached resolution as evidence of the City of Gilbert's support of the Poly Met Environmental Impact Study. I am hoping this is accepted into the Public Comments on this matter. Debra Sakrison City Clerk/Treasurer City of Gilbert PO Box 548 Gilbert MN 55741 debrasakrison@gilbertmn-org voice: 218-748-2232 fax: 218-748-2234

City of Mountain Iron 40523

City of Mountain Iron 8586 enterprise Drive South Mountain Iron, MN 55768

City of Virginia 15963

Attached is a copy of Resolution No. 14033, in support of the Supplemental Draft EIS for the PolyMet Mining NorthMet Project, which was adopted by the Virginia City Council on February 11, 2014- Please let me know if you need any additional information. Thank you. Lois Roskoski City Clerk City of Virginia 327 South 1st Street Virginia, MN 55792 (218) 748-7500 HYPERLINK "mailto:roskoskil@virginiamn.us"roskoskil@virginiamn.us

42520

See attachment

42521

See attachment

CJ Feist 44605

I am a girl from an urban city where I get enough of a feel from both the city and the country to know where I stand on this issue. Time and time again, coal miners have been given opportunities to 'clean' up their area years into the future. And for years, these sights have been left untouched because of the companies 'claiming' bankruptcy and so the land is left polluted. The boundary waters have for years been a beautiful and important part of minneosta and its culture. This mine would sit at the prime spot for the pollution to run off into the waters and pollute this 'protected' area. The company claims they'll clean up this mess within 500 years for 20 years of use. If the East Indian Trade Company can't even stick around long enough to last for 200 years, why should we believe that the Nickel mine will last for over twice that amount of time. When will we finally reach a point where we say enough is enough. This mine is creeping in on one of Minnesota's landmark jewels and if we allow it to be followed through, we'll be facing not only a loss of biodiversity and ecosystems but a loss of one of our vital minnesotan organs. The mine is wrong and we should not allow it to be created.

CJ Jacobson 43582

Please - do not let PolyMet pollute so much valuable, fragile land and water. For short-term economic gain and jobs that will not last long and a support infrastructure that will be time-stamped even as it's being built - the cost in the environmental impact and devastation is far too high. Please put life-affirmation ahead of planet devastation. Some things are not renewable and the health of the planet merits protection. Thank you. Sincerely, C.T. Jacobson 617 East Main Street Wabasha, MN 55981

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Claire Barnett 14050

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I have heard that PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. Too often, mining companies use subsidiary corporations that declare bankruptcy after the mining is finished, leaving taxpayers to pay for cleanup. It is vital to have long term planning and delegated responsibilities for cleanup that can not be avoided when mining is finished. And environmental standards should be in force at every stage including planning. Wetland destruction and pollution are not acceptable byproducts of mining. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Claire Barnett 110 W Walnut St Baraboo, WI 53913-1170

Claire Gerhard 4894

Please see attached for my comment on this development. Thanks, Claire Gerhard - CHG Art Conservation Services cel: 917-582-9237 HYPERLINK "<http://www.chgartcon-com/>"www.chgartcon-com

6701

See attached for statement from Charles Lyons. Thanks. - CHG Art Conservation Services cel: 917-582-9237 HYPERLINK "<http://www.chgartcon-com/>"www.chgartcon-com

Claire Goebel 40133

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Claire Goebel 24th ave south mpls, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Claire Nelson

48604

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Water is the cornerstone of Minnesotan identity. We are the people of the land of ten thousand lakes. What this project proposes is, basically, to threaten our very identity. The Duluth Complex will be situated on a 27 square mile swath of land which was supposedly protected as part of the Superior National Forest. How can that be undermined. By boasting that this project will bring in more jobs and economic revenue, and more the PolyMet Mining company has circumvented the very blockades meant to purposefully keep them out. Sulfide mining causes damage that is extensive and practically irreversible, PolyMet itself has stated that the clean-up process could take up to 500 years. 500 years. Over that period of time who knows how much the chemical problem would increase. Compacting, like interest on debt, the length of time to make our land and water pure again. Can we afford to do so much damage to a place so resplendent. And while they destroy our environment PolyMet plans to use those resources of copper and nickel in overseas trade, so the profit will not stay in the United States, but be outsourced. I understand that they do not want to upset their investors at Glencore, but what about the people who will work for them and those that live in Minnesota. Do we not have a say. The environment affects us all; people, animals, plants etc Please do not allow this atrocity. Anyone who has seen this land knows what a loss we, as a nation, would be taking. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Claire Nelson 845 Clayland St Saint Paul, MN 55104-1005

Claire Sefiane

40887

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Claire Sefiane 1065 S 21st Ave Ozark, MO 65721-7842 (417) 732-7172

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clara Groenhoff

40159

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I feel that everything is done on a monetary level. Everyone thinks about the jobs that this will generate, so we can't stop progress. But do progress and jobs need to harm the environment. So often things get done for supposedly good reasons only to find out years later the harm that is done and the cost of it to right the situation. Please provide all possible care in the proceeding of this. Our future depends on it. Sincerely, Mrs Clara Groenhoff 1178 Highway 68 Canby, MN 56220-2201 (507) 277-5726

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clare Padgett

15321

Feb 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

clarence jarvis 15834

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, clarence jarvis 2200south blvd south st paul, MN 55075

Clarence Kontio 42636

See attachment

Clarence Malick 47407

Ms Lisa Fay: I am writing to express skepticism that mining which requires hundreds of years of cleanup can possibly succeed. It has never been tried over such a long period. There is a high probability of some sort of natural calamity intervening to disrupt the walls, dams, membranes, pipes, etc How the size of a sufficient set aside cleanup fund can possibly be determined through, what tens or hundreds, of economic boom-bust cycles eludes me, and I daresay you, as well. The BWCAW is a national treasure for all the citizens, not to be irreversibly exploited for a few hundred local jobs. - C W "Buck" Malick 715 386 7010

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clarence Roed

39520

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Clarissa Ellis

40643

Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to urge you not to issue the required permits for the proposed PolyMet mine. I am very concerned about the pollution of our waters, and the lasting impact this will have on the people, economy and environment long after the mine operation has closed down. I understand that jobs are greatly needed in northern Minnesota. But I do not think that sacrificing the quality of our water and all that will impact for the short term economic gain is worth the price we will all have to pay. Given their history, I do not believe that the assurances of the mining companies are valid. Please make a wise decision for a healthy future based on the science, not emotion. Thank you. Clarissa Ellis-Prudhomme 53533 Sjordahl Rd Sandstone, MN 55072 (320)245-2589 -

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clark Gantzer

44209

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has not been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Sulfide mining's potential for pollution is tied to the presence of water (wetlands), and for that reason it has usually been done in arid climates. Even in dry areas, the sulfide mining has still created severe pollution. The likelihood that sulfide mining can be done in northeastern Minnesota's wetland ecosystem without polluting lakes, rivers, and streams is highly improbable. The legacy of likely environmental pollution, and the price the public would pay is very high. NorthMet would drain into in the Boundary Waters watershed and tributaries of the St Louis River, a stream that discharges to Lake Superior. This is a concern since acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all locations where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Moreover, to ensure proper reclamation and water treatment is done there must be continuous treatment for decades, even if PolyMet goes out of business, at a probable and unnecessary cost to the public. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness to help PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Clark Gantzer 112 E 1st St Hermann, MO 65041-1112 (573) 882-0611

Clark Seha

39532

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Clark Seha 10201 Rich Rd Bloomington, MN 55437-2502

Claude Pettis

23382

Many thanks. My family, colleagues and I feel very strongly about this and we are registered voters. In case you do not have my address it is: 2386 S. Goebbert RD # 1043 Arlington Heights, IL 60005 Thanks and regards, Claude M Pettis From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 1:20 PM To: Claude Pettis Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft EIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Claudia Engeland

41791

I write to express my concern about the proposed Cooper/Nickel "Sulfide" mine. I have compared the 2010 and 2013 SDEIS and I do not see anything in the 2013 version that convinces me that this mine can be operated without damage to our environment. There should be no trade offs - jobs vs the unique water rich environment that is Minnesota. As I watched the State Hockey Tournament last night I noticed that PolyMet references "hundreds" of jobs. This mine would have a LIMITED lifespan. A significant portion of Northern Minnesota's economy is tied to tourism that is centered around our clean rivers and lakes - the rights of these Minnesotans should not be threatened. The mere possibility that Lake Superior could be threatened by pollution from this mine should be enough for denial of this proposal. But factor in acres in Superior National Forest and acres of wetlands that will be impacted. Contamination world wide from this type of mine has resulted at every site where water quality standards existed. PolyMet's 2013 SDEIS certainly does NOT guarantee that it can't or won't happen here. 200-500 years of potential damage to Minnesotans' health and water quality is an unconscionable risk. Claudia Engeland 3940 Inglewood Ave S St Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Claudia Gibson

40866

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Remember you are entrusted with our resources. No one owns them No one has the right to destroy them. Please don't pollute with this terrible project. Teddy Roosevelt would kick your ass. Sincerely, Ms Claudia Gibson Cascade dr Fairfax, CA 94930 (415) 302-5954

Claudia La Paglia

41835

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Claudia La Paglia Via E. Bernardini n. 8b/20 Genova, None 16138

Clay and Amy Wenner

21244

Dear Ms Fey, I am writing to express my concern with PolyMet's recent SDEIS. The environmental impacts of the project are just too great, and I worry that the state will be left picking up the bill for clean-up and that the water and wildlife of the region will be irreversibly damaged. I am a Minnesota Master Naturalist, a member of the Environmental Commission of Chanhassen, and an environmental educator at Excelsior Elementary. Our family visits the Boundary Waters every year, and our love of the area extends to our children who have been going since they were both out of diapers. The state already realizes the environmental importance of this region, witnessed by the creation on the BWCA and the Superior National Forests. We have friends world-wide who appreciate Minnesota for this gem, and it has been a source of pride for us that Minnesota has done such a wonderful job protecting it. We also have friends who live in Babbitt, and realize the need for more jobs in the area. However, the introduction of this type of mining would irreparably hurt tourism in the region. I would love to see more research and incentives to develop "knowledge clusters" in the region instead. Some research I contributed to in graduate school explains the concept, "HYPERLINK "http://www.hhh.umn.edu/centers/slp/economic_development/documents/rkc_MnSCU.pdf"Rural Knowledge Clusters: Implications for Minnesota Colleges and Universities." Please consider my comments in the DNR's response to the SDEIS. Thank you so much, Amy Wenner 7046 Chaparral Lane Chanhassen, MN 55317

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clayton Sankey 39359

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Though the mine would bring money and jobs to Minnesota, the risk of disaster is too great to allow this mine. Any incident that damages the reputation of our state as a pristine vacation destination will cost more than we could ever gain from this mine. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Clayton Sankey 6484 Kings Dr Oakdale, MN 55128-2523

Cliff Martin 54872

See attachment

Cliff Odegaard 42033

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Cliff Odegaard Roseville, Minnesota

Clifford Fenton Martin 57187

Yo. Destroying the earth destroys ourselves. Mining does nothing but fuel consumerism, kill miners and communities and kills the environment. We cannot continue to mine or start a new one. Clifford Fenton Martin 1275 62nd Street West Northfield, MN

58092

The extreme extraction of resources does nothing but that Extract. When we extract materials in an unhealthy and unbalanced way from the land, we extract the dignity of the humans who we not only impacted by the poison of this mining but also the workers who have to do it. There's no better way to create hurt, unhealthy, angry, said, and dangerous people, than to have them engage in the active destruction and killing of living things. We can see this demonstrated in slaughter house workers and the resulting abuse in their families. The same applies for the employees of Polymet and the hurt they will cause the land, water, [ILLEGEIBLE] and people. Jobs are never worth destruction, hurt and pain. This mine absolutely should not happen.

Clifford Hansen 14219

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I would like to express my opposition to the proposed mining of sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota. Twenty years of jobs isn't worth the permanent damage sulfide mining would do. This proposal should be rejected outright. Barring that, financial assurance should be required for the full cost of the hundreds of years of water treatment that may be needed. Sincerely, Clifford Hansen 318 5th St SE Apt 5 Rochester, MN 55904-4882 (507) 281-0249

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clifford Johnson

40829

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Clifford Kashtan MD

37359

The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1) Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2) Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3) Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Clifford E. Kashtan, M.D. 2828 Huntington Avenue Saint Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Clifford Kashtan MD 37723

I am writing to express my firm opposition to the PolyMet mine proposal. The risks posed by this mine to water quality, the health of Minnesotans and the BWCA ecosystem are too severe to allow this project to move forward Clifford E. Kashtan, M.D. 2828 Huntington Avenue St Louis Park, MN 55416

Clifford Moyes 31289

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The mining companies have a history of making promises they can't keep in order to get the permits they need. And when they are later identified as the source of pollution, they place the blame on everyone and everything except themselves. Solve the problem before it exists. Don't grant the permits. Sincerely, Clifford Moyes 905 Division St Horicon, WI 53032-1745 (920) 643-7046

Clint Jurgens 42839

See attachment

Clyde Erickson 54155

We do not believe the environment with its lakes and rivers could ever be protected from this mining project. OPPOSED. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cole Christenson

45547

Dear Ms Fay, Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Tim Dabney US Forest Service Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Dear Ms Fay, Mr Dabney, and Mr Bruner I am writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes and does not take into account the true cost of the project. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to future surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of 6,026 acres of area with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest-replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest and 1,400 acres of floodplains. Secondly, PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swampland and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. This would result in the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres in total due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and water from wetlands. These comments are made from both the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit. In addition, the PolyMet sulfide mine would negatively impact 2 out of 13 remaining corridors for wildlife, including resident and migratory species, to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet mine plan would destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which has dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Eleven endangered or threatened species, including lynx, would be further impacted. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants including wild rice. PolyMet and the SDEIS do not acknowledge the true cost of the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. PolyMet is a lean deposit of copper-nickel, therefore, 99% of what is dug out of the ground will be waste. For that 1% gain in metal, the true cost will be unfathomable. The toxic extraction process will be energy and water intensive (releasing 200,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide). Even more water and energy (generating 707,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year) will be used in processing; leaving us with even more waste that will need to be managed for 500 years. This is in direct opposition to Minnesota's goal of reducing greenhouse gas emission by 30% by 2025- Lastly, it can no longer be ignored that fresh water is a precious resource and must be treated as such. By rejecting PolyMet's SDEIS and sulfide mining plan, you have the opportunity to pass on to future generations of humans and nature alike, the gift of irreplaceable wetlands, mature forests and fresh water resources of the Lake Superior Basin. You have the responsibility to do what is right and lead the way to a future that faces the fact that we live on a finite earth with finite natural resources. I respectfully ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project. Sincerely, Cole Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N White Bear Lake MN 55110 colejchristenson@gmail-com Cole Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Colin Walker

23997

Dear Ms Fay, My name is Colin Walker and I live and work in Ely, MN. I have some major concerns regarding the SDEIS and specifically, the water model, which is at the foundation of the entire SDEIS. The water model basically portrays the estimated amount of water in and around the potential site. This includes where the water is coming from, how it flows through the ground, and where it will end up. In essence, it is a reconstructed prediction of the pattern of water flow. On January 23rd, Marshal HelMBERger published an article in the Timberjay, revealing the inadequacies of this model. The specific miscalculations are related to the amount of water that flows through the mine site at the headwaters of one of the tributaries of the St Louis River, the Partridge River. A misjudgment in math could potentially result in catastrophic, irreversible impact on the watershed. One of the world's largest fresh water sources, Lake Superior, is at stake. Several environmental agencies have issued similar statements regarding the inaccurate reflections set forth by the water model. Mike Liljegren, a DNR hydrologist said that it is "more than likely" that a new model will need to be developed in a revised SDEIS. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission also highlighted the miscalculation in water flow near the mine site, which eventually drains into Lake Superior. (Found in Appendix C) From the beginning, we've been told to "trust the science." Well, until a mining company can prove that sulfide mining can be completed and not harm a watershed, this is the wrong place with too much at risk. I demand that the DNR addresses this issue, with the highest expectation that the water model within the SDEIS will contain accurate data prior to any further decisions are made. Because of the fundamental flaw in calculation, the SDEIS is fundamentally inadequate and unacceptable. We must stay committed to the environment if this mine is going to happen. Yes, metal is a precious and sought after resource but not at the sacrifice of the greatest resource, our water. Colin Walker PO Box 104 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colin Walker 49494

My name is Colin Walker and I live and work in Ely, MN. I have some major concerns regarding the SDEIS and specifically, the water model, which is at the foundation of the entire SDEIS. The water model basically portrays the estimated amount of water in and around the potential site. This includes where the water is coming from, how it flows through the ground, and where it will end up. In essence, it is a reconstructed prediction of the pattern of water flow. On January 23rd, Marshal Helmberger published an article in the Timberjay, revealing the inadequacies of this model. The specific miscalculations are related to the amount of water that flows through the mine site at the headwaters of one of the tributaries of the St Louis River, the Partridge River. A misjudgment in math could potentially result in catastrophic, irreversible impact on the watershed. One of the world's largest fresh water sources, Lake Superior, is at stake. Several environmental agencies have issued similar statements regarding the inaccurate reflections set forth by the water model. Mike Liljegren, a DNR hydrologist said that it is "more than likely" that a new model will need to be developed in a revised SDEIS. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission also highlighted the miscalculation in water flow near the mine site, which eventually drains into Lake Superior. (Found in Appendix C) From the beginning, we've been told to "trust the science." Well, until a mining company can prove that sulfide mining can be completed and not harm a watershed, this is the wrong place with too much at risk. I demand that the DNR addresses this issue, with the highest expectation that the water model within the SDEIS will contain accurate data prior to any further decisions are made. Because of the fundamental flaw in calculation, the SDEIS is fundamentally inadequate and unacceptable. We must stay committed to the environment if this mine is going to happen. Yes, metal is a precious and sought after resource but not at the sacrifice of the greatest resource, our water. Colin Walker PO Box 104 Ely, MN 55731

Colleen Bonniwell 42594

See attachment

54496

See attachment

Colleen Fisher 21640

Hello I am absolutely for Polymet opening in northern minnesota. I believe they have gone beyond what is needed to prove they can obtain the minerals safely. I am tired of northern minnesota being denied the capability of supporting itself with great paying careers for the residents. I am from Duluth, MN originally. I am one of thousands of people from northern minnesota who ended up leaving 25 years ago due to lack of well paying jobs. Please continue to work towards goals of the people who actually live on the Iron Range and surrounding areas. I am tired of people who do not live there dictating to residents what should go on there. I love Northern Minnesota and want the people there to have a legacy of great paying jobs and the economy that will flourish due to Polymet. I spread the good word of Polymet whenever I can. Keep going PLEASE. Colleen Fisher Maple Grove, MN Sent from my iPad

Colleen Krebs 25231

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, To avert the greatest tragedy in our state's environmental history, you must demand strong scientific evidence that our precious woods and waters will NOT be damaged. That RESTORATION can be guaranteed. Reassurances are not enough. Intentions and beliefs are not enough. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Colleen Krebs 3655 Garfield Ave Minneapolis, MN 55409-1112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colleen LeBlanc

39414

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colleen LeBlanc

40868

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colleen Lund

47775

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Many thanks for this opportunity to express my concerns regarding the proposal put forth for Polymet to establish their mining venture in northern Minnesota. I am strongly opposed to opening up this pristine area of boreal forests and majestic waterways to the magnitudes of unknown challenges to the health of this valuable environment as well as the quality of life and health of the residents and animals who call this their home. I myself own acreage just south of this area — and have lived in and learned to appreciate the value of this healthy environment for most of my younger years. It seems absolutely ludicrous to me that any business involving mining with all of the potential toxic pollution that goes along with these operations would ever be allowed to establish itself in the heartland of this vital watershed district. While I understand that PolyMet has proposed innovative ideas to deal with some of the potential anticipated hazards, there simply is no guarantee that incidents resulting in toxicity being released into the environment well into the unforeseeable future will not happen. The aquatic surroundings of the proposed mining area only amplifies the danger of this rapid spread of contamination throughout a huge area of the northland. I am very concerned for the potential sulfate pollution of this area and its impact on human and animal health. Arsenic, mercury contamination and asbestos-like fibers have already presented serious hazardous health issues in some of these areas. Has there been an accurate assessment of how this mining proposal would further affect the well-being of the local residents and animals living in this area. If not, please consider requiring such a study to determine the potential health hazards involved with the PolyMet proposal. I understand that the PolyMet water model significantly understates the amount of water flowing in the nearby Partridge River. If this information is wrong, predictions about water pollution are in question. If the model is incorrect, and there is more water flowing through the site than it assumes, the polluted water from pits and waste rock will move more easily through the soil, and reach lakes and rivers more quickly. The water could also carry more pollutants than the PolyMet model predicts. Please fix the inaccurate water data and redo the water model in PolyMet's mine plan. I am particularly concerned also for the loss of thousands of acres of critical habitat for our legendary moose inhabiting this territory which would be negatively affected by the PolyMet proposal. These animals are already in serious population decline and remain in peril as a result of the recent tick infestation and additional problems. Having recently been listed as animals of “serious concern” because of their requirement for extensive and specific habitats in order to thrive, it is disappointing to me to see that the PolyMet plan has obviously ignored the challenges their plan poses to this majestic being of our northwoods. Please require thorough analysis of the impact of the mining proposal on the moose population in northern Minnesota. Native Americans have been challenged in their cultural practices for far too long. The issue of PolyMet mining also appears to present yet another threat to their way of life by ignoring the impact on their sacred connection to both the moose population as well as to our state grain - Minnesota Wild Rice, a significant resource to local Minnesota tribes. Unfathomable gallons of polluted sulfate waters released into the watershed will undoubtedly have a negative effect on wild rice crops in the northland. The PolyMet proposal should clearly address these expressed concerns of Minnesota’s tribal populations and further guarantee the safety of this vital, natural crop. The PolyMet operation

Colleen Roman

52191

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Colleen Roman 5504 University Way NE, #3 Seattle, WA 98105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colleen Sehnert

16096

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Colles B. Larkin

45604

I have additional comments: - The sulphuric acid and toxic metals produced by this type of mining are the result of exposure of this rock to air and water. This contamination happens wherever such mining exists and has always - with no exceptions - polluted surrounding waters. - This particular site is in a water-rich environment and, as such, facilitates/accelerates the seepage of pollutants (sulfide, heavy metals) due to the open-pit mining process. - The PolyMet site is within the confines of the Superior National Forest (public land). Federal law prohibits open-pit mining within national forests/parks. - Since federal law prohibits mining in national parks, a "land exchange" of some 6000 acres has been proposed as an equal exchange for the land and water that will be polluted by PolyMet's mine. This is not an equal exchange. An "exchange" misses the point entirely. National parks/forests are set aside as recreational areas for humans to enjoy Nature as well as habitat refuges for flora and fauna. The reason for setting aside large tracts of land is to provide an extensive natural habitat; a mine in the middle of such an area cannot be compensated by token land elsewhere. - The DNR, as presently set up, has a conflict of interest relating to mining decisions. By federal statute the DNR is mandated both to regulate and promote mining on public lands ~ and, in its promotion capacity, to maximize the royalties collected for any mining on state land. Promotion and regulation are two different jobs; one government agency should not be responsibly for both. The EPA should be given the regulatory responsibility ~ for the sake of citizen's health and, of course, the ecological impact. - A recent article (January 27, 3014) in the Star Tribune noted, as has the WaterLegacy organization, that 99% of the rock from which the mined metals are extracted would be waste. It is not only the sulphuric acid mentioned above that will contaminate surrounding water and land, but other pollutants such as mercury, arsenic, lead and unspecified others. This contamination, it is estimated, will last 500 years. And our state government would sanction this for so little copper.. ..and when Duluth's children already exhibit high levels of mercury in their systems. - The DNR would compromise our water resources for copper when, per "the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, copper scrap now provides half of the annual US demand for that metal and the US provides 23% of the world supply of recovered copper" The 500 year certainty of polluted water that will compromise the St Louis River and others that spill into Lake Superior is, I think, too high a price to pay for the small amount of copper and the huge amount of polluting waste. - Last Monday (March 3, 2014) the Star Tribune ran an article: "Duluth tires new view on tourism" and, next page, "Duluth: Not just a pretty view." This article announces the city's effort to expand tourists' awareness of the city's surrounding attractions. These include "miles of hiking and biking trails, a zoo, a ski hill, a campground and several places to launch canoes and kayaks ON THE WIDE AND SCENIC St LOUIS RIVER." (my emphasis) I'd be willing to wager that mothers will not want their family members to canoe on waters contaminated with sulphuric acid, mercury, heavy metals, lead PLEASE do not allow this permit to go forwaRd Our water and the health of our children is just too important. Thanks you. On Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 4:51 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Colles Larkin

58119

As someone interested in the environment I am really opposed to the PolyMet Miing Company being allowed to mine in our near [ILLEGIBLE] Forrest area north of Duluth.1. Polymet's history is not stellar. Oversight is something they have shown [ILLEGIBLE] to not [ILLEGIBLE] with regularity.2. No open pit [ILLEGIBLE], it's my understanding has ever left a clear site. 500- years worth of pollution – Polymet has not, in SDEIS, has not put forth contingency plan for inevitable problems – leaks, from water pollution.The possibility of major contamination of the watershed that spills into the Great Lakes is too important to allow to happen. Water is not a never renewable [ILLEGIBLE] particularly if we are not careful stewards.Please do not allow this to happen – the risk is too greatEPA regulates and [ILLEGIBLE] for oversight need be augmented if we are to survice

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Collette Leonhardt

17150

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Collette Leonhardt 1582 Circle dr Winona, MN 55987

50420

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Collette Leonhardt 1582 Circle dr Winona, MN 55987

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Collin Motschke

21152

Feb 24, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. To whom it may concern, I am writing in regards to the proposed construction of the NorthMet mine in Minnesota's Arrowhead region, a few miles south of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). The NorthMet mine, a project conceived by PolyMet Mining Corporation, would be the first metallic sulfide strip mine in Minnesota. Though supporters claim that it will produce large quantities of precious metals (copper, cobalt, and nickel), the NorthMet mine will have destructive ecological and economic impacts. The most threatening of these adverse effects is the potential for Acid Mine Drainage, a phenomenon in which sulfide ores become exposed to air and moisture, undergo a chemical reaction forming sulfuric acid, and leach into surface water and the aquifer. This process decreases pH levels, thus destroying many aquatic ecosystems and contaminating drinking water. According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Acid Mine Drainage from metallic sulfide mines is the leading source of water pollution in the Mid-Atlantic States. NorthMet mine will also have dampening effects on the economy. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a federal document projecting the ecological consequences of business proposals, estimates clean-up costs of over \$44-6 million, to complete clean-up tasks including land reclamation and acid remediation. In addition, construction and operation of the mine could disrupt the natural serenity of the area, which, in turn, would negatively influence ecotourism, a significant contributor to the region's economy. Besides its ecological and economic consequences, the NorthMet mine would have harmful impacts on my recreational and spiritual life. Since my childhood, I have viewed the BWCAW as an utterly divine place, the destination of my daydreams Each year, my family and I would travel north to paddle the placid waters, camp amongst the ancient pines, and submit to the enveloping aura of tranquility. In this peaceful wilderness, I developed an undying appreciation for nature and contemplated life in its most primitive form. Destruction of this blissful refuge, an inevitable result of the NorthMet mine, would be absolutely devastating to me and the thousands of other people who enjoy the BWCAW each year. Please oppose any legislation that would allow the PolyMet Corporation to begin sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. If passed, these bills would set a precedent for selling public lands to private corporations and undermine the National Environmental Policy Act. Sincerely, Collin Motschke US Student Fulbright Program The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Collin Motschke 1514 11th Ave S Saint Cloud, MN 56301-5638 (320) 761-8112

47170

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I am writing in regards to the proposed construction of the NorthMet mine in Minnesota's Arrowhead region, a few miles south of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). The NorthMet mine, a project conceived by PolyMet Mining Corporation, would be the first metallic sulfide strip mine in Minnesota. Though supporters claim that it will produce large quantities of precious metals (copper, cobalt, and nickel), the NorthMet mine will have destructive ecological and economic impacts. The most threatening of these adverse effects is the potential for Acid Mine Drainage, a phenomenon in which sulfide ores become exposed to air and moisture, undergo a chemical reaction forming sulfuric acid, and leach into surface water and the aquifer. This process decreases pH levels, thus destroying many aquatic ecosystems and contaminating drinking water. According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Acid Mine Drainage from metallic sulfide mines is the leading source of water pollution in the Mid-Atlantic States. The NorthMet mine will also have dampening effects on the economy. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a federal document projecting the ecological consequences of business proposals, estimates clean-up costs of over \$44-6 million, to complete clean-up tasks including land reclamation and acid remediation. In addition, construction and operation of the mine could disrupt the natural serenity of the area, which, in turn, would negatively influence ecotourism, a significant contributor to the region's economy. Besides its ecological and economic consequences, the NorthMet mine would have harmful impacts on my recreational and spiritual life. Since my childhood, I have viewed the BWCAW as an utterly divine place, the destination of my daydreams Each year, my family and I would travel north to paddle the placid waters, camp amongst the ancient pines, and submit to the enveloping aura of tranquility. In this peaceful wilderness, I developed an undying appreciation for nature and contemplated life in its most primitive form. Destruction of this blissful refuge, an inevitable result of the NorthMet mine, would be absolutely devastating to me and the thousands of other people who enjoy the BWCAW each year. Please oppose any legislation that would allow the PolyMet Corporation to begin sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. If passed, these bills would set a precedent for selling public lands to private corporations and undermine the National Environmental Policy Act. Sincerely, Mr Collin Motschke 1514 11th Ave S Saint Cloud, MN 56301-5638

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Collin Motschke

50955

Feb 24, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. To whom it may concern, I am writing in regards to the proposed construction of the NorthMet mine in Minnesota's Arrowhead region, a few miles south of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). The NorthMet mine, a project conceived by PolyMet Mining Corporation, would be the first metallic sulfide strip mine in Minnesota. Though supporters claim that it will produce large quantities of precious metals (copper, cobalt, and nickel), the NorthMet mine will have destructive ecological and economic impacts. The most threatening of these adverse effects is the potential for Acid Mine Drainage, a phenomenon in which sulfide ores become exposed to air and moisture, undergo a chemical reaction forming sulfuric acid, and leach into surface water and the aquifer. This process decreases pH levels, thus destroying many aquatic ecosystems and contaminating drinking water. According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Acid Mine Drainage from metallic sulfide mines is the leading source of water pollution in the Mid-Atlantic States. NorthMet mine will also have dampening effects on the economy. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a federal document projecting the ecological consequences of business proposals, estimates clean-up costs of over \$44-6 million, to complete clean-up tasks including land reclamation and acid remediation. In addition, construction and operation of the mine could disrupt the natural serenity of the area, which, in turn, would negatively influence ecotourism, a significant contributor to the region's economy. Besides its ecological and economic consequences, the NorthMet mine would have harmful impacts on my recreational and spiritual life. Since my childhood, I have viewed the BWCAW as an utterly divine place, the destination of my daydreams. Each year, my family and I would travel north to paddle the placid waters, camp amongst the ancient pines, and submit to the enveloping aura of tranquility. In this peaceful wilderness, I developed an undying appreciation for nature and contemplated life in its most primitive form. Destruction of this blissful refuge, an inevitable result of the NorthMet mine, would be absolutely devastating to me and the thousands of other people who enjoy the BWCAW each year. Please oppose any legislation that would allow the PolyMet Corporation to begin sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. If passed, these bills would set a precedent for selling public lands to private corporations and undermine the National Environmental Policy Act. Sincerely, Collin Motschke US Student Fulbright Program The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Collin Motschke 1514 11th Ave S Saint Cloud, MN 56301-5638 (320) 761-8112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Collin S. Mackey

44553

3-13-14 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resource Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Dear Ms Fay: I am writing to request that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the United States Forest Service either suspend the NorthMet Project Proposed Action and the Land Exchanged Proposed Action, or extend the amount of time left to discuss possible alternatives to these plans. I believe that these mitigation techniques to reduce the impact on the environment are not strict enough and should be further amended to have as little impact as possible on the environment. I feel that Alternative B does not really accomplish anything, as all it really does is reduce the amount of land being exchanged between the NorthMet Project area and federal lands. It does not put further restrictions on waste and toxin management, so does not reduce any of the affects caused by the mine. I feel that if a different, more effective alternative cannot be made, no action should be taken, in order to protect the plants, wildlife, and local tribes at risk. In the NorthMet Project Proposed Action, they state that 90% of the ground and surface runoff that comes in contact with the various toxins and contaminants at the mine and plant site will be treated. But that still leaves 10% untreated water contaminated with hazardous materials that can seep into the ground or runoff into the Embarrass River, St Louis River, and other streams and lakes nearby. This could cause significant water quality degradation throughout the area, possibly disrupting fragile aquatic ecosystems nearby. Also, local animal wildlife rely on these bodies of water for drinking water. If such a significant amount of untreated water gets into these waterways, it could have detrimental effects on these animal species. They also state that a side effect would be an increase of aluminum and lead amounts entering into tributary streams north of Tailings Basin. Aluminum and lead can be very toxic, and if they get in the waterways, it could lead to further degradation of water. In order for this mine to work, the mitigation techniques to stop pollutants and chemicals from entering into water ways should be stricter. It also concerns me that 912-5 acres of wetlands will be directly affected and 6,498-1-7,350-7 acres of wetlands will be indirectly affected by this plan. Wetlands are a very important part of the environment that play a vital role in the purification of water. If this many acres of wetlands are going to be directly and indirectly impaired in some way, it could have some effect on the water quality. A good chunk of these wetlands will be removed and replaced with the mine and plant site, along with various buildings. So instead of having a natural environment allowing for water to percolate through and be purified, there will be open barren land bringing toxins to the surface. So this plan is decreasing the amount of land used to remove pollutants from water, and increasing the amount of pollutants put into the water. I believe a good alternative would be to decrease the size of the mine, and develop a layout that would build around the wetlands, while removing as little of it as possible. Another concern is the 4,016-3 acres of vegetation and wildlife habitat that will be reduced. Eleven special concern plant species will be directly or indirectly affected by this plan, which would only endanger them even further, and could disrupt the balance of the local ecosystem. It could also lead to the decrease of the local Canadian lynx population and other species, such as wolves. These are special status species, and any action that can threaten their habitat and endanger their population should be looked at with some scrutiny. As you are aware, this land sits

Colvin Loken

54127

I do not support PolyMet! Please consider possible water contamination. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Commissioner Keith Nelson

18196

Hi. I'm Marla Fredrickson, and I'm deferring my time to Commissioner Keith Nelson. Commissioner Landwehr, Supervisor Halter, and Deputy District Engineer -- and I'm going to try this -- Tahanus? Close. Okay. I'm sorry. My name is Keith Nelson. I'm a St. Louis County Commissioner. I am going to ask this audience to show me the respect that I would certainly show you as I speak. All of my career as an elected official, I've had the luxury of following Tom Rukavina. He was the representative from the very same district that I serve, and once again, Tom Rukavina has stolen a great deal of my thunder. At 5' foot 4", he can do that. AUDIENCE MEMBER: He can steal other things, too. KEITH NELSON: With that, I would like to address something that I don't feel has seen a lot of attention, and this idea that somehow construction jobs are temporary jobs. I respectfully submit that construction jobs are temporary in their location. I would like to tell you Kermit's story. Kermit was my father. He came to the Iron Range in 1952 after serving his country in the Korean War. He came there because he heard there was jobs there. He brought my mother and an infant son, my brother, with him. He went to work, ironically, for Foley Building Mining Company, the very same site that we're talking about PolyMet today. Thirty-seven years later, he was still working that temporary job. Our construction workers are not temporary employees. As Former Representative Rukavina stated, jobs matter on the Iron Range. I will tell you that that one person who came to Minnesota's mineral range from western Minnesota now has 24 direct descendants living, working on Minnesota's mineral range. Thank you very much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Community of St Martin 54722

See attachment

Compudyne 54710

See attachment

Coni Erickson 42607

See attachment

Conn Mattfield 42552

See attachment

57363

I would like to show my support of the Polymet, Northmet project near Hoyt Lakes.. We need a safe and viable means to support economic growth in this region and with the states help I believe this is 100% possible. Sincerely, Conn Mattfield 311 Coventry Rd Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750 Sent from my iPhone

Connie Grundhofer 3656

Dear DNR Please do not let the dollar signs dancing around your heads be the ultimate deciding factor for having the Polymet mine plan come to be. The people of the United States needs for quality water and land are more important than money. We can not keep on destroying the earth and still live on it. Money won't fix all of the destruction. The Great Lakes is the largest body of fresh water on earth. Why would you take the chance of risking it. Really. Have you truly thought of all the possibilities. You do know that the least amount of destruction from this type of mining is to be far away from bodies of water and wet lands. Did any decision maker watch the PBS special Great Plains: America's Lingering Wild with Michael Forsberg. Did you see the destruction in the west because of the process of the mining. Have you heard about Alaska's Bristol Bay. People are trying to save it from losing a valuable fishery. Do you need to see destruction first and then say, "Well maybe that was a bad idea after all." Through destruction there are lives lost, ecosystems ruined or destroyed for years after. As you are well aware of, we are losing too many species of flora and fauna now. So please do not take the risk because of dollars signs dancing around your heads. Thank you for your time. Connie Grundhofer 235 Linda Ave Lino Lakes, MN

Connie Lacher 38732

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Connie Lacher 12325 County Road 51 Apt B1 Saint Joseph, MN 56374-9808 (320) 363-4364

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Connie Lanphear

43277

Hi, I want to register my opposition to the PolyMet mine proposal. I have so many concerns about the project but my main concern is the potential to contaminate the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers, which flow into the St Louis River and then Lake Superior. The plan to contain pollutants sounds weak and I have a very hard time believing any company would be around in the next 200-500 years to oversee the required and promised containment. Secondly, I don't like the precedent this mine would set for the many other mining projects waiting in the wings. I love our state's water resources especially, and want my teenage girls (and all Minnesotans and visitors) to continue canoeing the BWCA and to have the opportunity to share it with their own kids someday. Please, please, please keep the big picture and the value of our natural resources in mind when evaluating this proposal, and I urge you to deny the project permit. Best regards, Connie Lanphear 3715 45th Ave S, Mpls, MN 55406 612-384-3405

Connie Lehr

43796

My name is Connie Kirvida-Lehr and I would like to make a few comments about Polymet's SDEIS and the process that ends today. 1) It is my belief that the MN DNR and ERM have acted as proponents of this project, rather than in unbiased roles protecting the best interests of the residents of the state of Minnesota. 2) The access to information was frustrating at best, and included a maze of different resources available in different ways. Transparent, it was not. 3) I also question the amount and location of wetlands used in remediation. They are outside the Lake Superior watershed and the amount less than most believe is an adequate replacement. 4) I believe the state of Minnesota deserves to put this project to rest and concentrate on mining that does not come at such a risk. If the copper is so valuable, we should keep it safe, just like the water. We protect our environment and our future that way. 5) Lining the pockets of foreign investors at the risk of our environment is not worth 350 jobs on the iron range. It is time for the people who choose to live there to realize that Minnesota's heyday of mining was just that. You cannot expect to do the same job your grandfather did today anywhere. Jobs evolve over time for everyone, unless they are sustainable like fishing and farming. As you can see, my concerns are all over the place. Just as they are for many I know. This, along with the continual release of new information, I also believe your decision to not extend the comment period was wrong. Polymet had years and millions of dollars, along with data provided by those protecting our resources to create their case. The residents of MN got 90 days to digest it and comment. Connie Kirvida-Lehr 8679 243 rd street Forest Lake, MN 55025 -and- PO 217 Lutsen, MN 55612

Connie Metcalf

9820

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Connie Metcalf 802 Mendenhall Ave Breckenridge, MN 56520

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Connie Metcalf

18614

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Connie Metcalf 802 Mendenhall Ave Breckenridge, MN 56520

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Connie Metcalf

40463

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Connie Metcalf

50690

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Connie Metcalf 802 Mendenhall Ave Breckenridge, MN 56520

Connie Wanner

54655

See attachment

Connor McComas

38389

Mar 6, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Governor and DNR, I support the position of the MN DNR and associated legal bodies. The mining operations should go through as planned. As an environmental scientist that specializes in water quality, I believe that mining, tourism, and good environmental quality can coexist I am writing from the Audubon society webpage, where I have found dozens of inaccuracies that they support and willingly spread to the public. A brief list of inaccuracies would include: Calling the mining "sulfide mining" when in fact it is copper-nickle mining. 500 years of treatment will not be required as stated by the Audubon, that figure is used in modeling the sub-surface water percolation in the EIS and does not represent treatment estimation. There will be no toxic runoff as all drainage will be treated, and mining will have no impact on the boundary waters (BWCA) as the watershed is not affected. The Audubon society is being intellectually dishonest when they make a number of unfounded claims that have no scientific basis. The deceit by the Audubon society is hard to ignore by anyone familiar with the science. I truly hope that good data will make it's way to the general public. Sincerely, Mr Connor McComas 426 Wheeler St N Saint Paul, MN 55104-3623 (651) 231-3239

Conrad Gill

3657

Please reconsider the environmental impact that could possibly occur (and generally does), if their mining project is permitted. It seems to me that all mining projects, whether it be for oil, minerals or whatever, end up with some sort of catastrophic consequence. There is always an unforeseen event used as an excuse when the catastrophe occurs. Now is the time to do something about it. The jobs created are not worth the eventual costs. I'm sure that there are plenty of other industries that could be located in this area without the possibility of environmental endangerment. Sincerely, Conrad and Kathy Gill 1270 S. White Iron Road Ely, MN 55731-8237 [HYPERLINK "mailto:gill37@frontiernet-net" gill37@frontiernet-net](mailto:gill37@frontiernet-net)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Conservation Minnesota 42942

Paul Austin Executive Director Conservation Minnesota 1101 West River Parkway, Suite 250 Minneapolis, MN 55415 612-767-2444 www.ConservationMinnesota-org
Meet our Strategic Advisors – Helping Conservation Minnesota deliver results for you. <http://www.conservationminnesota-org/people/advisors>

Constanza Raber 42028

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Constanza Raber Saint Paul, Minnesota

Cook County Coalition of Lake Associat 38695

---Original Message--- From: Biz Clark <bizclar@aol-com> To: NorthMetDEIS.dnr <NorthMetDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> Sent: Sun, Mar 9, 2014 10:07 pm Subject: comments on North Met SDEIS Please see attached comments from the board of the Cook County Coalition of Lake Associations(CCCoLA). CCCoLA represents 15 lakes in Cook County. Thank you. Biz Clark, co-chair

Coral McDonnell 42737

See attachment

Coralee Thilges 44993

This project may have benefits of jobs, but with all things pros and cons must be considered. This project is such a short term mine in the first place. 40 years is not long-term for job seekers. Is it worth building a home in a place that will loose all it's boom in 40 fast years. The environmental impact has to be considered. Mining absolutely will pollute the ground and water with toxic materials that have been known to cause cancer. It's not worth 500 years of cleanup for 40 years. Just because the natural resources are there does not mean it has to be mined right now. Waiting for the right technology that can extract without polluting is very worth it. The sensitive ecosystem will never be the same. The land holds so much value, let alone beauty. All that matters to mines is making money. Even with guidelines it cannot be done safely. Let's wait for technology to develop better techniques. The environmental impact is a serious issue and needs to be a real concern. Prevention of having the water contaminated is the best route. Not an attitude of it can be eventually cleaned up. This project should not happen. We need to preserve the land in order to sustain the population. Thank you for your time, Coralee Thilges

Corey Wipper 3713

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I've always loved the wilderness up north, especially around the boundary waters. That area has been preserved for a long time, and I wish it were kept that way. Sincerely, Corey Wipper 565 Sandhurst Dr W Apt. 106 Roseville, MN 55113 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Corey Wipper 565 Sandhurst Dr W Apt 106 Roseville, MN 55113-4663 (612) 770-8307

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Corey Wipper 51794

Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I've always loved the wilderness up north, especially around the boundary waters. That area has been preserved for a long time, and I wish it were kept that way. Sincerely, Corey Wipper 565 Sandhurst Dr W Apt. 106 Roseville, MN 55113 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Corey Wipper 565 Sandhurst Dr W Apt 106 Roseville, MN 55113-4663 (612) 770-8307

Cori Mattke 20956

Hello, Wondering if written comments must be received by March 13 at 4:30 PM, or postmarked by March 13- Thank you for the clarification, Cori

Corie Ekholm 9607

As I downloaded the SDEIS for Polymet, I was amazed at the size. As I read through it, it became obvious that a lot of time, money, and effort went into the document/project to ensure all topics were thoroughly investigated and discussed. Polymet has a well thought out plan to minimize and mitigate the environmental impacts associated with copper-nickel mining in Northern Minnesota. We need all the minerals Polymet will mine, they are essential to live in our society. I would much rather mine them here, where we will do it in an environmentally friendly manor, than in some other country with no regulation that will pour the pollutants into the air and water. We are already seeing the effects of Chinese factories air pollution in the US. The SDEIS is good but I would like to have more explanation on the model used to predict the number of years of water treatment. I do not think the SDEIS fully discusses the fact that the model allows for no decrease in the amount of pollutants coming from the various areas. As the rocks weather (oxidize over), pollutants will no longer be leached out at the same rates. The weathering will form a barrier covering the rocks preventing more pollutants from reacting and being leached out. This will cause a decrease in the pollutant load as time goes on, which is not addressed in the model or discussed in the SDEIS. The Polymet project will have numerous benefits for the community. It will provide good paying jobs that are needed in the area. The additional jobs will enable people to stay and live in the area instead of having to move elsewhere to find work. The local communities will benefit from the tax revenue and additional jobs. Overall, I feel the SDEIS did a good job at addressing the environmental impacts of the Polymet project. We can do both, mine and protect the environment. I support the SDEIS and the Polymet project. Corie Ekholm 4413 Woodlawn Dr W Eveleth MN 55734

Correy Merritt 3072

Everyone is very concerned about the negative effects of mining, with good reason, but we need to look closely at the facts. The need for mining precious metals is being driven by the demand for; cars, computers, phones, televisions, appliances and any other technologies that require these metals. Whether we like it or not we are all "supporting" mining by creating this demand. The need and demand for these things is not going away so how do you protect the environment and provide the things that people want and need. I suggest that it is by conducting mining in countries like the United States who have systems of laws and regulations in place that protect workers and the environment. By having mines here we can keep control of how they are operated and have accountability. By blocking projects in the United States we are simply shifting the supply source to countries like; China, South Africa and Russia. It will probably be cheaper to get our precious metal from these sources because they don't have the cost of government regulation to deal with but is that the right thing to do. If you're really concerned about the environment but you're not ready to give up your modern technology it seems to me that we should all be supporting companies like Polymet. Here are a few more facts that you may not be aware of; If you are a supporter of solar energy, wind energy, electric cars, hybrid cars, renewable energy, electronic devices, then you are a supporter of metal mining. Did you know that wind energy requires 30-50% more copper than larger base loaded power plants. Did you know that a hybrid car uses 50% more copper than a standard car and an electric car uses 3 times more copper. If you really support these greener energy and transportation alternatives, then you are supporting metal mining. Where will these metals come from, an area without strict environmental regulation and oversight. Or an area that is highly regulated and has been metal mining for generations. Think about which is better for our planet. Correy Merritt 8561 W Hwy 61 Schroeder, MN 55613 [HYPERLINK "mailto:merritts@northlc-com"](mailto:merritts@northlc-com)merritts@northlc-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Corryl Jeske

9366

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Your support is paramount to keep Poly Met Mining from irreversibly contaminating Minnesota's treasured northern land. The well being of all living things is in jeopardy with this inaccurate and incomplete SDEIS document. A few low paying jobs in the area will never compensate for generations of contamination to our environment. Thank you for listening. Sincerely yours, Corryl Jeske 8996 North 15th St Lake Elmo, MN 55042

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Corryl Jeske

15943

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Corryl Jeske 8996 North 15th St Lake Elmo, MN 55042

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Corryl Jeske

18514

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Your support is paramount to keep Poly Met Mining from irreversibly contaminating Minnesota's treasured northern land. The well being of all living things is in jeopardy with this inaccurate and incomplete SDEIS document. A few low paying jobs in the area will never compensate for generations of contamination to our environment. Thank you for listening. Sincerely yours, Corryl Jeske 8996 North 15th St Lake Elmo, MN 55042

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Corryl Jeske

40469

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cortney Evans

40406

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Cortney Evans 800 nw fork Rd 1-p stuart, FL 34994 US

Cory Hertog

57995

I believe that going forward with the NorthMet Mining project will not be a good step to developing a sustainable future for Minnesota, and the world. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cory Wagner

16095

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Council of Carpenters

54724

See attachment

Courtney Boettcher-Whited

46082

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Please do not support approval of the PolyMet sulfide mine because the Superior National Forest is an environmental gem for the community, the State of MN and for our country. I ask you, have you cross country skied there in the winter when the frozen snow sparkles on the trees. Have you hiked there in the summer time to witness the numerous, clean waterfalls. I could provide scientific studies that don't support this, but I'm asking that you simply visit this area and decide what makes sense when you look back at your legacy and how you left this community, this state, this country as pristine as when you first saw it. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Courtney Boettcher-Whited 5829 Chowen Avenue South Edina, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

courtney butcher

17607

Feb 15, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby communities, and describe contingency plans to address the risk to public health and worker safety if asbestos-like fibers are detected during construction, operation, closure and post-closure 3) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate inaccurate characterizations of the University of Minnesota mesothelioma study. Specifically, eliminate statements that imply that commercial asbestos is the primary risk factor for mesothelioma risk Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I am a concerned citizen, grassroots activist, auntie, traveller, herbalist, and dedicated bioregionaliSt Recently I had the privilege to travel to the southern part of what we call the united states where the corporation transcanada has built - or is finishing - construction on the infamous keystone xL. though it was an immense privilege to travel and spend time in the communities along that route and to experience the landscape and the terrain it was also devastating to witness and hear the stories of people who live along the route and in the communities where that nasty tar slosh is being transported and . refined. these were stories of legacies lost and people facing DEATH simply b/c a company was irresponsibly given rights to the landbase. aside from the outright racism that moves such as this by a greedy corporation perpetuate the environmental hazards are devastating. michael bishop (who is now running for governor) is suing several state and one federal entity for the failure to enforce regulations. the land that he bought with plans to turn it into a self-sustaining farm yard is now torn up and polluted with the futures he planned for his grandchildren taken away just like that *insert finger snap here.* lovely maya, who's mother cooked us dinner and heated up the sauna for us, and who's church brought us in and fed us soup EVERY sunday that we were there (and housed us when it rained) is feeling the affects of the pipeline on her land: her father is suffering from cancer caused by the gas that comes through the

Alphabetical by sender's first name

courtney butcher

19150

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, courtney butcher 1298 32nd st sw pine river, MN 56474

Courtney Kerns

47171

I am writing to register my total opposition to PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mine near Hoyt Lakes. I am originally from West Virginia where we have so many dead rivers and creeks due to acid mine drainage. These rivers and streams ran clear, beautiful, and brimming with life for thousands of years until companies came along and extracted a couple decades of short-term profits from the land. The jobs and companies are long gone, but the rivers still flow dead- and in some cases yellow and orange. We CANNOT risk this happening in northern Minnesota. The short-term gains (the vast majority of which will go to out-of-state shareholders) are absolutely not worth the risk to our state's clean and living waters. Thank you, Courtney Kristina Kerns 2505 Elida Dr Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Courtney Werk

41851

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Courtney Werk Moorhead, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig 20092

Craig & Karen Groth 16141

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig A Swenson

19921

I've been following the Polymet project for several years, and my concerns are satisfied that the due diligence required of PLM has been performed. Let me state that my family owns lake property in Northern MN and I trust that the MN DNR and overseeing agencies will monitor very closely any data and react with Polymet to correct if there are any surprises not anticipated by EIS (although that seems unlikely with a 1000 page study). Our State, especially Northern MN, needs jobs and this project (future projects) can bring economic vitality into the communities where the young generations have been forced to leave. It wouldn't be right for Washington DC or the Twin Cities environmental lobbies to kabosh a project for Northern MN that is complying with all rational requirements. We Northern Minnesotans don't stick our noses into the business of the Metro area, nor do we necessarily have the clout to do if we tried. The polls and surveys for Northern MN residents are overwhelmingly positive. Northern Minnesotans are the most knowledgeable of the mining industry- they are not afraid. I believe strongly that the net Global effect on the environment is positive if Polymet is permitted. This copper/nickel mine will set an example for the rest of the world to follow. The environmental lobbies should spend their time on where the real problems are (third world) rather than claiming the end of the world is coming if Northern MN operates one brand new mine with tons of oversight. I thank all the good people of the DNR for their work in this matter. Please help breathe some life to Northern MN. -Craig Swenson Craig Swenson Financial Advisor Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc. 1201 Tall Pine Lane Cloquet MN 55720 Cloquet Office: 218-879-6784 International Falls Office: 218-283-3051 Toll Free: 888-256-3292 Learn more at: [HYPERLINK "http://www.ameripriseadvisors-com/craig.a.swenson"](http://www.ameripriseadvisors-com/craig.a.swenson)ameripriseadvisors-com/craig.a.swenson LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin-com/pub/craig-swenson/15/373/b07> We shape financial solutions for a lifetime® An Ameriprise Financial Franchise. Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc. offers financial advisory services, investments, insurance and annuity products. RiverSource® and Columbia Management ® products are offered by affiliates of Ameriprise Financial Services, Inc., Member FINRA and SIPC. ***** "This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use, or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments. Thank you."

Craig Andrew Anttila

42578

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Blacklock

1778

Dec 9, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Blacklock

6233

Dear DNR Commissioner: I wish to voice my opposition to any sulfide mining in Minnesota at this time, for the following reasons: As a landscape photographer, I make my living photographing the wild beauty found within the watershed the proposed PolyMet mine would impact. I've paddled, hiked, and photographed these areas my whole life, and have struggled to protect them from various threats over the decades. No previous threat has been as sinister or long-lasting as the ones presented by sulfide mining. I'm not alone in relying on the area's relatively pristine beauty as a source of income and inspiration. Tourism has been, and could sustainably continue to be a stable, long-term employer in northern Minnesota. I'm very concerned we might be sacrificing these sustainable jobs in favor of a short-term boost in employment from mining. We humans have a pretty myopic outlook on life — especially if jobs are involved. We build on flood plains that haven't flooded for a few years and are surprised when it floods. We build houses in forests that haven't burned in decades, and are surprised when things go up in flames. Like floods and fires, the effects of sulfide mining present threats we can predict with near certainty, and common sense would dictate we prohibit it— especially adjacent to the BWCAW and Lake Superior. What is predictable is that Sulfide mines will cause pollution. What is also predictable is that mine companies may go out of business far sooner than the need to mitigate mine pollution, sticking tax payers with clean up costs. It happens over and over. One of the really outrageous realities in the PolyMet proposal is the need to actively manage the waste for hundreds of years. This would require a guarantee that our system of government would still be in place that long, and that it would have the necessary funds, ongoing technical ability and political will to continue this. There is no example of that kind of stability in the history of mankind. And besides, who are we to place such a burden on that many generations. It is my opinion that if anything requires active management beyond a few years, it should not be permitted — as there will surely come a time when it is allowed to fail. Budget cuts, wars, plagues, famines, all come about with the same certainty as floods and fires, and will be much more likely as climate change and commodity shortages due to population growth strain global stability. If someone were proposing a hazardous waste disposal site, with the exact same specs as the PolyMet proposal, rather than a mine, EVERYONE WOULD BE OPPOSED TO IT — ESPECIALLY THOSE LIVING NEAR IT. I'd like to raise an additional thought, which is perhaps the largest reason to deny permits at this time. Any mining operation takes lots of electricity. Actively treating water through reverse osmosis creates the spectrum of huge amounts of electricity into the foreseeable future. Climate change is an imminent threat to the planet. Many scientists feel we must stop adding any more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere to mitigate what will already be severe environmental damage, especially to northern areas and forests. The DNR is charged with protecting our natural resources, including the health of our forests and waterways, and certainly must take this issue into consideration. Currently, any new mining operations in the area would be primarily serviced by fossil-fueled electric power plants, emitting huge amounts of carbon dioxide and other pollutants. The mineral deposits these companies wish to extract, are not going to go away, and the demand for these minerals in the future will only produce higher prices as they become scarcer. Humans will, within the next few decades, develop much cleaner sources of electricity — sources such as liquid fluoride thorium reactors, and advancements in solar and wind energy. In light of this, it would be totally irresponsible for the DNR to allow mining to go ahead now. If it

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Blacklock

19122

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Craig Blacklock 3853 County Line Road P.O. Box 344 Moose Lake, MN 55767 2184850478

Craig Bowron

43992

Dear Ms Fay and other members of the EIS for the proposed non-ferrous mine, I believe there are multiple problems-among them tax structure, water quality, lack of a health impact assessment, water quality issues-and so I would ask that you not allow the mine to be built as described in the current plan. Beyond that, I simply do not trust that any mining company (or any private company) can be held to a 500 year clean up plan. Capitalism is a remarkable economic system, but its view is short term; it seeks to maximize short term profits, and minimize losses. When the nickel and copper are gone, they will shift to loss prevention-by either loosely following clean up agreements or by abandoning them altogether, thereby forcing them into the courts (whichever option minimizes the losses would be the preferred option). That's not a judgment statement, that's how capitalism works. Bankruptcy is also a tried-and-true method for minimizing losses. The history of capitalism is littered with externalities-economic costs that private companies foist onto the public. When the private snowplowers here in Saint Paul push all of the alley snow-which they are being paid to remove-out into the street, the snow becomes an externality that the public plows must deal with. Simply look at the lumbering industry here in the early days of our state. When the trees were gone, the lumber companies moved west. The slash and the stumpage was sold to immigrants as "cleared farm land," even though most of it would never be successfully farmed. In this regard, I would ask you to fix the Polymet mine plan by hammering out a detailed plan that provides solid financial assurances to the current owners of the nickel and copper: Minnesotans. Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration. Craig L. Bowron 1396 Sargent Avenue Saint Paul, MN. 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Brown

40105

From: cbrown@monkeybridge-com [cbrown@monkeybridge-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:33 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Craig Brown 2908 Southbrook Drive Minneapolis, MN 55431-2447

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Brown

41780

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Craig Dienger

42074

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Craig Dienger Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Geiger

40407

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Craig Geiger 2810 Galloway St Se Olympia, WA 98501 US

Craig Johnson

18071

I would like to discuss for a few minutes the concept of risk management. All decisions involve risk. It's the ability to properly evaluate, account for, and mitigate the risk that sets apart the fly-by-nighters and the professionals. I think that we can manage the risk to provide our people resources that they need to advance and maintain our current lifestyles. I think we know how to manage the risk better than anyone else in the world could. We have over a century of mining experience to learn from. Undoubtedly some of these examples are not good ones. But yet we have learned from them and are better prepared to face the challenges that may arise tomorrow and long into the future. We do have some of the most pristine habitat and natural water quality in the United States. And maybe even the world. And have standards that far exceed those of our contemporaries to ensure that these blessings that we enjoy remained unblemished. Moving ahead with the NorthMet copper-nickel mine involves risk. I believe those risks have to be evaluated, accounted for, and mitigated to meet one of the highest standards, the Minnesota-not-in-my-backyard standard. I believe we can set a new standard of mineral extraction that will be used as an example for generations to come. And hopefully without eight and a half years of prior scoping and evaluation. As I mentioned in the beginning, all decisions involve risk. It should be understood that determination to not allow a proposed mine also involves risk. We risk allowing someone else of lower standards than ours to gain an advantage in the precious metal market. We set up a big warning sign for future investors in Northern Minnesota that says, "Don't even think of mining here unless you can guarantee that nothing will ever happen. That absolutely no habitat will be impacted. And your pre-scoping budget must be greater than \$100 million." I mean how else will we support our economy? And finally we risk the wellbeing of Minnesota's most important resource, our people and our children, which are all stakeholders in this project. Thank you for all who have spent an enormous and expensive amount of time and resources choosing to professionally address the decisions and the associated risk before us in a highly professional manner.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Laughlin

40425

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Nagel

16088

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Olson

18368

My name is Craig Olson, O-L-S-O-N. I'm a proud fourth generation (inaudible). What makes me even prouder is my daughter Christie is a fifth generation. She works in the painter's union as an apprentice. Very proud to be five generations. My family has been able to live in these communities from Ely to Duluth and be able to make a living here. I'm speaking tonight as the President of the Duluth Building Trades Council. Our 17 construction trade unions, many of them were here tonight. I was proud to see all the apprentices are that here. The men and women, the young people were here. They care about this issue. Speaking as the president, we are on record in support. The Northeast Area Labor Council is also on record. I'm on their executive board. Of course we have a project labor agreement on this project. PolyMet has done everything we've asked them to to ensure our members, who live in these communities, from the Iron Range to Duluth and the region, to make sure that our people are the ones that will be employed there. And that is absolutely going to happen. This project will produce a lot of jobs. Not only construction jobs. The construction isn't just for the PolyMet site. The recycled LTV site, which by the way I worked at LTV as a construction worker. I'm proud to have a good job. That project alone will bring in 2 million man hours construction. 2 million man hours. That's the equivalent to the Target Stadium that was built here recently in the Twin Cities where the Twins play. There is 360 full-time mining positions. And there's more than 600 related jobs that will be produced. That will produce good-paying jobs for the families that are very much needed. We cannot afford to miss the opportunity of these full-time job, including the construction jobs. Copper-nickel mining can be done right. I've listened to a lot of good speakers on both sides tonight. My members of my unions, trade unions, they are environmentalists. You bet they are. I spend in my time in Tower, Minnesota, every chance I get at the family cabin. We fish. We hunt. We are environmentalists. We're going to protect our environment. But we're going to make sure it's done right. The agencies in front of us tonight we know. We trust them. We know it's going to be done right or it's not going to be permitted. We know that. But it's about time we put our people to work. A lot of men and women in the trades, over 6,000 in this region. We need the jobs. Thank you.

Craig Poorker

42471

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Craig Poorker 3711 York Ave N Robbinsdale, MN 55422-2312

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Prudhomme

45438

From Craig Prudhomme 53533 Sjordahl Rd Sandstone, MN 55072 [HYPERLINK "mailto:craigprudhomme@gmail-com" craigprudhomme@gmail-com](mailto:craigprudhomme@gmail-com) 320-245-2589
Comments on SDEIS PolyMet Minnesota has a long history of natural resource extraction from fur-bearing wildlife like the beaver, to our forest resources like the big pines and the Big Woods, to mineral extraction like the great iron mines. It has consistently been a story of huge changes on the landscape, of boom and bust. When we are done, the land is never the same, never as good. We can never fully undo the damage and the change. In the 1970s and 80's we began to see the price of such unsustainable practices and to create some agencies and laws to protect the land and the water. Though it seems like the land of 10,000 lakes has a never-ending water resource like the loggers thought of the the great pine forests, we are seeing that too is not true. Excessive draws on groundwater is draining lakes, water quality is decreasing, invasives are increasing, wetlands continue to be compromised, and the habitat surrounding our surface waters is under constant attack from development - residential, commercial and industrial. Northeastern Minnesota, though somewhat beat up, is one of the last great reservoirs of wild land in this region. It is an international resource that includes the Superior, the greatest of our Great Lakes. PolyMet is proposing to create a mine that will further destroy wetlands and put at risk watersheds that include Lake Superior. This is done for a finite mineral resource that will be extracted for a finite number of years with the promise that the waste left behind, will be adequately and safely monitored and the environment protected - for many lifetimes - far longer than this corporation, this government, or current agencies can even imagine paying for and maintaining. This is not going to occur in a desert region, it will occur in a temperate, wet, leaky region, where we have the occasional flood event. I have personally observed the immediate after effects of when heavy rain caused a "secured" ash pile to fail and wash across the highway into Taconite Harbor near Schroeder in 1993- We can look to reports of power plant ash dikes that have not been adequately inspected here in Minnesota. How do we think we can take the risk to monitor and inspect for hundreds of years when we do not have enough institutional memory to keep from revisiting past errors. This mine should not be permitted. The potential costs are too great for the potential short-term gains. And these gains will be short-termed by comparison to the costs. The people who moved to the mining areas for the past booms bemoan the bust. They'll get some jobs and it will revitalize their communities until the next bust, and then, unlike beaver and trees which can grow again, a bunch of grassed-over, leaky, walled-off tailings piles and polluted water will leave the land even less able to sustain a living. We think copper and nickel are valuable resources, but when we look at the one most important resource to life, fresh water, we are only now beginning to realize that it is the number one, most important resource. Clean water is finite. You just have to go to different regions of our country to see it is our most basic necessity. Do not put this at risk. Sincerely, Craig Prudhomme

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig R. Miller

3491

Dear Lisa Fay, I believe the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources' DEIS on PolyMet's mine plan is flawed and inadequate, as it does not fully describe impacts on Minnesota taxpayers or the surrounding environment. It is very problematic that PolyMet's details about a financial assurance or a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in this revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from liability. As a former shareholder of PolyMet stock I have changed my position on this mining project 180 degrees and am now strongly opposed to this mine proposal. I am very concerned that PolyMet Mining company anticipates that at least 500 years of polluted water will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Also, every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. Who will be paying for all of this after the mine is closed in just 20 years. As a current stockholder of many other mining companies, I do not believe that PolyMet's plan is reasonable, responsible or in the best interests of Minnesota, its citizens or environment. The DNR's DEIS must be revised to more fully analyze the range of environmental and economic impacts of this flawed proposal. Sincerely, Craig R. Miller 1849 Whitaker Street White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Craig R. QualeyFisher

17340

Please see Attached Letter. Craig R. Qualey-Fisher, CLU Risk Advisor 2048 Superior Drive NW 620 Main St/ P O Box 49 Suite100 Red Wing, MN 55066 Rochester, MN 55901 Phone (651)388-4613 Phone (507)535-3133 Fax (651)301-7620 Fax (507)535-3130 www.cobrown-com The information in this email is intended for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain CONFIDENTIAL information or material. If you receive this information or material in error, please contact the sender and delete or destroy the information or material immediately. ---Original Message--- From: mp161@lba-com [mailto:mp161@lba-com] Sent: Monday, February 17, 2014 11:52 AM To: Craig R. QualeyFisher Subject: This E-mail was sent from "RNPDB6FA8" (Aficio MP 161). Scan Date: 02-17-2014 11:52:09 (-0600) Queries to: mp161@lba-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Craig Schroeder

15771

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Craig Spry

42770

See attachment

Craig Westgate

39790

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Craig Westgate 3523 Saint Paul Ave Minneapolis, MN 55416-4344

Alphabetical by sender's first name

craig zlimen

15451

As a lifelong resident of Minnesota, including living in Eveleth, MN and currently owning a summer home and property on the Iron Range, I am highly concerned about the proposed PolyMet Mine. While I appreciate the need for livable wage jobs in this generally depressed economic area, it seems the risk of wide-spread, long-term contamination of the area's water-supply far outweighs any potential benefit of a few hundred, relatively short-term jobs. Currently, tourism is the one of the largest sources of jobs and revenue in and around the Iron Range. Given the tourism industry is driven almost entirely by the area's lakes, streams, and outdoor recreation opportunities, it seems absurd to consider any large-scale plan that would place those invaluable natural resources at risk. It is not worth risking large-scale harm to the environment and established tourism industry for the prospect a relatively small number of jobs expected to be created by PolyMet. I sincerely hope the DNR will advocate for the long-term health of Minnesota's environment, water, and tourism and deny PolyMet's permit to mine in Northeast Minnesota. Thank you for taking comments on this matters. Craig Zlimen 2203 Ogden Court St Paul, MN 55119 651-245-5330

craigaparsons

41998

I would like to voice my opinions regarding the SDEIS for the proposed Polymet mine. I believe the SDEIS has serious shortcomings that need to be addressed before any permitting decisions are made. The location of the proposed mine is identified throughout the document as being on the Iron range, implying that it is part of the Biwabik iron formation. However I've read reports that contradict this and place this mine location in the sulfide-bearing rock of the Duluth formation. I'm concerned about this beyond simple semantics. Are the assumptions underpinning the studies of potential pollution caused by hydrologic and geologic activity consistent with this misclassification. I feel the economic benefits section of the document is misleading. There has not been quantitative accounting of the many environmental effects on the economic outlook. Full and part time jobs have been lumped together in the analysis. Also the economic benefits of mining should be compared to a no-mining scenario. Without such a comparison, how does one claim the mining option results in a net social and economic benefit, even if the huge environmental risks are deemed acceptable. The environmental risks completely dominate the decision on whether the mine should be allowed or not. Mines such as the one proposed here, where sulfide bearing rock will be exposed have the monumental task of containing the sulfide runoff from that waste rock. In fact, no mine of this type has been successfully operated without accompanying acid pollution. This proposal fails to convince me that this mine will be first to avoid that outcome. It is paramount that the technical plan for mine cleanup and water treatment be beyond reasonable question especially in light of the location of this mine so close to pristine wilderness such as the BWCAW, and Lake Superior. The SDEIS as it exists now does not meet that requirement. I have read that even other taconite mines that have been shuttered in the state of MN have not been in compliance with acceptable levels of sulfide runoff, and those were mines where the waste rock was of much lower sulfide content. In the last week, it has been announced that the MPCA will soon release new standards for sulfate release into waters that are capable of growing wild rice. This is expected to have far reaching consequences for any mining operation. Because these new standards, this proposal should be delayed for further consideration until it has addressed compliance with these new rules. The most disturbing shortcoming of the SDEIS is the lack of an accounting for the financial aspects of the closing and decommissioning of the mine. The report indicates unacceptably high levels of sulfide in discharge water for hundreds of years after mining ceases, yet none of the projections actually show safe levels being reached for the hundreds of years over which the models were run. How can a decision to permit be discussed without a timeframe identified where active and costly water treatment such as reverse osmosis are no longer required. Polymet has been quoted in the press as saying that they are able and willing to treat mine runoff for as long as it is required. This is clearly a ridiculous statement. No realistic business plan could be based on an infinitely long treatment plan that would at some point negate all profits realized from the mining operations. Knowing the length of this treatment time is absolutely necessary to determine if the mine can be a successful business venture. Polymet knows this and I imagine they know exactly how long they can afford to treat water and stay profitable or otherwise they wouldn't have been able to attract investors for this project. The corollary to establishing a true cost estimate for the long term water treatment is to also understand how much money Polymet must place in a trust to ensure the treatment needs can be met without taxpayer support. Without this trust, there i

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Crystal Myslajek

38772

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Proponents of the project argue that it will create jobs however, there are other and better ways to create jobs that do not deplete and pollute our natural resources for generations to come. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mitigation measures for dealing with the risks are costly and are not guaranteed. This project puts too much at risk The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Crystal Myslajek 2731 14th Ave S Ste 620 Minneapolis, MN 55407-1126

Crystal Waters

42694

See attachment

Crystal Yakacki

18893

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Crystal Yakacki 1014 27th Ave SE Apt E Minneapolis, MN 55414 (516) 987-6328

ctok

21718

Ronald and Carol Tokarczyk 243 Kent Road Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750 218-225-3564 Fact: Each season has differing amounts of snow levels, and rainfalls. Question: Will they in fact be prepared to meet the varying demands for safe handling of the byproducts of production. Fact: We hear that Polymet is reluctant to put money into a trust fund for cleanup. Question: Can they be trusted to be responsible for long term water control and reclamation. We would like to see Polymet become a reality, but we are uncertain whether they can be trusted as a good neighbor.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Curt Bush

9838

Dear Ms Fay, As a downstream resident on the Whiteface River near Cotton, Minnesota, and because I have been learning about sulphide ore bodies once uncovered, I gotta ask you to demand a renewed environmental review based upon accurate water flow measurements at the Polymet site. My real hope is that the DNR will work with the tribal agencies and form an alliance to protect our water resources. My ultimate hope is that the whole darn project will be evaluated as too risky, in too sensitive an area, and should be abandoned. I have so very little faith that Polymet, or any mining corporation, would be trustworthy partners in understanding the critical value of water conservation and environmental protection and doing what they say they will. Please give my letter to you, every consideration we don't have many clean water areas left. sincerely, Curt Bush 7789 Arkola Rd Cotton, MN

9847

Dear Mr Bruner, As a downstream resident on the Whiteface River near Cotton, Minnesota, and because I have been learning about sulphide or bodies once uncovered, I gotta ask you to demand a renewed environmental review based upon accurate water flow measurements. My real hope is that the Army Corps will work with the tribal agencies. My hope is that the whole darn project will be evaluated as too risky, in too sensitive an area, and should be abandoned. I have so very little faith that the Minnesota DNR will look at the project from the standpoint of the critical value of water conservation and environmental protection. sincerely, Curt Bush 7789 Arkola Rd Cotton, MN

18629

Dear Mr Bruner, As a downstream resident on the Whiteface River near Cotton, Minnesota, and because I have been learning about sulphide or bodies once uncovered, I gotta ask you to demand a renewed environmental review based upon accurate water flow measurements. My real hope is that the Army Corps will work with the tribal agencies. My hope is that the whole darn project will be evaluated as too risky, in too sensitive an area, and should be abandoned. I have so very little faith that the Minnesota DNR will look at the project from the standpoint of the critical value of water conservation and environmental protection. sincerely, Curt Bush 7789 Arkola Rd Cotton, MN

42508

Dear Mr Bruner, As a downstream resident on the Whiteface River near Cotton, Minnesota, and because I have been learning about sulphide or bodies once uncovered, I gotta ask you to demand a renewed environmental review based upon accurate water flow measurements. My real hope is that the Army Corps will work with the tribal agencies. My hope is that the whole darn project will be evaluated as too risky, in too sensitive an area, and should be abandoned. I have so very little faith that the Minnesota DNR will look at the project from the standpoint of the critical value of water conservation and environmental protection. sincerely, Curt Bush 7789 Arkola Rd Cotton, MN

51495

Dear Mr/ Ms Dabney, As a downstream resident on the Whiteface River near Cotton, Minnesota, and because I have been learning about sulphide ore bodies once uncovered, I gotta ask you to demand a renewed environmental review based upon accurate water flow measurements at the Polymet site. My real hope is that the Forest Service will work with the tribal agencies and form an alliance to protect our water resources. My ultimate hope is that the whole darn project will be evaluated as too risky, in too sensitive an area, and should be abandoned. I have so very little faith that the Minnesota DNR will look at the project from the standpoint of the critical value of water conservation and environmental protection. Please give my letter to you every consideration we don't have many clean water areas left. sincerely, Curt Bush 7789 Arkola Rd Cotton, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Curt McNamara

7722

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The PolyMet sulfide mine is an extremely bad idea for Minnesota. Our legacy is clean air, water, and recreation. Mining in such a sensitive area is not compatible with our values and presents substantial risk to air and water quality. I realize that work has been done to quantify how the discharges would affect the environment, and predictions have been made. The sad fact is that "stuff happens" and it will take the environment hundreds or thousands of years to recover. In addition the mine would destroy wetlands which we and our wildlife desperately need. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Curt McNamara 3616 44th Ave S Mpls. MN 55406 Curt McNamara 3616 44th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Curt Steinerbraun

18148

My name is Bernie Rissanen. I'm a representative of the Pipefitter's 539 Minneapolis. And I yield my time to Curt Steinerbraun. CURT STEINERBRAUN: Hi my name is Curt Steinerbraun. This morning when I left my home in Winter Springs, Florida, it was 81 degrees. Let me assure you I'm happy to be here. And I am grateful for the opportunity to speak here. Actually, my journey started in 1923. 90 years ago last month my grandfather got off the boat, went through Ellis Island seeking a better life. Four days later he was working for the Westinghouse Corporation. He worked in the factory 42 years. My father was an apprentice. Worked in the same factory for 43 years. I was blessed with the opportunity to get a mechanical engineering degree. I have two sons, both mechanical engineers. With the four generations we have 151 years in the energy business. My first trip to The Range was in 1973. 25 years ago I had my first shore lunch. I fished the Boundary Waters -- and they truly are beautiful -- two of the last three years. I'm hoping to be there again this summer. Minnesota has beautiful scenery, has wonderful resources, and some of the best people in the world. And I'm here to advocate on behalf of the Minnesota mining initiatives. I work for Siemens. Siemens is a large global company, a leader in the field of energy and electrical equipment. We're a \$100 billion company doing business in the US of \$25 billion every year. We are approaching 60,000 employees globally here in the US. And I'm responsible for the western part of the US for our energy sector. We build products that make electricity and deliver it to your homes and your businesses. We need copper and other critical metals to build our products. An example you can see in your community here is wind turbines that we are building in the state of Minnesota and North Dakota that feed this territory with clean, renewable energy. One of my issues or problems is every one of those wind turbines requires about 8,000 pounds of copper. And it also requires other specialty metals. If I -- if my company is to maintain a thriving, healthy business, we need a secure domestic source for copper and other metals like that. And I would speak just a moment on the EIS process. Every major power plant we build is required to go through EIS. I know how thorough it is. I know how time consuming it is. And I know how many hours everybody puts into it. So thank you to the US Corps of Engineers, the Department of Natural Resources, and the US Forestry for your effort.

Curt Thompson

38488

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. NAME ADDRESS Sent from my iPhone

Curtis Martinson

42773

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Curtis Stendel

39057

---Original Message--- From: curt@panelworksplus-com [mailto:curt@panelworksplus-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 11:38 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies' view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Curtis Stendel 4861 Ambassador Blvd NW Saint Francis, MN 55070-9716

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cyn Goustin

9390

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cyn Goustin 6029 Dupont Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55419

18621

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cyn Goustin 6029 Dupont Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cyn Goustin

50697

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Cyn Goustin 6029 Dupont Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55419

Cyndi Neus Bradley

39558

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Cyndi Neus Bradley 4510 Chatsworth St N Shoreview, MN 55126-2207

Alphabetical by sender's first name

CYNDI SALINAS

40362

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, CYNDI SALINAS 1632 PARK DRIVE SCHAUMBURG, IL 60194 US

Cyndy Klinksiek

4219

From: Cyndy Klinksiek [mailto:klink@visi-com] Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2013 4:58 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet Ms Fay: My husband and I moved to Duluth because of the great natural beauty and unspoiled resources of northern Minnesota. I'm writing to express my views about the SDEIS draft for PolyMet. I understand that people need jobs, and we citizens of Minnesota want to build a strong, sustainable economy, but we also need to consider the legacy we leave our children. The proposed copper-nickel mine may bring money into communities in the short term, but when the metals have been extracted, tax-payers will be left holding the clean-up bill. Our precious pure supplies of water are the envy of the world. We need to safeguard them for future generations. I've read about the chemistry of sulfates, and I believe we need to value our supplies of fresh water more highly. With waste that may need to be treated for more than 500 years, the risk is too great. Mining will create wealth for few, leaving generations of Minnesotans wondering how our citizens could have been so short-sighted as to approve this extraction at so cheap a price. Cyndy Klinksiek 125 E 7th St Duluth, MN 55805 _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"Image removed by sender. This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Cynthia A & Russell K Hobbie

54571

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cynthia Cone

16232

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

cynthia hardy

41850

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms cynthia hardy 1145hudson rd apt 335 st paul, MN 55106

Cynthia Hobbie

21541

Please see the attached document.

Cynthia Lee

14677

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. You all know the problems with PolyMet - and you know that the public does, too, and that people like me are spreading the word that PolyMet has a horrible plan which will make them rich, and then they'll duck out on taking care of their mess. We all know this. Don't think that there are any good sides to their proposals, because what small good things come of it are not even close to outweighing the damage that will result from this. So I say to you: Reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Miss Cynthia Lee 1882 Shryer Ave W Roseville, MN 55113-5412 (612) 570-4595

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cynthia McKeen

16259

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Cynthia Peterson

48176

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Cynthia Peterson 518 N 23rd Ave W Duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Cynthia Wicklund

14869

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Cynthia Williams

41862

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Cynthia Williams 1940 E Hearn Rd Phoenix, AZ 85022-4515 (602) 482-1089

D Becker

17540

Based on reading the reports it is apparent Polymet can safely mine in norther MN with little impact on the environment. With the limited environmental impact I fully support the approval of permits for this mine. Native of MN. David Becker

Alphabetical by sender's first name

D Borgmann

46963

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine Project and the proposed exchange of 6650 acres of Superior Forest Lands. The US Forest Service does not allow strip mines on Federal land within the Superior National Forest where this proposed mine would be located. I feel it is wrong to do this land exchange to basically get around the intent of this law and it is not in the public's interest. Sulfide mining has a track record of water contamination caused by acid mine drainage. In particular water rich areas are most vulnerable such as in the Superior National Forest where this Polymet mine is proposed. Even lower sulfide content can be quite toxic when there is a lot of waste rock which is the case for this proposed mine. Many if not most owners of mines declare bankruptcy leaving taxpayers with the cleanup costs which run into the millions of dollars. In fact Hardrock mining is considered by the United State EPA as being the top toxic producing industry. Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The SDEIS has admitted treatment of water would require 200- 500 years or more. This is basically perpetual treatment. This violates Minnesota Rule (6132-3200) calling for a mine to be left maintenance free at closure. With that said it amazes me this is even being considered. We need a law as strong as Wisconsin's "Prove it First" mining moratorium law. This is what I want and Minnesotans deserve, we should not be risking our valuable resources. Sincerely, Diane Borgmann 2285 Stewart Ave #2123 St Paul Mn 55116

D Hudson

40317

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, D Hudson Tracy st Los Angeles, CA 90027 US

D K

9657

This email is intended to communicate my personal opinion that the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be deemed complete in every respect. This project should proceed to permitting without delay. This is a good project capable of creating good jobs in northern Minnesota. It will also allow many of the legacy issues that exit due to past mining activities to be addressed by PolyMet in a technically sound manner in a shorter timeframe. Respectfully submitted, David King 7563 Park Lane Eveleth, MN 55734 218/780-8868-

Alphabetical by sender's first name

D O

41717

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, D O 1600 Pine Road Chesapeake, VA 23322

D Ross

58144

Board Resolution Regarding PolyMet Mining January 28, 2014 The Duluth Area Chamber of Commerce supports the emerging strategic metals mining industry in Northeastern Minnesota. The Chamber's board of directors passed a formal resolution, illustrating this support, on May 28, 2013. The Chamber's board understands how the strategic mining industry of Northeastern Minnesota will generate thousands of new jobs for our region. As well, the board appreciates how strategic metals mining will have a positive impact on local tax revenue and education funding. Additionally, the board realizes how mining companies operating in Northeastern Minnesota, such as PolyMet, will utilize advanced technology to meet rigorous environmental standards established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Minnesota to ensure protection of human and environmental health. These agencies rely on years of scientific research to set these standards that safeguard our air, water and land. The board also recognizes and appreciates how members of our Chamber have already benefited from the planning phase of the PolyMet project. For example, Barr Engineering is doing much of PolyMet's environmental work. Additionally, Krech Ojard is providing PolyMet engineering support. PolyMet has spent more than \$1.2 million doing business with Duluth companies in 2013. We recognize that, once PolyMet receives its permits, several more Duluth area businesses will provide services and product to the Polymet Project. The positive economic impact of PolyMet will exponentially grow when construction and mining begin. In summary, the Duluth Area Chamber of Commerce stands in support of the emerging strategic metals mining in beautiful Northeastern Minnesota. The PolyMet Project is the most immediate example of this mining. Therefore, the Chamber's board is passing this formal resolution to: fully support and publicly advocate for the PolyMet Mining initiative. We respectfully encourage decision makers empowered with determining PolyMet's future to allow this needed project to proceed.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

D V Sandstrom

42559

POLYMET COMMENT/EDITORIAL 1/22/14 • My family has N.E. MN roots dating back of the turn of the century (early 1900's). I have lived in other areas of the Midwest but have lived here on the Iron Range since the late 1970's and chose to raise a family here in large part for a love of the outdoors & this area's unique environment. • I do not wish to impugn the motives of those against this project but I am a bit mystified by their positions, especially "the sky is falling" mentality environmentally. "Conservation" is the wise use as opposed to misuse or nonuse of resources. It seems to me that our presence here at this evenings forum is proof that here in America, we have policies & procedures in place designed to protect the environment. Polymet is utilizing environmentally friendly technologies designed to utilize resources without abusing the environment- technologies that simply were not previously available. For years this Nation has been concerned with becoming "energy independent"... Why not the same sentiment re: "metals independence"? Regardless of how well intentioned, on at least two fronts that I can think of, those who are against this project for "environmental" reasons may not have entirely thought through their position. 1. Overreaching under the "environmental protection" mantra actually does more harm than good to the very environment they are claiming to protect. How so? To the extent that we find ourselves dependent upon foreign supplies of these resources, are we not simply shifting at much higher environmental cost (and social & economic cost I might add) the liability to countries who do not have policies in place designed to protect the environment? That many of these other countries are unwilling to invest in technologies & infrastructure designed to utilize resources without regard for the environment should be obvious, just ask the average Chinese citizen how they feel about their air or water quality. By refusing to move forward with projects such as Polymet, we in effect do more damage to the environment globally and are subsidizing atrocious policies where concern for the environment takes a back seat and stringent environmental measures are paid lip service at best. 2. Furthermore, refusing to utilize resources given the protections and processes we have in place is irresponsible economically and socially. Not only are wages and benefits lost to N.E., MN and our state generally but, as alluded to previously, our refusal to responsibly mine these resources means that we are subsidizing entities who, as demonstrated by their wanton disregard for the environment, obviously have little regard for economic or social stewardship. Are those who work in the mines and industry of China enjoying a dignified standard of living? If so, at what cost? At the cost of wearing a respirator just in order to be outdoors or of being afraid to drink the water? Shame on us if we allow a well intentioned but misguided few nix projects such as Polymets and thereby promote continuation of these policies globally. Finally, in my opinion "Polymet" and all those involved with the project, ought to be commended for their conviction, patience and persistence and used as model rather than vilified. Thank you for the vision and risk you and your investors have been willing to take for all of our benefit. Respectfully, D.V. Sandstrom 3747 Hwy 5, Hibbing, MN 55746 d.v.sandstrom@gmail.com (218)262-3987 or (218) 966-2720 cel

Dabney Bullivant

52289

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota Duluth. The natural beauty of the Great Lakes is what drew me to going to school here. I love Minnesota because it is a state that values and protects these natural spaces. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Dabney Bullivant 7518 130th Ave Milaca, MN 56353-4437 (763) 898-0268

Dagmar Romano

1811

Please email the Executive Summary of the PolyMet Draft EIS to [HYPERLINK "mailto:ron-moore1@hotmail-com"](mailto:ron-moore1@hotmail-com)ron-moore1@hotmail-com Thank you - Dagmar Romano _____ From: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us To: dagmar.romano@hotmail-com Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Date: Sat, 14 Dec 2013 23:20:08 +0000 Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dagmar Romano

18257

My name is Dagmar Romano. I am from St. Paul. I am 71 years old. My professional background is in environmental remediation. I am a mom and a grandma. My granddaughter is six years old and my grandsons are four-year-old twin boys. I call them my three little munchskins. They are so cute. They are my greatest source of joy and my greatest source of fear. The joy is self-explanatory. My fear is that they will not experience the natural health, beauty and serenity of Minnesota's northland as I have been able to do for so many years. I fear that they will inherit from my generation a state that is much less environmentally sound than it was when I found it. It is a well-known and honored practice that when camping in the BWCA we always leave our campsites in as good a shape or better than when we found them. Wouldn't we want to do the same for our precious state? The PolyMet SDEIS isn't a plan. It is an experiment that would put Minnesota's clean water at risk for hundreds of years, as stated in the document. The document doesn't provide the basic information to support its predictions. How much polluted wastewater is going back and forth through nine miles of pipes? What is the total volume of wastewater in tailings and processing residue? Just how polluted is the wastewater and waste rock piles, pits, sump ponds, the tailings basin and the hydrometallic waste dump? The SDEIS is incomplete because without this basic information, we can't estimate what would happen if PolyMet's unrealistic assumptions, not based on data by the way, don't come true. The project -- the SDEIS admits that the project is an experiment. On page after page it says that in the event that modeling shows violations of water quality, PolyMet will adaptively manage the problem. How does "adaptive management" as a plan sound to you? The document is incomplete. It must reveal wastewater volumes and pollutant levels at every step. It must have facilities from day one to meet water standards. In closing, can someone help me understand how on earth we, as Minnesotans, would even consider a project that threatens to pollute our water for hundreds of years? Is this the state and the legacy that we want to leave our kids and grandkids? And for what? Some jobs that last a few years and huge profits for a mining company? I'm reminded of a poem by Robert Fulghum titled, "All I really need to know I learned in kindergarten." Particularly these lines, "Share everything, play fair, don't hit people, clean up your own mess, don't take things that aren't yours." PolyMet, are you listening?

42447

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, The SDEIS is incomplete because important issues, such as environmental assurances, are not adequately addressed. In addition, there is inadequate data to make an informed decision about the 500 year time frame that is being proposed for water treatment from the operation. In addition, how can any state agency agree to a 500 year time frame for water treatment/monitoring. That proposition is nuts I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms dagmar romano 1840 Goodrich Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1509

Daisy Dominguez

54221

Dear Ms. Fay I am a student at Humboldt High School and we are an environmental school. We like to take care of nature, we also try to prevent damage to our environment. Environmental impact statements show that water from mines will have toxic levels of metals after 500 years. Of course it does not have to be that way. This is all preventable. I have noticed that your map is incorrect. I am sure that you are well aware of this. Giving false information and leaving out very important information is not okay. I am asking for you to redo your map correctly and show the correct length of the swap. I also find it necessary for a hydraulic conductivity test to see how much the swap and the mines could effect the boundary waters. Also there must be a water test in the boundary waters to make sure there is no chemicals in it. The boundary waters are very important and special because they are pure and clean, not too many places are left like that. You do not have the right as well as any other person to contaminate the boundary waters. You can not take your own selfish decisions and harm our environment. Sincerely, Daisy Dominguez 58 East King St. Paul, MN 55107

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dakota Hoska 39812

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The fact that we are even considering this mine is ludicrous. We have so much to protect, so much to lose, it is not worth the few measly jobs this project will create and for how long. Jobs for 200 people for 20 years. For what. Loss of rice beds, loss of wildlife habitat, loss of water security and the loss of fragile, pristine ecosystems. The copper mine must be stopped. That is the bottom line. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Dakota Hoska 5152 10th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1724 (612) 823-2821

Dakota Johnson 42540

See attachment

Dale & Lynie Shimmin 44631

I am writing to encourage you to not approve the proposed PolyMet mine project. After studying the available research, I am convinced that this mine would be detrimental to the people of Minnesota as well as all those who visit this area. The long term effects on the land and water of this area would be disastrous. Sincerely, Dale Shimmin 2832 Minnesota Avenue Duluth, MN 55802

Dale Boeff 39527

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Dale Boeff 1738 Forssa Way Eagan, MN 55122-2658

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Dahlquist

38712

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dale Dahlquist 1005 Argyle St St Paul, MN 55103

Dale Gustafson

28767

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I would like to add my comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The records are clear, the mining industry has a terrible record of pollution and note standing behind their statement of taking care of problems Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. There is no proof that they can contain the pollution from this mining practice and only proof that they will not keep promises to protect the value of clean water and the species that thrive in that water. Once some pollution gets in the water flowing to Lake Superior it will be impossible to clean it out. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Dale Gustafson 1845 Wisconsin Ave N Golden Valley, MN 55427-3962 (763) 544-4215

Dale Hegfors

42799

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Hintsala

9283

PolyMet EIS Project Manager I wish to submit my opinion concerning the release of permits for the construction and operation of the PolyMet project in Minnesota. I sincerely believe the citizens of Minnesota and the United States would environmentally and economically benefit from the construction and operation of the PolyMet project in Minnesota were the facility would have to be managed and operated under strict US and Minnesota environmental regulations. If the capacity of the proposed operation were to be developed in other Nations, such as China, our western States would receive atmospheric pollutants as they experienced from other mineral beneficiation processes located in countries with little or no environmental regulation. Build the capacity in the United States were it can be environmentally controlled-do not submit to building the capacity in a foreign nation were we only experience the environmental pollution from unregulated processes. Thank you Dale A. Hintsala, P.E. 11152 County Road 553 Nashwauk, Mn 55769 218-262-3654

Dale Johnson

10205

To Whom It May Concern: Time after time we are assured all necessary precautions have been taken to protect the environment yet when damage is done the responsible parties declare bankruptcy and walk away. I cite the company that released chemicals into the water supply in Charleston, West Virginia as the most recent example. What assurances are there this won't happen the first time pollutants are "accidentally" released. The beauty and quality of Northern Minnesota is too valuable to risk for a few jobs that will end up costing the citizens of Minnesota multiple times their value in damages and clean-up. Dale F. Johnson 4141 Victoria St N. Shoreview, MN 55126

16031

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Johnson

41738

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Dale Johnston

10869

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Dale Johnston 14615 Oakwood Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345-2322 (952) 929-3765

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Johnston

39731

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Dale Koplin

41810

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Dale Koplin 111 Bayfield Ct Lake Mills, WI 53551-1566 (920) 648-5137

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Lockwood

43574

I am concerned in many ways. Number one, does the MN. DNR have up to date fish surveys and inventory of fish populations present. Aquatic plants present. As a person who is very familiar with the use and labeling of copper sulfate By the US EPA as a herbicide, pesticide, fishicide etc. it can be deadly at very low levels. Montana still has Blue ribbon trout streams completely void of fish due to runoff of copper sulfate waste from mines closed years ago and still having problems containing the runoff and leaching. Copper Sulfate at concentrations as low as 0-2PPM, which is equivalent to adding 0-5 pounds of copper sulfate per acre foot of water as Mn. DNR records show moves fish. At low alkalinity if present for more than a day has the potential to kill fish. Higher concentrations will definitely kill fish. These levels may even be lower than the levels Wild Rice can tolerate. Also any acidification of the water will cause soluble mercury levels to rise and work into the food chain, causing levels in fish to rise, which recommendations for people to eat are already very limited in the area. Recent study along the north shore indicates 10% of women who are pregnant have too much mercury in their system at present time. Dale Lockwood 13894 Two Mile Rd Brainerd MN. 56401 email: dale.lockwood@hotmail-com

Dale Long

18101

My name is Dale Long. The last name is spelled L-O-N-G, from Orr, Minnesota. I was the mayor in Orr for several years. And water and resources are dear to our hearts. I am an operating engineer for Local 49 and also a business representative there. I am speaking today for the Iron Range Building and Trades, which consists of 17 trades, with 6,000 plus members in this region alone. We support the state and federal agencies' document that has analyzed the PolyMet project thoroughly. This is not just about the construction jobs and building this project, but it is also about the long-term jobs to run the plant, as well as the spin-off jobs and positive effects to our area communities. I have seen this east end of the range deteriorate from the time I was in high school to where it is today. This region definitely needs this project. Thank you.

Dale Olson

4121

I forgot to include my address, it is Dale Olson 2427 Hutchinson Road Duluth, Mn. 55811 ---Original Message--- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) To: ddolson8845 Sent: Sun, Dec 22, 2013 3:02 pm Subject: RE: polymet Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

4166

please consider all of are family in your decisions four legged and two legged as some animals and ecosystems will be adversely affected. the four legged brothers and sisters don't even use money but like the two-legged they need water to live. there are alternatives to destroying eleven percent of the fresh water of the world, it would be more wise to buy out the lease of poly in the long run. this is going backward first heavy industries then tech like med tech devices now back

Dale Schwerin

39610

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Dale Schwerin 23465 Cedar Lake Dr Aitkin, MN 56431-3195

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Stewart

44405

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dale Stewart - Life long Northeastern MN resident Addendum: Tourism is a much, much more important industry in this area than some copper nickle mine. Let them go open a mine where water is not an issue. Dale Stewart PO Box 792 Willernie, MN 55090

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dale Stewart

44406

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dale Stewart - Life long Northeastern MN resident Addendum: Tourism is a much, much more important industry in this area than some copper nickle mine. Let them go open a mine where water is not an issue. Dale Stewart PO Box 792 Willernie, MN 55090

Dale Swanson

20020

Dale Swanson 16288 Cart Trail SW Kensington, Mn 56343 I think that exploration for minerals and mining can be done in a manner that would not be detrimental to our environment. I am an environmentalist, but I also see the need to put people to work. HYPERLINK "http://www.incredimail-com/.id=621159anddid=10501andppd=2820,201206281812,9,1,92825524811683742andrui=151179276andapp_test_id=0andsd=20140227" HYPERLINK "http://www.incredimail-com/.id=621159anddid=10501andppd=2820,201206281812,9,1,92825524811683742andrui=151179276andapp_test_id=0andsd=20140227"FREE Animations for your email http://www.incredimail-com/.id=621159anddid=10501andppd=2820,201206281812,9,1,92825524811683742andrui=151179276andapp_test_id=0andsd=20140227 http://www.incredimail-com/.id=621159anddid=10501andppd=2820,201206281812,9,1,92825524811683742andrui=151179276andapp_test_id=0andsd=20140227

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dalen 47318

I support polymer and the fact that we need to keep family's working and food on the table Sent from my iPad

Dan Allosso 40139

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Furthermore, given Glencore Xstrata's well-documented irresponsibility as a long-term steward of the environment, I think any claims the corporation makes about its commitment to multi-decade or even centuries-long containment of environmental externalities should be treated as nonsense. To put this in the plainest English possible, Glencore Xstrata intends to treat northern Minnesota as a third-world resource provider and waste sink. I live in northern Minnesota, and I have no doubt that given a thorough understanding of the issues, none of my neighbors would willingly trade our environment for a short-term solution to economic problems that could be solved in a variety of ways that wouldn't involve making our home unlivable. Sincerely, Dr Dan Allosso 9400 Cottonwood Ave NE Bemidji, MN 56601-8663 (218) 333-0480

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Anderson

38624

We have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. We would also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine takes into account the costs to the environment and the displacement of other economic activity. Tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty will not be adversely affected; nothing is the same as it was when the treaty was signed. Tribal people have, and always will adapt. Further: The supplemental draft Environmental Impact Statement is a detailed, independent review of the PolyMet project. Federal, state and tribal agencies shaped the development of the SDEIS, which was written by an independent, third party. I am confident that the lengthy, thorough environmental review process has addressed potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. I am confident that the SDEIS gives regulators the information they need to issue PolyMet Mining permits to operate while protecting natural resources. The PolyMet project has been designed to minimize environmental impacts. It reuses an existing site and existing infrastructure, minimizes the disturbance of wetlands, and utilizes multiple safeguards to protect the environment. PolyMet's planned mine layout minimizes impacts to wetlands, and its reclamation and mitigation plans will replace the wetlands that are lost due to mining. In fact, PolyMet will restore and protect more wetlands than it impacts. PolyMet will control and manage stockpile water with proven technology, including foundation liners, water collection systems and cover systems. PolyMet will have dramatic, positive socioeconomic impacts to a region that has been built on mining. This project is located in an area that supports mining and the jobs it will bring. The land exchange with the US Forest Service will open up new public recreational opportunities for all Minnesotans. We cannot afford to miss this opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Dan and Lucy Anderson 810-7th Street Cloquet MN 55720

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Anderson

39910

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Dan Burnett

41570

Howdy Lisa, I am Dan Burnett, resident at 2308 Elliot Avenue S Minneapolis, MN 55404 who works with the Lutheran Volunteer Corps at Open Arms of Minnesota - a nonprofit located in the Phillips Neighborhood - and I would like to express my objections to the proposed Mining Project. It is simply foolish to ask a company to provide water treatment for the area for a length of time that is over three centuries. If the contaminated water is projected to be undrinkable for longer than white people have been politically organized in a meaningful way then we should not allow the water a chance to be contaminated in the first place. It is irresponsible to expect anyone to be obligated for such a period of time. Therefore I urge the DNR to deny this permit to PolyMet. Best, Dan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Carn

18110

My name is Dan Carn. I would like to address the location that we're talking about. I believe this is the absolutely perfect location that we're looking at. I see Hoyt Lakes as the birthplace of our mining industry. And I see history repeating itself. If the mining company hadn't stepped forward at that time, we wouldn't have the construction we have today. We have a great opportunity here. This is a world-class resource. And I think this is a stepping-off point that has an awful lot of merit. Everything that we do has an impact and we should make as small of an impact as we can. This is already an industrial site. We already have a huge facility there. We're using the existing tailings basin. And we have the railroad infrastructure in there. The only thing we're doing is moving the pit area (inaudible). Regarding the issue of risk, we've said a lot about that tonight. And I also trust all the agencies that have worked very hard for eight years or more, maybe closer to ten. And I'm assuming they have an awful lot of work to do in that time. And I believe they've been hard at it. Regarding the issue of adverse risk. Nobody wants to (inaudible). If we want to eliminate risk, you can't do anything and we will have nothing, which brings me to my next point of unintended consequences. If we don't do this, there is a cost of not having it. Look at the Middle East in the last 50 years. (Inaudible) wars since the history of mankind since the beginning of time are resource based. You don't have it, you take it. You're not immune from pollution here.

Dan Cooke

6426

I do not believe the few jobs that this will bring to the state is worth the potential of long standing environmental impact. Dan Cooke Cooke Custom Sewing 7290 Stagecoach Trail Lino Lakes, MN55014-1988 [HYPERLINK "http://www.cookecustomsewing-com"www.cookecustomsewing-com](http://www.cookecustomsewing-com)

DAN DEMARINO

21971

EIS Project Manager- I support the Polymet Mining project. I have followed the project over several years and watched how socially responsible solutions to concerns have progressed nicely. The seemingly never ending long term assurances voiced by those opposing the mine may be able to be resolved by the requirement to have long term bond assurance. Sometimes the pleasures of having a recreational retreat are not realistic and that location may have to move to a new location. The hard points are that families will be able to survive with a great quality of life if they are allowed to have an income. The mine will provide that. The community will be able to grow economically. The advances in contamination control should help to ease the concerns of pollution. The checks and balances in place should also alleviate concerns. Let people work. Let people advance. Let the mine open. Dan DeMarino 142 Sonning Rd Irmo, SC 29063

Dan Dimick

57969

I am deeply opposed to the project. The economic gains are outweighed by long term environmental risks. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Dan Esposito

42483

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Dan Esposito 1510 N Rowell Ave Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan G. Eischens 7524

Looks like a pretty extensive process for this mining operation, and would like to say how impressive this information is. I think that the environment would be better off after the sulfides are no longer exposed to the effects of climate after the reclamation work is done. This is just the type of mining project this state needs to boost the economy and school aids it delivers, along with jobs and a supply source of much needed copper. Daniel G. Eischens 7700 Sunwood Dr #144, Ramsey, MN 55303 (763) 587-5201 (763) 323-5410 NOTICE: Unless restricted by law, email correspondence to and from Anoka County government offices may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

7525

Dan G. Eischens would like to recall the message, "COMMENTS POLYMET". NOTICE: Unless restricted by law, email correspondence to and from Anoka County government offices may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

7526

Looks like a pretty extensive process for this mining operation, and would like to say how impressive this information is. I think that the environment would be better off after the sulfides are no longer exposed to the effects of climate after the reclamation work is done. This is just the type of mining project this state needs to boost the economy and school aids it delivers, along with jobs and a supply source of much needed copper. Dan Eischens SAMA - Senior Appraiser Anoka Co. Property Records and Taxation (763) 323-5410 NOTICE: Unless restricted by law, email correspondence to and from Anoka County government offices may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Dan Harp 42532

See attachment

Dan Houle 3641

Daniel G. Houle 3065 East Arm Rd Ely Mn 55731 20 years of destruction for a few labor jobs and exporting our "precious metals" with a 500 hundred year price tag just doesn't make sense. Like Ms Otto said,, how do you do the math on that. The time is not right we should save it for the future generations when it means more than just a few jobs. Who know what the need and technology will look like in 200 years .. Dan Houle 218-235-0413

43367

PLEASE STOP THIS THE TIME IS JUST NOT RIGHT AND THERE IS NO PROVEN SYSTEM AT THIS TIME TO MINE COPPER NICKEL WITHOUT POLLUTION. A prime example of times to come is directly stated by the current Mesabi Nugget quest to raise the amount they can pollute. We have one of the worlds largest supply of fresh water. Any degree of pollution is incomprehensible for a few jobs. Take the example of Alaska and the NO PEBBLE MINE stance. The land of 10,000 polluted lakes. not here please. Daniel G. Houle 738 East Camp St Ely Mn 55731 218-235-0413

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Humay

18062

My name is Dan Humay. I live just outside of Ely in Eagle's Nest Township. I've reviewed some of the EIS. And obviously it's a cumbersome document. But I look for assurances that what is being claimed can in fact be accomplished. And I must admit I have some really great concerns. I think my initial concerns were triggered by reading that copper mining has never been conducted anywhere in the world without producing grave pollution of water resources in the mining area. I look for some hope in this project that that won't happen. Yet I see veiled attempts to prevent information in one way without answering with some pertinent questions. I'm especially concerned about the contamination of mercury from the mining operation. Northeast Minnesota already has a serious problem with mercury. And the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has listed a number of water, rivers, lakes, and streams in this area as impaired with methalized mercury found in fish tissue. So there are some warnings about eating levels of fish beyond a certain point. And it seems to me that the mining company, PolyMet, does not do anything to assure that this is not going to become worse because of their activity. They are talking about releasing annually from the tailings container 11 million gallons every year of untreated seepage right into the water system. Furthermore, they're going to release another 6 million gallons of untreated seepage from the mine site itself into adjacent streams and rivers. Any increase in the level of mercury in the water table, whether it be in a stream, river, lake or aquifer is not acceptable. And I don't see where they can give any assurance that this will be done. Children born in this region one in ten have elevated levels of mercury in their bodies when they are infants. Elevated to the point where they are listed by the National Board of Health as hazardous. This is an anomaly. And women who are pregnant are warned about ingesting sources of mercury. To date I think they've tested 1,465 children and they found their bodies are contaminated with mercury poisoning. And yet we're going to allow a mining company to create a situation that will only exacerbate this. I think that's unconscionable. For 360 jobs for 20 years that's an embarrassment that we will perpetuate a widespread health problem to that end. I also think that corporations are not living things. They are entities that are driven by profit. And the only reason PolyMet is here is because they're interested in making money at our expense. And I wish the permitting people would wake up and smell the coffee. I think it's just wrong, unconscionable, and it may even be criminal. Thank you.

18126

Thank you. My name is Dan Humay, and I live between Ely and Tower, about halfway and I want to thank you for having the hearing, and I hope you're listening carefully because a lot of good things were said tonight. None of us are as smart as all of us, so it's important that we take what we hear and really think about it. This is really kind of an not going to tell you that I read 2,300 pages because I didn't. I think that's impossible. But I did focus on some things that were a concern of mine, and I'm not going to talk about what if, what would be our how long it would be. I want to talk about what is right now. Right now, today, as we sit here, in this watershed, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has classified dozens of strange rivers and lakes as impaired. What would make them impaired? Levels of mercury above what are considered to be safe. Methylized mercury appearing in fish tissue. One in 10 children who are born in this watershed have elevated levels of mercury in their body when they are born. That's not a statistical anomaly, but compared to other places in the state, it's astronomical. This project, as good as it appears to be, and the science you are examining, what it claims, admits this in this document. Annually, 11 million gallons of untreated water will be released into the watershed from the tailings containment area. Another 5 million gallons will be released into the watershed from the mine site itself. Sixteen million gallons of water this year, the next year, the next year, the next year, the next year. How much mercury is that? The EIS really falls short in dealing with mercury, and I think behooves you to hold them accountable. We certainly expect that. Everybody here who is in mining community expects it and those of us who aren't, but live here, also expect it. As a matter of fact, we demand it. We cannot put at risk children who are innocent residents the way we are now. 1,675 kids have been tested positive so far, and I think that's unconscionable --in the name of jobs or minerals or anything else. Children is all we have. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Iler

17693

To who ever is in charge, I am concerned about the potential opening of a copper/nickel mine by PolyMet Mining Corp. in northern MN. It is my understanding that in October 2009, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed PolyMet mine was released for public review and comment. Following that statement in February 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gave the proposal its lowest ranking: Environmentally Unsatisfactory-Inadequate. The EPA gave many reasons, including: missing information, failure to address pollution problems, structural issues, and lack of financial assurance analysis. PolyMet Mining's response to this was a revised draft called the "Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement" or SDEIS. There are a number of reasons that I object to allowing a copper/nickel mine to open in northern MN by PolyMet Mining (or any mining company). My first and primary concern is the environment. The second concern is financial and the third concern is a lack of trust in mining companies. 1- With a projected mine life of twenty years and a projected water clean up of the mine site for a minimum of 200 years and 500 years at the plant site the risk to reward is skewed to the way too risky side. Environmentally it is reckless and naïve to believe that any company or agency can contain and clean all of the waste water from the mine site or processing plant. It is impossible to account for all the variables mother nature can throw like floods, cracks in bedrock allowing seepage to ground water, plants and roots tearing into a possible synthetic cover over the tailings pile or Not to mention inevitable mechanical breakdowns, leaks or breaks in piping used to move waste water, human error, or . The EPA identifies the hardrock mining industry as the largest toxic-waste producing industry in the US and no sulfide mine has ever operated without polluting its nearby waters. Even if the projected water clean up is off by a hundred years or so it is still not a sound or viable deal for Minnesota's fish and wildlife, the people relying on the region's water supply, or the vegetation (wild rice ect..). 2- When it comes to the financial assurance side of the equation I feel it is unrealistic to think there is a magic formula to get a monetary number for 200 - 500 years of water clean up and reclamation. Once again, there are too many variables to try and account for with such a long time span involved. Even if the company sets aside a "damage deposit" for financial assurance and gets a back up insurance policy for financial assurance, there is not a company out there that has a track record of being in business for 500 years. It seems inevitable that eventually Minnesotans will be on the hook to cover the cost of clean up. 3- The track record of mining companies abandoning mine sites that are no longer profitable is long. The EPA has designated many of these sites as "superfund" sites, leaving tax payers to shoulder the cost of cleanup (if clean up is even possible at all). It is easy for corporations to hire good lawyers to write a nice "plan" on how well they will take care of the land and be good stewards to the environment. It is an entirely different thing for them to actually honor that plan and implement it. PolyMet Mining Corp. is simply the pawn on the chess board set up to fail. PolyMet Mining Corp. will have sent most, if not all, of its earnings to major backers (like Glencore International PLC). Once all the valuable minerals are extracted from the mine site and it is no longer profitable they will close up shop and file bankruptcy to evade clean up coSt At the end of the day the only people that really benefit from all this are some top executives of the company, some well paid lawyers and a few bought off politicians. When a person sits back and looks at this, from a common sense and scientific approach, they will see that twenty years worth of jobs mining the precious metals is

Dan Iverson

19944

It is apparent to me or any one with more than a passing interest in the sulfide mining issue, and let's call it sulfide mining because that is really what your mining, that the DNR and the Corp of Engineers and to a lesser extent the US Forest Service has no issues with the potential impact of sulfide mining to the recreational treasure Minnesota posses and has, until recently, protected from the grasping hands of logging and mining interests. At the initial hearings at the capitol in St Paul I was stunned at how the DNR's presentation mimicked the Poly Met proposal and then angered at the arrogance of the national mining representative who arrogantly stated to all that this was an opportunity for income to the state of Minnesota and jobs and so what is "your problem." Over the past few years now, as one independent source after another has pointed out the folly of this venture for the state, the DNR has remained steadfast in it's support for sulfide mining, consistently willing to tweak the computer modeling of the project to meet the desired outcome. At the last public hearing in St Paul, it was disgusting to see the parade of paid for spokesman for the mining interests profusely thank the DNR and the Corp of Engineers for their hard work and good judgment. Obviously, the deal was in the bag as it always had been and the DNR was just going through the motions, a little dance all government agencies must do to appease the public with a show of democracy. Your actions and others in government who have been tasked with preserving Minnesota's legacy of clean water and quality of life have failed us. Your betrayal is unprecedented and will plaque and sadden future generations as the true impact of your shallow deceit slowly and forever befouls our treasured northern lakes and streaMs Dan Iverson Master Electrician Silgan Containers Savage, MN. 55378 Office (952)707-1635 Main Plant (952) 890-2120 diverson@silgancontainers-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Iverson

57504

Northern Minnesota is essentially a realm of water inundated by forests. And, it is this realm that defines Minnesota and holds the promise of our present and future quality of life. Twenty years of promised prosperity for a few is a poor exchange for an eternity of poisoned lakes and streams. Dan Iverson Master Electrician Silgan Containers Savage, MN. 55378 Office (952)707-1635 Main Plant (952) 890-2120 diverson@silgancontainers-com From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 7:34 AM To: Dan Iverson Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Dan Jobin

45242

March 12th 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road St Paul, MN 55115-4025 Dear EIS Project Manager, I recently attended the public meeting in St Paul regarding PolyMets proposal to open a mine in Northern MN. I went into this with an open mind and heard presentations from both PolyMet as well as watched the video regarding what this project would entail. I want to thank the DNR and other agencies for their hard work in objectively evaluating this project. After viewing the video of this project a number of questions came to my mind so I spent a considerable amount of time with one of the representatives from the MPCA. This gentleman was very informative and provided me with as many facts as he could and clarified a number of things for me. 1- One of my biggest concerns is the lining that will be used under the stockpile of the most highly reactive rock. The MPCA told me there would be damage to the liners, holes and punctures so some highly acid waste would seep directly into the ground and would not be appropriately treated. I realize there are projections of what this would look like but what if they are not accurate based on some unforeseen circumstance. I am also questioning the viability of these liners over the long run of 50 to 100 years, especially when it will be constantly exposed to an acidic environment. Can we reasonably say that these liners will hold up for the long term. If they do not what is the plan to mitigate this possible scenario. 2- High levels of lead and aluminum due to the overall mitigation process of treating this water have not been addressed. These levels are well above the norm according to the MPCA. Recently a waiver was revoked on one of the taconite mines in northern MN which was allowing for high lead discharge levels. I would not be in favor of any such waiver. What a waiver tells me is that we are willing to take an environmental risk. 3- Copper is one of the key minerals that will be mined and is currently not in short supply. After attending this open house I did not walk away with the confidence or complete certainty there would not be significant impact on the water in this area. The Mayor of Hoyt Lakes said "is it a risk, yes but it is time to take it". I am not in favor of taking a risk at this time when there is a possibility that future technology would provide us a better way to mine these metals. 4- I am concerned about the pressure being put on the DNR, legislators, and other decision makers by the business community that has a direct financial incentive on this project moving forward. 5- The MPCA told me there has never been this type of a mine around this much water. These mines are usually in arid areas which helps mitigate the possibility of water contamination. I am not a scientist and I do not have many alternatives to provide solutions. But I do believe we need solutions that will guarantee beyond a shadow of a doubt the protection of our water resources in this area. Thank you so much for considering my comments. Sincerely, Dan Jobin 1716 Heritage Lane New Brighton, MN 55112

Dan Johnson

19966

Sirs: I did not send my mailing address in my original comment so I will restate it as follows: In spite of the EIS there have never been a documented metals operation like this that has not led to surface and ground water pollution surrounding the mines. We do not need this in Minnesota and I am strongly against this mine. Dan Johnson 3764 Gershwine Ave N. Oakdale, Mn. 55128 From: "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" To: tadpoly@comcast.net Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:55:12 PM Subject: RE: PolyMet EIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

19968

Sirs: In spite of the EIS there have never been a documented metals operation like this that has not led to surface and ground water pollution surrounding the mines. We do not need this in Minnesota and I am strongly against this mine. Dan Johnson Oakdale, Mn.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan La Vigne

18244

Name is Dan La Vigne, L-A space V-I-G-N-E. I have a couple talking points more or less. My first one is 200 years of water-pollution treatment from the mine site and 500 years of pollution seeping from the pit is not a viable solution to prevent an environmental catastrophe. Such a proposal indicates there is not a real method to deal with the problem of sulfide mining in Minnesota. Balanced against some 250 to 300 jobs for an estimated 20 years of employment is not an equitable deal for Minnesota residents. Minnesota's resplendent with wetlands and this puts them at high risk. Owning lake property makes me very concerned. There is a possibility that eventually this could affect Lake Superior, which contains 10 percent of the fresh water on the planet, and also, the Boundary Waters, the BWCA. This applies to quotes section 404 permits and the SDEIS. Even current tailing ponds leak, for example, the one at Minntac. It has been out of compliance for years. How is PolyMet going to do better? Putting money aside in a fund is not feasible, especially for 200 to 500 years. Who can predict the cost? Besides, human nature being what it is, the probability of that fund remaining untouched is next to nil. I can easily imagine it being raided to reduce taxes or for something else. A DNR report shows the rate of groundwater base flow is 200 to 300 percent higher than PolyMet's plan, so we should reject this plan. Just a comment that sulfide mining may be feasible in a different ecological system, but in Minnesota, it just makes no sense.

Dan Little

47508

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dan Little 2729 E 6th St Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Mack

17143

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dan Mack 706 1st ave north apt 512 Minneapolis, MN 55403

50409

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dan Mack 706 1st ave north apt 512 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Mork

41893

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Dan Mork Chanhassen, Minnesota

Dan Murray

42006

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Nelson

38401

Hi, I do not remember whether I sent a comment or signed a petition so excuse me if I already sent a comment but I want to make sure I have voiced my opposition to allowing a permit for the Polymet project for the following reasons. Water Pollution - there are no sulfide mining operations that have not had problems and I do not believe PolyMet has shown that they will prevent any major pollution problems. The tailings and mine waste are reactive for too long a time period to take this lightly. Fiscal Outlook - 20 years of mining is not enough to pay for hundreds of years of pollution risk and monitoring when the company could easily renege on its pledges by selling its assets or opting for bankruptcy in the case of a disaster. Precedence setting - there will be other permit requests and if this first permit is put through without it being bullet proof then other companies will use that as the benchmark. So even if Polymet, by some stroke of luck, does everything right and does not have an issue, other companies may have issues that they can't handle. So Polymet, as the first one down the pipe, needs to be conservative in their projections and promises and liberal in funding for all the risks now and for hundreds of years. Job Outlook - Any pollution problems from this project will negatively impact the tourism industry jobs for far more than the 20 years of mining jobs. Thank you for your time and consideration and the very professionally run public meetings on this topic. Dan Nelson 3010 Winnetka Ave N Apt 423 Crystal, MN 55427

Dan Nyberg

39908

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. This is all short-sighted and bad for our state. Minnesota deserves better. Sincerely, Mr Dan Nyberg 3285 Emmert St Shoreview, MN 55126-4116

Dan Parsow

57507

To Whom it May Concern, I would like to voice my support for Polymet Mining and their pending mining project. I have followed the company for many years now and have reviewed the SDEIS and other relevant documents. I have also had the opportunity to visit the actual site and speak with the company's management and operating teams. I feel strongly that they have put together an excellent team of professionals and that this project will meet and exceed all environmental standards. In addition this project will bring much needed jobs and tax revenue to the area. I hope you allow this project to continue. Best regards, Dan Parsow dparsow@aol-com

Dan Pearson

18340

My name is Dan Pearson. So the spelling is D-A-N P-E-A-R-S-O-N. So nobody can serve two masters. It is you either hate one or love the other or else you can loathe one and despise the other (phonetic). You cannot serve God. A very famous man once said these words. You might have heard of him. His name was Jesus. "First, learn right from wrong and good from evil (phonetic)." Today I stand in front of you, looking into your eyes (inaudible), to bear false witness in the name of the Lord. I always (inaudible). PolyMet has the right to sit here tonight, as indicated, and talk about their mine in front of the people, where in fact their mine is only about the profits (inaudible). They have taken a path away from God, away from love, and now they put a profit before the lives of others; simple. In the past and present (phonetic). Do these words have any meaning? We've turned our backs on these words so many times, in so many different ways. PolyMet acts as the hearts and minds, but we are still here today calculating whether PolyMet is right in the eyes of God, even though we might hurt others. I will tell you right now, no. PolyMet's actions are not just and not right in the eyes of God. Any corporation that will (inaudible) disregard life for the personal needs for themselves is committing sins in the eyes of God; and these are. (Inaudible) reparations for such acts. To me, children die every day, every minute and every second from actions of corporations like PolyMet. Due to their actions (inaudible). All of these actions have to stop. (Inaudible) these words and (inaudible) rethink their actions (inaudible). Put love in your heart and not evil. (Inaudible) doubt that. If not (phonetic), your actions can be taken for life severe consequences in the eyes of God. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Pederson

41616

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Dan Pederson St Paul, Minnesota

Dan Petrella

40134

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. To the DNR, Let's be responsible to the future people of Minnesota and make sure the fragile rocky ecosystem of Northeastern Minnesota is protected from the kind of devastation the dumping of taconite tailings did to Lake Superior. I worked hard to prevent what happened to Lake Superior in the 1950's and see the same tactics being used today regarding PolyMet. The people of Minnesota will make a good decision regarding PolyMet if they are given honest and complete answers. It is not rocket science to understand the make up of the soil in Northeastern Minnesota. All the data regarding the rocky soil and shallow bed rock structures is available in any public library. Water in Northeastern Minnesota doesn't soak into soil because the soil is primarily rock. Water simply runs through the rocks and directly into the rivers. We found good solutions regarding the mining of taconite and I'm sure we can find a good ecological solution to copper-nickel mining if we deal with the honest facts. I urge we find other ways then is currently proposed to dispose of the water tailings from the copper-nickel mining. Sincerely, Dan Petrella 5809 Whited Ave Minnetonka, MN 55345 Sincerely, Mr Dan Petrella 5809 Whited Ave Minnetonka, MN 55345-6659 (952) 934-2529

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Skorich

15991

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dan Steinhacker

52226

Hi: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed copper/nickel mine in Northern Minnesota. I am sympathetic to the positions of residents of the area that stand to benefit from the influx jobs and money, especially given the economic hardship many face and the migration of young people from the area. However, the history of copper sulfide mining repeatedly shows a short window of increased employment and a certain future management of contaminants that remain long after the economic benefits and Polymet have gone. The lackluster initial proposal by Polymet is indication that any mining in Minnesota will be business as usual and business as usual with copper sulfide mining has a short window of benefit, generations worth of contamination and local communities and states left to deal with the mess. Every time. No thanks. Dan Steinhacker 1407 Arona St St Paul, mn 55108 Sent from my iPhone

Dan Sullivan

11327

The Polymet proposal does not sufficiently address the amount of money that should be set aside for environmental degradation. The mining industry has a long history of declaring bankruptcy and leaving taxpayers with the bill. The risks of this project are so much higher than the reward and I am opposed to it. Thank you. Dan Sullivan 1004 Chatsworth PL Shoreview MN 55126

Dan Turpening

58161

I am very much opposed to the Polymet mine. The environmental risks are too great in my opinion.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dan Waters

18123

My name is Dan Waters, W-A-T-E-R-S. I am a member of Up North Jobs, which has over 600 members in Ely. It's a non-profit organization in favor of jobs, any kind of jobs, on the Iron Range. I'm a business owner in Ely. Last year was my 50th year in business. Unlike some of the people here I am in the tourist business. Doesn't have anything to do with mining. It's strictly tourism. My business is not open in the winter time. It's strictly a seasonal business. So I don't have any links to economic help from a mining industry necessarily other than the ones from reduced taxes and things. That being said, I'm also a conservationist. I think I can consider myself an environmentalist. And I'm in favor of clean water. I am also in favor of mining. Especially copper-nickel mining and the PolyMet project. I think the Environmental Impact Statement that was done was excellent. And I think that not being a scientist I will rely on what they said in that statement. One fact I would like to clear up, in Ely it seems that some of the organizations that feel like Ely is they call it sustainable, and that is based on that tourism can sustain Ely. Tourism cannot sustain Ely. Since I started in business, Ely has changed dramatically. We used to have year-round bus service. At one time Ely had passenger train service. We had five grocery stores. We're down to two. We had two lumber yards. We're down to one. We had 1700 plus students in the schools. We're down to 500 and some. We're in danger of having our school go through consolidation. We're in danger of losing our hospital. All these things point to the fact that Ely and the entire East Range needs mining. This is what the range was built on. This is what will sustain Ely and the rest of the range is mining. We can have both. We can have mining. We can have clean water. We can have tourism. There's no reason not to have any of those. Thank you very much.

Dan Wicht

40111

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dana dembinny

40324

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, dana dembinny harsdörfferstr. 20 nürnberg, ot 90478 DE

Dana Harth

9489

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darin Harth Dana Harth 19592 state hwy 28 Glenwood, MN 56334

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dana Harth

18429

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darin Harth Dana Harth 19592 state hwy 28 Glenwood, MN 56334

50549

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darin Harth Dana Harth 19592 state hwy 28 Glenwood, MN 56334

Dana L Jackson

54916

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dana Lansky

43508

When considering sulfide mining proposals, please take climate change into careful consideration. And please make sure the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS explicitly states the assumptions about Minnesota's climate, economy, society, water security, food security, and political system for the next five hundred years; upon which its conclusions depend. And please require that every one of those assumptions is backed up with strong evidence that those assumptions can be dependably relied upon for the next five hundred years. Any sulfide mining proposal that doesn't address and plan for the reality that our climate situation will deteriorate is not addressing everything it should. There is an extraordinary amount of consensus among the scientific community that climate change is happening. Reporting on a major U.N. study, The Atlantic explained that "We are Terrifyingly Close to the Climate's 'Point of No Return.'" (<http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/09/we-are-terrifyingly-close-to-the-climates-point-of-no-return/280076/>) The Guardian reported that scientists are now saying that the planet is likely to warm by 4C by 2100, and that "4C would likely be catastrophic rather than simply dangerous." (<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/dec/31/planet-will-warm-4c-2100-climate>) Even if governments around the world were doing everything they have pledged to do to prevent catastrophic climate change, which they aren't actually doing, it still wouldn't be enough to prevent our climate situation from getting perilously worse. (<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/dec/03/un-2c-global-warming-climate-change>) Some climate experts say we aren't even aiming for the right target. Mother Jones reported that scientists are now saying that the: "Current International Warming Target Is 'Disastrous.'" (<http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2013/12/scientists-current-warming-threshold-would-be-disastrous>) In fact, even if we immediately stopped all fossil fuel emissions, which we are not doing, our climate situation would likely continue to deteriorate. (<http://www.princeton-edu/main/news/archive/S38/51/51I69/>) Some climate experts think we would need to make radical changes in an extremely short amount of time in order to give our species a fighting chance. (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T17YF4fmh4o&feature=youtu.be>) As you have probably noticed, we aren't making radical changes quickly. Because some climate feedback loops may become practically unstoppable by human efforts once they get going and because carbon dioxide emissions remain in the atmosphere for prolonged periods of time, by the time most people realize how dire our situation is, it may be too late to prevent catastrophic change. Professor Richard Zeebe said: "The legacy of our fossil fuel burning today is a hangover that could last for tens of thousands of years, if not hundreds of thousands of years to come." (<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/08/130805152422-htm> and <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/05/130530095020-htm>) So unless the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS bases all of its conclusions about the next five hundred years on the assumption that our climate situation is likely to be significantly changed for the worse, it is not taking reality into consideration. Different regions are expected to be affected by climate change to different extents, at different paces. And it is extremely likely that there will be a period of time when people continue to live in Minnesota under much more environmentally stressful conditions than exist today. There may even be large numbers of people seeking refuge in Minnesota from coastal and more severely drought stricken areas. Any sulfide mining proposal that does not take into consideration, and plan for, a time period such as this, is grossly inadequate. The University of Oklahoma reported: "OU Study Suggests Non-Uniform Climate Warming Affects Terrestrial Carbon Cycle, Ecosystems and

Dana McCarthy

44298

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The studies done to support the PolyMet mine project have been deeply flawed and do not adequately protect our environment. There are also insufficient economic guarantees to address pollution issues in the event that the company goes bankrupt. Sincerely, Ms Dana McCarthy 1681 Lafond Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-2214 (651) 644-2831

Dana Wahlberg

9334

Good Afternoon~ Thank you for providing the opportunity for the public to make comments on the PolyMet Project. I attended the public meeting at the RiverCenter earlier this week. My name was not drawn to speak, so I would like to share my thoughts in a written format. Like so many others, my family is extremely hopeful that this thoughtfully and carefully developed project will soon become a reality for all of us in Minnesota. The co-lead agencies have invested significant time and resources in this initiative, for which we are both appreciative and thankful. Sincerely, Dana Wahlberg 5188 Midway Rd Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dana woods

40303

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, dana woods 8744 e moreland st scottsdale, AZ 85257 US

D'Andre Wilson

54216

Can you not build a mine near our lakes cause waste run which can pollute our waters. It can also mess up our trees for sight-seeing. I can disturb our forest animals heavily. Sulfur pollutes water sulfuric acid. And it decreases they're PH. And fish die because of the acid that goes in the water and it effects the fish. No human wants to eat acid fish cause its bad for you.

Danette Vassilopoulos

39497

The SDEIS for the Poly Met Mining Project is flawed and does not guarantee that sulfide mining can be done in Minnesota without seriously harming water and habitat. This project should not go forward. It seems an absurd assumption that water treatment for hundreds of years is a reasonable expectation. There are no models for replacing the types of habitats that will be destroyed. The major impact to the water shed is too complicated to know what the outcome will be in all scenarios. Let's protect the valuable parts of our state that have already been set aside for future generations. Danette Vassilopoulos 13704 James Ave South Bursnville, MN 55337
HYPERLINK "tel:952-894-9235"952-894-9235

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Alvarez

14879

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Balto

16001

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Daniel Batten

54670

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Belgum-Blad

36347

Dear Reader, I am writing after carefully studying the information on several sites about the Polymet and Twin Metals Copper-Nickel Mines Proposal(s). I also write as a nearly life-long Minnesotan, and someone who has canoed the pristine waters of the northern Minnesota's BWCA and the Canadian Quetico Park areas for 45 years. I have also guided canoeists in the BWCA-Quetico for three summers as a canoe guide. The beauty, spiritual renewal, and invigorating physical aspects of travelling in the untrammled wilds of the northern Minnesota Boundary Waters is unparalleled, and leave a deep, lasting impression. There is NO PLACE like it on earth. I have traveled around the world and visited countless wilderness areas, including in Alaska and Asia, and I can say that there is no place like our Boundary Waters. It is an unparalleled, pristine wilderness area. I have always drunk the water straight out of the lakes. Never have I gotten sick, nor has anyone, to my memory, on one of the trips I guided. I want to see the BWCA and Lake Superior Basin kept pristine for my children and grandchildren. and for others' grandchildren This is why I am writing. I am convinced that Polymet's and Twin Metals' plan will not keep our BWCA and surrounding rivers and lakes (watersheds) safe. The fact is: other copper-nickel mines around the world have led to terrible pollution of surrounding waters. It will be tragic if this happens near our beloved BWCA or Lake Superior - and the wonderful watersheds surrounding them. I am convinced it is just a matter of time before the mines and there extensions will do just that - cause environmental devastation. I realize jobs are important. But, the long-term risks do not justify the short-term "gains" - for anyone. The greatest freshwater lake in the world, Lake Superior is also at risk, as is the St Louis River and estuary. The fact that it will take hundreds of years of monitoring and cleanup after the mines finally close, is evidence supporting this: "don't start mining." The EPA has identified "hard rock mining" as the nation's top toxic producing industry. The sulfuric acid produced by this kind of mining is known to leach into rock and dissolve compounds that are toxic and that can then leach into waters - impacting birds, fish, amphibians, and the whole web of life. That's not acceptable to Minnesotans. In fact, the EPA reports that hard rock mining produced 41% of all toxins in our country in 2010- In addition, Polymet's mine would destroy 1000 acres of irretrievable wetlands. We already have lost most of our wetlands in Minnesota. We can't afford to lose more. Again, this is unacceptable. The bottom line, there are just too many risks, and I am deeply opposed to both of these proposed mines. In my opinion, it will be a big mistake if they are allowed to proceed. Sincerely, The Rev. Daniel Belgum-Blad 301 Ramsey Ave W. Atwater, MN 56209 Phone: 320-974-0736

Daniel Berg

9318

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Why give jobs to China, this is a global economy, use your heads and let mining be a part of the economy. Sincerely yours, Daniel Berg 500 Fiddler Ave SE New Prague, MN 56071

50540

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Why give jobs to China, this is a global economy, use your heads and let mining be a part of the economy. Sincerely yours, Daniel Berg 500 Fiddler Ave SE New Prague, MN 56071

Daniel Butler

6194

I have reviewed the environmental information posted on the DNR website regarding the Polymet mining proposal. I will just get to the point. It appears the company has done their research into the process and have a reasonable plan forward in their mining operation. I am in favor of allowing the company to mine. I would also like to make the point that the public input for the process is somewhat unproductive and at times unreasonable. Rather than open all of this public opinion why doesn't the DNR simply have the best professional field determine if the mining is reasonable and allow the operation to proceed. I would bet most of the people weighing in on this haven't even bothered to read all of the information on the website and very well may not understand the information. This is too much politics and should be more scientific. Let the mining move forward. Thanks, Daniel L. Butler Cohasset, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Donnelly

44095

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel Donnelly 2533 34TH AVE S MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55406

44100

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel Donnelly 2533 34TH AVE S MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Drehmel

39602

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Additionally, mining has historically put strain on the surrounding communities via the boom/bust cycle that tends to follow an influx of capital and workers in mining towns/areas. It is my view that mining should be withheld from the region altogether. As northern MN is a beautiful and wild area that houses countless treasures that are uniquely ours and of great importance to the ecosystems that comprise northern MN, allowing potentially harmful mining practices to be used in advance of a full exploration of all options and a full report of the environmental consequences within that range would be irresponsible. Open pit mining is an abhorrently destructive practice that leaves landscapes irreparably damaged. Please ensure that every alternative is considered throughout this process and fight for the health of MN's gateway to the north as our voice in a position to be heard Sincerely, Daniel Drehmel 9733 Wedgewood Bay Woodbury, MN 55125-9313

Daniel E Pearson

42665

See attachment

Daniel Engelhart

39238

I sent an email in opposition to the Polymet Mine. I am in opposition but I neglected to include my address. It is 525 19th ave ne, Minneapolis, MN 55418- Thank you. On Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 12:12 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record - Dan Engelhart "The function of an ideal is not to be realized but, like that of the North Star, to serve as a guiding point." -Edward Abbey

39271

I am extremely opposed to Polymet and any Sulfide mining in Minnesota. The proof is that no sulfide mine can escape the terrible pollutin that comes from this. The Jobs argument is also false given that mechanization has changed the way mining is done. I am someone who was once for this and am not opposed to taconite mining and using natural resources responsibly. Sulfide mining cannot be done responsibly and The studies have already shown that. Thank you for considering my comment for the public record - Dan Engelhart "The function of an ideal is not to be realized but, like that of the North Star, to serve as a guiding point." -Edward Abbey

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel H Mundt 54769

See attachment

Daniel Haller 44270

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Our family owns property and resides seasonally near Ely, Minnesota. We believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and that this destructive project must not proceed as currently proposed because of the 1) widespread and severe environmental damage inherent in the PolyMet project and 2) the failure of the SDEIS to include a cost/benefit analysis and specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. We believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. 3) Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures -The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. -The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The Mine Plan Requires an Absurd and Unachievable Level of Monitoring and Maintenance for Many Centuries -Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 requires that the site must be maintenance-free at closure, but the PolyMet mining plan calls for at least 500 years of active water treatment. -526 acres of land, covered by more than 167 million tons of waste rock, would be covered by a plast

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Hirsch

46396

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel Hirsch 85 Bridgewater Drive Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

46398

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel Hirsch 85 Bridgewater Drive Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Hollenhorst

40765

To: DNR, State of Minnesota Regarding: Comments about PolyMet Sulfide Mine Proposal From: Juliana Elchert, 513 7th Av. S., St Cloud, MN 56301 Please include this commentary in opposition to the PolyMet Sulfide Mine Proposal as part of the public recoRd I am following the PolyMet Sulfide Mine proposal with great concern. How can you assure that precious Minnesota water and land resources will be preserved and protected. The scale of the proposal is so overwhelming and the technology so unproven that it appears that a failure is all too possible - and at what cost. For example, how can we be certain that attaching a huge wall to bedrock for long distances will not fail. What if the bedrock crumbles. What if an attachment fails. Or more attachments fail. We know that water is so mobile that any failure will lead to immediate leakage. Minnesota is known for its 10,000 lakes. We cannot accept the potential of seriously polluting pristine areas. I have only to remember the breach of a tailings holding area along the Northshore onto Highway 61 a number of years ago to know that calamities can occur. A failure in this project would be a calamity on a much higher scale. Do we want to risk it. NO. It is not worth it.

Daniel Holsinger

42078

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Daniel Holsinger Minneapolis, Minnesota

Daniel J. Peters

38636

Hello, I am writing to urge denial of the proposed PolyMet mining operation near Babbit, MN. In my opinion, the risks to MN water quality, at a time when potable water is becoming more scarce and valuable, is too great. Furthermore, I do not trust PolyMet or its parent corporation, and suspect they will simply declare bankruptcy and walk away with their profits, leaving the taxpayers of the state to foot the bill for potentially centuries of water pollution mitigation. All that risk for 5 years of jobs for a few hundred people. U think that's a foolish trade. Please oppose the proposed PolyMet mine in Babbit. Thanks, Dan Peters Minneapolis, MN 100 Melbourne Ave SE Mpls, MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Martin

41669

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Daniel Merfeld

57367

To whom it may concern, I believe that this mining project is a great project. It will help the communities involved and have a small impact on the local environment. I would like the DNR to listen to the voices of those that live in the area, not residents of southern MN, who will see no impact of the mines in northern MN. This project will not only provide MUCH NEEDED jobs both now and in the future, but will also create many off-shoot jobs in the process. When it comes to the impact on the environment, all I ask is that the state of MN keep a close eye on how the plant is being run, as you do with all the current mines in the state. Continue to monitor what the mines put back into the environment and regulate it as you have been. If people have a problem with anything leftover from mines, feel free to feed them some of the trout from Miners' lake in Ely, MN. I grew up eating fish from that lake and nearby Shagawa. I have never seen a problem from the water in these lakes (Now that the local sewage plant is better-controlled). And this mine was from a time when there were very few regulations on mining.. Between mining and logging, these two jobs are the life-blood of Northern MN. We need these jobs or else our communities will quickly die out. Even Ely is not able to survive on tourism alone in our current economy. WE NEED MINING IN MN. Thanks for listening to one person's opinion, Dan Merfeld 2309 3rd Ave West Hibbing, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Mettner

47063

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel Mettner 19 N. 44th Ave E. Duluth, MN 55804

Daniel Moran

58023

Any times we destroy wet lands we add co2 to the atmosphere and this causes global warming so I support the no action alternative. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnninage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Olson 21186

Daniel Olson, 1495 Simpson Street, Saint Paul, MN, 55108: These are some of my concerns regarding the proposals and plans of the Poly-Met Corporation as of 2014- - The plan covers a period of between 200 to 500 years and beyond. Our knowledge is not sufficient to make predictions for that long of a time period. Accurately making predictions over such a long time horizon is very difficult, and our confidence in the outcomes must be quite low. For example, a variation of a half to one percent can create vast changes in outcomes over such a long period. We are essentially saying that we are going to successfully complete an action plan that has never been completed successfully before. We will hope it is a good plan. We will hope that the outcomes will be close to the predictions. By the time that we learn if the plan worked or not, this mine will be long closed. It could also be true that several mine operations had been opened, closed and similar waste treatment plans had been put in place for other sites as well. By the time we learn whether or not the plan worked as predicted, it will be too late to prevent similar outcomes with similar operations. There could be unforeseen damages and costs that will have to be borne by our very distant descendants. Northern Minnesota is a wet, watery land of abundant lakes and streams and includes the world's largest and cleanest freshwater lake, Lake Superior. This region has vast, natural resources that will sustain healthy lives and healthy economies, if we protect them from degradation. We like to think that we are so wise and knowledgeable to accomplish anything that we need to do. Our scientific capabilities are great, but we are simply not smart enough to know if this plan, this experiment with our northern environment, is worth the risks that it presents. The time frame is simply too large. We do not have those kinds of capacities at this time. We may need to conduct some long-term demonstrations and experiments to give us better understandings of this kind of challenge. We need to know more confidently, that this plan will be a workable and durable and successful plan. Our climate is currently undergoing an unusually high rate of change. Human beings have not seen such changes over the course of recorded history. This current situation, alone, makes prediction models for what will occur 200 to 500 years from now much less reliable. We do not have the knowledge that we need to implement this plan at this time. Sincerely, Daniel R.C. Olson, St Paul, MN Daniel Olson
HYPERLINK "mailto:olso1981@umn.edu"olso1981@umn.edu

Daniel Otterstrom 11252

Sent from Windows Mail Hello, my name is Daniel Otterstrom. I have been a resident of Minnesota for a number of years, mainly in the Duluth area. I have seen the economy of that part of the State go from good to bad because of lack of jobs and tax money's not being there. I believe that we have resources that should be looked at with Polymet Mining. I have been following the progress of Polymet Mining and believe that they are going to be careful with the environmental issues so that the mining does not impact the land and wildlife in a negative way. They already have the resources to process the ores from mining and with them using the reverse osmosis to make sure that there are no residues left in the water to pollute the environment, I have faith that the Polymet Group will make the responsible choices so that both sides will be working together for the greater good of Minnesota.

Daniel Pauly 42966

Please find enclosed my comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. A hard copy will be delivered to the MNDNR this afternoon. Regards, Daniel Pauly 2100 West 49th Street Minneapolis, MN 55419 612-325-1237

Daniel Schutte 42674

See attachment

Daniel Telin 19528

Daniel Telin, T-E-L-I-N, 1540 North 8th Avenue East, Duluth, Minnesota 55805.I would just like to go on record that I believe the EIS, as written, is insufficient in that the project introduces sulfites and other contaminants into an essentially uncontaminated environment and a partially compromised St. Louis River watershed. The potential for environmental degradation is high because of untested assumptions in the EIS as written. And finally, there is no long-range plan for the treatment of the tailings and the sulfide wastewater whose treatment would run into centuries.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel W Iverson

9988

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel W Iverson 4640 North Arm Dr 4640 north arm drive Mound, MN 55364

18731

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel W Iverson 4640 North Arm Dr 4640 north arm drive Mound, MN 55364

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel W Iverson

18957

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Daniel W Iverson 4640 North Arm Dr 4640 north arm drive Mound, MN 55364 952-472-7835

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel W Iverson 50805

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Daniel W Iverson 4640 North Arm Dr 4640 north arm drive Mound, MN 55364

Daniel W McLaughlin 54811

See attachment

Daniel Zachman 44881

The plan to mitigate waste-water run off is not adequate. It is irresponsible to expect our grandchildren to continue to clean the waste-water from our jobs project. Please send PolyMet back to the drawing boards and ask them to come up with a workable plan. Daniel Zachman Minneapolis, MN

Daniel Ziegler 30041

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining on tourism. I hope someone other than taxpayers will pay for the clean up future mining operations. Sincerely, Daniel Ziegler PO Box 115 Port Washington, WI 53074-0115 (920) 892-7377

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Daniel Ziegler

40669

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Daniel Ziegler 2040 W Wayzata Blvd Apt 115 Orono, MN 55356-5605

Danielle Cabrera

41695

To who it may concern at the Department of Natural Resources, Please do not grant the permit to PolyMet for building a mine in Northern Minnesota. The gravity of losses that would be incurred as a result of the mine are much greater than the economic benefits. You must consider the health, social, cultural, and environmental consequences of a mine. While I understand the need for jobs in northern Minnesota, you can neither rebuild an environment full of biodiversity nor reverse the negative health impacts of local families. I ask that you decline the permit and set a precedence that affirms the dignity of humans and the life in northern Minnesota. I also ask that more sustainable jobs be presented to the local communities in the North. Thank-you for your time. Danielle J. Cabrera - Danielle J. Cabrera Communication Studies Major '15 Student Senate Co-President Collegiate Fellow Gustavus Adolphus College

danielle henjum

52316

I do not think that the Polymet Mining Project in Northern MN will be a good project for the people of this region. I believe that use of water for hundreds of years to clean up the mining is too precious of a resource for our people. The threat of contamination of our fresh water is something that I don't think is outweighed by the minerals and jobs that will be mined and created. If a mining is allowed try it on a scale that is only 25% of what Polymet is currently proposing for 20 years. Use this as a way to both compromise with business and environmental interests and as a way to study the impact of such mining in MN. Brian Smith 5001 Oakely St Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Danielle Lake Diver

39466

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I live in the Minnesota Arrowhead region and I do not want my home and farm polluted by toxic waste from mining. My husband is a member of the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa and he is concerned for the future of wild rice, which is a culturally important food as well as a means of economic and nutritional support for many people on Fond du Lac Reservation and throughout the Arrowhead region. If waste from open pit mining gets into wild rice beds the wild rice will die off. If the waste reaches our ground water, we will have to leave our home. I am strongly opposed to open pit mining and I believe that PolyMet's short-sighted vision will quickly become a nightmare for those of us who live near the mines. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Danielle Lake Diver 1811 Big Lake Rd Cloquet, MN 55720-9708

48737

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I live in the Minnesota Arrowhead region and I do not want my home and farm polluted by toxic waste from mining. My husband is a member of the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa and he is concerned for the future of wild rice, which is a culturally important food as well as a means of economic and nutritional support for many people on Fond du Lac Reservation and throughout the Arrowhead region. If waste from open pit mining gets into wild rice beds the wild rice will die off. If the waste reaches our ground water, we will have to leave our home. I am strongly opposed to open pit mining and I believe that PolyMet's short-sighted vision will quickly become a nightmare for those of us who live near the mines. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Danielle Lake Diver 1811 Big Lake Rd Cloquet, MN 55720-9708

Danielle Rodgers

54147

I DO NOT SUPPORT POLY MET [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Danielle Sveiven

54205

I am against building a mine up north, sulfide mining is one of the dirtiest mining types. Sulfide mining is 99% waste. The boundary waters has some of the purest watersheds, where people LOVE to go camping and canoeing. I personally love going camping up there and enjoy how clean and beautiful it is.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Danielle Taylor

18200

My name is Alice, A-L-I-C-E, C-L-O-S-M-O-R-E, and defer my time to a mentor of mine, Danielle Taylor. Thank you, Alice. My name is Danielle Taylor, D-A-N-I-E-L-L-E, T-A-Y-L-O-R. Almost 20 years ago, I moved to a small town on the shores of Lake Superior where its vastness and its power and its beauty inspired me. It was then that I knew that I had to do everything in my own power in the defense of the water. Recently, I was talking with my friend Pete who works tirelessly in defense of the water, the land and its creatures. Day in and day out, he does educational work taking people out to where they can see the source of Class 1 trout streams bubbling up in small streams, and he lets them decide for themselves; is this something that we collectively value? Sometimes when people are seeing a Class 1 trout stream for the first time, they are hooked, and that is inspiring. But sometimes the work of the educating can seem so small. So I asked my friend Pete, "How do you do it? How do you keep the energy and the commitment when sometimes it seems so futile?" He just said, "What else am I going to do." Working together patiently, defining our collective values and looking for creative approaches to our economic needs, these are activities that keep us going. What else are we going to do? The idea of the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest time is at the heart of development-oriented managed approach to our natural resources. The proposed PolyMet mine promises 300 jobs for 20 years, but it also calls for up to 500 years of monitoring cleanup. This equation does not add up to development. It is simply extraction. Although it merged at the beginning of the 1900s within the US Forest Service, the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time also applies to our ways of governing ourselves and living together in communities. In an essay on patriotism, Terry Tempest Williams said that "This is the bedrock of democracy: The greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest time." Few organizations by the numbers, United States, 250 years old, Minnesota just over 150. Minnesota DNR, 80 years old. USEPA founded in 1970 -- same age as me. PolyMet, how long has PolyMet been in existence. Among these groups, I would like to know which can make a genuine and credible promise to be around monitoring for up to 500 years? I can tell you, as far as I know, the only people that have been around here for 500 years are not too pleased about this proposal. I think there are a number of ways to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest period of time. We need to keep talking with each other, working together, one (inaudible) at a time.

20033

Attention: Lisa Fay What else are we going to do. Almost 20 years ago I moved to a small town on the shore of Lake Superior where its vastness, its power and its beauty inspired me. It was then that I knew I was to do everything in my own power in defense of the water. Recently I was talking with my friend, Pete, who works tirelessly in defense of the water, the land and its creatures. Day-in-day out he does educational work – taking people out to where they can see the source of Class 1 Trout Streams bubbling up in small springs. And he lets them decide for themselves. Is this something that we collectively value. Sometimes when people are seeing a Class 1 Trout Stream for the first time, they are hooked and that can be inspiring. But sometimes the work of educating can seem so small. So I asked my friend Pete, how does he do it. How does he keep up his energy and commitment when it sometimes seems so futile. He just said, “what else am I going to do.” Working together patiently, defining our collective values and looking for creative approaches to our economic needs—these are activities that can keep us going. What else are we going to do. The idea of “the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest time” – is at the heart of a development-oriented managed-use approach to our natural resources. The proposed Polymet mine promises 300 jobs for 20 years. But it also calls for up to 500 years of monitoring and clean-up. This equation does not add up to development—it is simply extraction. Although it emerged at the beginning of the 1900s within the US Forestry Service, the idea of “the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time” also applies to our ways of governing ourselves and living together in communities. In an essay on Patriotism, Terry Tempest Williams says that this is the bedrock of democracy- “the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest time.” A few organizations by the numbers: · United States is not quite 250 years old. · Minnesota just over 150- · MN DNR about 80 years old · US – EPA founded in 1970 – 44 years old. · PolyMet – How long has Polymet been in existence. Among all these groups, I would like to know which one can make a genuine and credible promise to be around monitoring for up to 500 years. As far as I can tell, the only people who have been around here for 500 years are not too pleased by this proposal. I think there are a number of ways to “do the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest period time.” We need to keep talking to each other, keep working collectively and creatively— It’s one story at a time. One peace at a time. What else are we going to do. Thank you for listening. Danielle Taylor 12325 County Road 51 Apt. B4 Saint Joseph, MN 56374

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dannell Shu

17157

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dannell Shu 1814 Taylor St NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

50425

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dannell Shu 1814 Taylor St NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Danny Ayotte

40158

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Danny Ayotte 14 Park Dr Northfield, MN 55057-2640 (507) 645-9447

Dara Syrkin

9732

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze, environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. We must be stewards of the land, stewards who use science and the long view, to determine actions. Sincerely yours, Dara Syrkin Dara Syrkin 3229 48th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dara Syrkin

18562

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze, environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. We must be stewards of the land, stewards who use science and the long view, to determine actions. Sincerely yours, Dara Syrkin Dara Syrkin 3229 48th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dara Syrkin

50638

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze, environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. We must be stewards of the land, stewards who use science and the long view, to determine actions. Sincerely yours, Dara Syrkin

Dara Syrkin 3229 48th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Darlene Coffman

16990

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darlene Coffman 1765 3rd avenue sw rochester, MN 55902

50275

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darlene Coffman 1765 3rd avenue sw rochester, MN 55902

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Darlene Eckert 42930

Please find attached my comments. Darlene Eckert

Darlene Haus 42865

See attachment

Darlene Jackson 42537

See attachment

Darlene Solheim 54649

See attachment

Darlene Subialka 40013

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This is not what we want scarring the pristine sacred land of Minnesota. I say no more mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Darlene Subialka 702 N 64th Ave W Duluth, MN 55807-1120

41977

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Darlene Subialka Duluth, Minnesota

Darlene Watson 18308

Darlene Watson of Duluth. I'm turning over my speaking time to David Kane.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Darlene Young

40008

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Darlene Young 222 2nd St SE Apt 1005 Minneapolis, MN 55414-5167 (612) 378-4933

Darrell and Delores White

57243

Sulfide mining in northeastern MN lacks common sense and is not a responsible thing to do. There is a high risk of pollution to our water, land and wild life. Tourism will be ruined for years in this area. This company lacks experience. Cleanup is expensive; they should have "billions" in a cleanup fund which no one can use except what it's intended for. Darrell & Delores White 22710 County Rd 70 Bovey, MN 55709

Darrell Godbout

18073

My name is Darrell Godbout. I represent approximately 1600 union ironworkers in my regions, and a while back, I was thinking, around the area, around the country, how many small towns there are who would love to have a project like this built in their small town to bring up their community, their schools, small businesses, and all of us that have had kids have to send them off somewhere else to go to work. Here's an opportunity we can have our kids stay right here, Hoyt Lakes, Aurora, the Iron Range, and get a job and stay here. I think that's very important. I've been at the PolyMet meetings in the past. CEO, John Cherry, Steve -- Steve Ryan, Joe Scipioni; I've talked to them many times, I've been to all their meetings, and not once has any of these guys ever said on this environmental impact that we need to change our laws or lift our laws to allow them to do some things that they shouldn't be doing. I think they need to follow the laws 100 percent and make sure we have clean water, clean air for everybody. But like I said, not once has any of these guys ever said, "We want to change these environmental laws and get this thing pushed through." I think they're outstanding people. I think they want a good project. And another thing I thought about quite a while ago is, at one of the meetings I heard 70 percent of our copper is imported in this country from other parts overseas where there is no environmental protection at all, spewing crap in the air and everything else. Here, we got a company that's going to do it clean. We won't have to import this stuff no more. We can sell it right here in Northern Minnesota. I guess that's all I had and thank you very much for your time.

Darren Froehle

54641

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Darsi Miller

44086

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darsi Miller Landowner in the Gilbert, MN area Darsi Miller 578 Jandel Ave NE Hanover, MN 55341

44098

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Darsi Miller Landowner in the Gilbert, MN area Darsi Miller 578 Jandel Ave NE Hanover, MN 55341

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Darwin Roth

39092

---Original Message--- From: darwinroth@msn-com [mailto:darwinroth@msn-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:49 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Darwin Roth 4517 W 84th St Minneapolis, MN 55437-1356

Dat Tran

40359

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Dat Tran 124 Academy Lane Upper Darby, PA 19082 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Bartholomay 15745

See attachment

Dave Carlson 9754

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dave Carlson 5818 Co Rd 2 Ft. Ripley, MN 56449

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Carlson

18575

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dave Carlson 5818 Co Rd 2 Ft. Ripley, MN 56449

18576

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dave Carlson 5818 Co Rd 2 Ft. Ripley, MN 56449

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Carlson

50651

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dave Carlson 5818 Co Rd 2 Ft. Ripley, MN 56449

50652

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dave Carlson 5818 Co Rd 2 Ft. Ripley, MN 56449

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Cicmil

6190

I have lived and worked in northern Minnesota all my life. The mining industry has provided me and my family the means for a quality way of life, excellent education, and the opportunity to remain in the area to enjoy all it provides. I have seen technological improvements within the industry to improve and protect our environment and believe there to be a “check and balance” between state and industry. With the time, research, and money that has been invested towards this project and Polymet’s commitment to the environment, providing well-paying jobs and tax revenue, while providing the metals so badly needed to improve our quality of life. I feel that it is very important that this project, already heavily scrutinized, be allowed to move forward. Respectfully, Dave Cicmil Industrial Lubricant Company

Dave Clapper

17001

To whom it may concern, I remember years ago when LTV was shut down and the impact it had on the local economy. When an opportunity like PolyMet comes around to mine the world’s largest cooper reserves, we owe it to the region to create hundreds if not thousands, of jobs. It would be a shame not to jump at this opportunity that we have been so blessed with. I for one believe that PolyMet Mining would operate the mine responsibly and protect the long-term environmental concerns. I say, move ahead and do not miss out on this tremendous opportunity. Our economy could use a boost in that region and help Minnesota continue being a leader and the envy of other States. Sincerely David F. Clapper 1617 woodstone drive Victoria Mn-55386 _____ This e-mail and its attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain privileged, confidential or proprietary information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. Thank you for your cooperation.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Crawford

38374

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: PolyMet's initial DEIS was found inadequate. The SDEIS is still inadequate. I have the following concerns and I request the actions stated with each concern: The PolyMet SDEIS fails to acknowledge the Tribal Cooperating Agencies' position that there will be a need for containment or treatment of contamination from mine waste, mine pit, and tailings pile in perpetuity. Require the SDEIS to be redone to include this testimony and an objectively substantiated response from PolyMet. The PolyMet SDEIS does not adequately substantiate PolyMet's claim that 99-37 percent of the seepage from the tailings pile will be captured and that no contaminants will seep from the mine waste rock pile. Require the SDEIS to be redone to provide verifiable substantiation of claims of protection of surface waters from contamination. Damage to wetlands surrounding the project site and direct destruction of 913 acres of wetlands by the project are inadequately mitigated. The majority of mitigation for direct destruction will take place outside the Lake Superior Basin and therefore does not mitigate the impact of the project on the Lake Superior Basin. There is no plan to replace most of the indirectly damaged wetlands which will likely be compromised in the area surrounding the project. Deny the Section 404 wetlands destruction permit and require a reassessment in the SDEIS of likely impacts to surrounding wetlands outside the project footprint. The PolyMet SDEIS does not adequately assess the potential impacts of contaminant seepage through existing bedrock fractures and through additional fractures which may result from routine blasting operations at the mine pit. Require the SDEIS be redone to accurately address these impacts. The PolyMet Land Exchange would result in net losses of thousands of acres of high biodiversity plant communities, floodplains, and mature forest. Deny the land exchange in both of its two proposed alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS lacks a health risk assessment which sufficiently addresses likely impacts to PolyMet workers' health and the effects of airborne and seepage contaminants on drinking water wells, surface waters and their human-consumable resources of fish and wild rice, and on aquatic and terrestrial wildlife throughout the watershed, including threatened and special concern species. Require a health risk assessment. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to explore alternatives such as comparing an underground mining alternative with the proposed open pit mine; placing waste rock back into the pit; placing liners under the waste rock pile and tailings piles; or implementing engineering solutions to reduce water drainage away from Partridge River Watershed wetlands and streams. Require a new SDEIS which documents these alternatives and compares them with the current proposal. Deny PolyMet a mining permit until all of these inadequacies are corrected with well-substantiated data and with guaranteed measures to negate adverse impacts for the entire expected duration of the problem.* This is of particular importance because the precedent which is set in allowing a hard rock mining permit in sulfide-bearing rock will set the bar for any subsequent applications for similar mining. Insufficient regulatory attention to human and environmental safety has characterized all similar mining projects across the US. Minnesota needs to set a precedent which will not leave the state facing the problems which plague communities and governments saddled with the presence and aftermath of sulfide mining elsewhere. *Mining companies are temporary entities, but the PolyMet proposal creates a permanent problem. Regulatory oversight is not sufficient unless it guarantees that the party initiating a proposal will take, and be held to, all of the responsibilities for all costs and damages, present and future, which may arise as a result of implementing the proposal. If the initiating party can't make this gua

Dave Ethier

43337

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to the citizens and taxpayers of Minnesota and the impact this project will have on water quality. Please respond to the following questions: There has not been enough research and analysis to identify the impact of a 100 or 500 year flood on containment systems and the site in general. The state, country, and world in general has had an increase in the number of large storms that resulted in historic flooding. Recent examples include the Duluth flooding in 2012, Colorado, Estes Park / Bolder areas, and the Ontario, CA flooding in the spring of 2013- Please take the following action: Conduct a impact assessment for potential historic flooding for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Dave Ethier 4209 S River Run Savage, MN 55378 952-447-6332

Dave Gaddie

6605

To Whom It May Concern: As a business owner/manager I would like you to approve the permits necessary for PolyMet to proceed to construction. This project has been thoroughly vetted as it should be, but it should not be held to higher standards than any other mining project currently operating in NE Minnesota. The company has fulfilled all of the requests throughout the EIS process and it is now time to approve the project and move forward with jobs and materials that will help drive the economic environment for all of us who operate a business in NE Minnesota. We operate bank in Hibbing and know first hand that people that live on the range are in dire need of living wage jobs and benefit packages. Regards, David M. Gaddie President/CEO Republic Bank with locations in Duluth and Hibbing

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Gibbens

38453

Dave Gibbens 9655 Inver Grove Trail Inver Grove Heights MN 55476 To Lisa Fay and the good folks at the DNR: I want to add my comments to the copper-nickel mining issue. Basically, I'm FOR it. While I hope to see Minnesota is as well-protected as we can make it, I think it's important to move forward on the Polymet project. Other proposals have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but again I am generally favorably disposed. This is just too good to let it get away from us. One thing for sure: copper and nickel will be mined, and we Minnesotans will do it better, cleaner and safer than anyone else. Unlike tourism, mining actually creates wealth. To the extent that deleterious effects are minimized, it's a good thing for northeastern Minnesota and the state as a whole. I grew up a child and grandchild of miners on the Iron Range and my grandfather worked in copper mining in Michigan. My dad was a mining engineer on the Range. I too worked in iron mining in the 1960s before graduating with a degree in physics, but I still spend my summers there and follow local issues. The iron mining companies' steel built our nation and gave us the materials to win WWII, but the nation needs copper now. Mining companies once made Range area schools the best in the state, if not the nation. That was then, but now the Iron Range is suffering and has lost much of its population as the better jobs migrated out. I have long been aware of the nickel, copper, gold and palladium deposits in the area Polymet proposes to mine, from acquaintances who worked on exploratory drilling rigs 50 years ago, and it has been surprising that it has taken this long for concrete mining business plans to emerge. It's a shame that it had to be at the hands of foreign mining multinationals, but that's better than nothing - the Iron Range economy has always been controlled by outsiders, whether they be from the Twin Cities, Pittsburgh, Wall Street, Canada or Europe. Nevertheless, copper-nickel mining will be a tremendous economic benefit to northeastern Minnesota and the whole state, and I urge you to help make it happen. Thanks again for your attention - Dave Gibbens

Dave H

9486

Sulfide Mining Comments: "Does The End Justify The Means" 1/28/2014 I am a native of this precious state. I was raised on a small farm in the south central area of rural Minnesota. As a youngster after school, and after the farm chores were done, I could choose to walk the many miles of fence lines between farmers fields hoping for a shot at a ring neck pheasant or I could sneak into one of several dozen grassy slews or swamps and wait for the ducks and geese to return from feeding all day in the bean and corn fields. Sadly, these opportunities do not exist any longer in rural Minnesota. Why. Global food demand caused our prairie lands and wetlands to disappear, first by removing the fence lines between farmer's fields, then by plowing over the grasslands and finally by tiling the wetlands. Although the yield per acre doubled, today, tons of nitrates flow into the Gulf of Mexico expanding the Dead Zone by hundreds of feet per day. Next, exhaustive global requirements for steel left acres and acres of massive holes in our northern forest land but not before we almost poisoned Lake Superior to death with tailings. Finally, urban sprawl has been chewing up acreage since settlement. In total, these operations have changed forever 2/3 of the state's natural landscape/geography, leading the nation in that category. Did the end justify the means. Maybe. I am sternly opposed to the activation of the Polymet mine or any sulfide for the following reasons. 1- No history exists, anywhere in the world, proving that sulfide mining does not negatively impact the environment. In Minnesota this means damage to our: . Natural wild rice plots . Streams, rivers, lakes, peatlands . Forests and vegetation . Wild life and Fish . Current and future drinking water supplies (including Lake Superior) 2- Stop endangering our wetlands. According to the National Wetlands Inventory, Minnesota has lost 1/2 or 10-6M acres of wetlands since pre settlement. 3- The Polymet mine would destroy 1,400 acres of precious purifying peatland increasing the state's CO2 level by 2% over 2005 levels. 4- Swapping nationally protected BWCA acreage for mining is renegeing on land promised for preservation. 5- How can we ignore the 2008 recommendations of the Minnesota Climate Change Advisory Group stating that protecting our carbon reservoirs (peatlands) is critical and that we should design policies to maintain those protections for the future. 6- Allowing sulfide mining not only carries the risk of pollution with perpetual cleanup and filtration, the natural resources being removed are not renewable. 7- Risk of losing tourism revenue in the NE counties. 8- Foreign owned/backed mining companies have NO risk to their own soil and environment. 9- Indications are that of Polymet's estimated 350 jobs only about 75 would involve local resources. We must protect our water supply at all costs. By now we all should be aware that an inevitable water shortage is forthcoming that will dwarf the agitating cost of current gasoline prices. Awareness of our state's diminishing water supply should be enough of an impetus for us to strictly protect ALL ground water, from ANY and ALL type of pollution, OR the RISK of pollution. Without fuel we don't move around, without water we die. Ok, let's consider some alternatives. 1- How about we change our environmental stewardship attitude from "reactive" to "pro-active". The Clean Water Act of 2008 (Legacy Amendment) was a beginning but is mostly reactionary by using money to fix a problem (533M allocated/committed to date) after it arises. I submit that our attitude towards damaging environmental issues should be pro-active and prohibit proven polluting operations in the first place, like sulfide mining. 2- Find a substitute for copper/nickel. Surely, just as man invented the wheel, tools, black powder, automobiles, plastics, airplanes and space ships to the moon and Mars, we can put the resources together to find substitutes or alternate products

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Hamlin

39339

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Dave Hamlin 12363 195th Ave NW Elk River, MN 55330-4143 (763) 234-4349

dave hillier

39117

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dave hiller 48172

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Dave Hiller 3634 Campaigne rd Brimson, MN 55602

dave hunsche 7623

Name: David R. Hunsche Address: 24 West Chapman Street, Ely, MN 55731 Mailing Address: PO Box 788, Ely, MN 55731 e-mail: dhunsche@hotmail-com I am wondering if there is any research into the presence of asbestos or similar fibers in the soils or rocks at the proposed mine site. If any of these fibers are present what are the implications for worker and the surrounding populations health. Thank you, Dave Hunsche

Dave Kinzer 41755

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Dave Kotula 42545

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Krings 38131

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. To the environmentalists, it does not matter if they are wrong. Even if they make no sense they feel they must fight on. They have bet the farm against Polymet and are convinced, losing will seriously wound their entire movement. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. David Krings 1329 Isleview Rd Grand Rapids, MN 55744 Phone: 218-327-8289 E-Mail: gofishingmn@msn-com

Dave Lacey 3246

These mining firms cannot be trusted with our water supplies and the health of the citizens around their for profit operations. Just say no to this project. We are dealing with a similar misinformation campaign in Oregon. The short term jobs do not compare to the degradation left over when they are gone. Happy Holidays. Dave Lacey 541 373-0487

Dave Laliberte 43063

Comment on PolyMet Project In 1946, the Reserve Mining Company announced plans to build an enormous new plant and nearby company town in northeastern Minnesota. Utilizing innovative new technologies focused on obtaining taconite—iron particles magnetically extracted from crushed rock—the Reserve mine promised thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars for local economies. By the 1960s, Reserve produced 15% of all taconite used in the American steel industry, according to historian Thomas Huffman, and had brought a financial windfall to Silver Bay, the site of its processing facility, and to neighboring communities along Lake Superior's North Shore. For a resurgent mining industry, these were boom times. By 1986, however, Reserve Mining Company declared bankruptcy. Its Silver Bay plant closed that same year. By 1994, when the downsized plant re-opened under new ownership, its host community had lost 1,000 of its 3,000 residents. Boom times, it seems, did not last forever. Today, Minnesotans are considering another potential mining project, this time for copper, nickel and other precious metals, again in the state's Arrowhead region. As seven decades ago, the current proposal of PolyMet Mining Inc. contains innovative features—this time for environmental controls—and the lure of enormous economic gain. Northeastern Minnesota's history, though, should caution us that in all likelihood, any mining proposal for the region is likely to feed another boom-bust economic cycle simply because the extraction of minerals from northern Minnesota is inextricably linked to the broader society's demand for that mineral—a trend that cannot be accurately predicted decades into the future. Just as lower-cost iron and steel imported from Brazil led to plummeting taconite demand from domestic sources in the 1980s, according to historian Norman Risjord, new sources of or reduced demand for today's sought-after minerals may prove PolyMet's requested 20-year operation in Hoyt Lakes overzealous. And in the end, whether PolyMet's operations continue for a portion of two decades or beyond it, a private company cannot be expected to endure—and financially ensure the environmental health of the area it impacts—for centuries. Ultimately, the PolyMet proposal determines to take from the land what we want now; I deem it more important to leave in the land what our children may value tomorrow. Respectfully, David J. Laliberte 1108 Seventh Ave N. St Cloud, MN 56303 [HYPERLINK "mailto:dlaliberte@usa-net"](mailto:dlaliberte@usa-net) dlaliberte@usa-net 320-251-0019 Dave Laliberte 320-251-0019 dlaliberte@usa-net

Dave LaZella 7152

First of all I'd like to express my support for the Poly Met project. As a native Iron Ranger I understand the economic value that this project brings to the state and local area. Poly Met will provide many jobs for the local economy along with generating a substantial amount of tax revenue for the state. Having grown up less than 20 miles from the mine site I understand how mining and the environment can co-exist This doesn't have to be an "either or" proposition. Jobs and the environment can be balanced out. I believe that the supplemental draft EIS has thoroughly looked at and addressed all environmental concerns. This has gone on long enough and I want the permits to be issued and the jobs to begin. Thank you, David LaZella 18362 Sherry's Arm Road Grand Rapids, MN 55744 218-259-4349 [HYPERLINK "mailto:dlaz1951@yahoo-com"](mailto:dlaz1951@yahoo-com) dlaz1951@yahoo-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Leitzke

44909

To Whom it May Concern: This Minnesota citizen now adds his voice to the many concerned people of this state regarding the proposed Polymet mine. From all reasonable accounts, this mine will have a devastating effect on the environment of the immediate landscape, as well as poison the drinking water of local residents. The beauty of our state must be preserved. This mine might provide short-term profit for its owners and share holder.. it will also wreak havoc with the surrounding countryside as well. if there was a statewide referendum on this topic today, I would vote NO, against the Polymet mine. Sincerely, David Leitzke 1404Raymond Avenue, Apt 2 St Paul, MN 55108

Dave Lislegard

44276

My name is Dave LislegaRd Like our late Senator Paul Wellstone, our Range Delegation, Congressman Nolan and Senators Franken and Klobuchar, and other Community, business, and Labor Leaders are working hard to support urgently needed mining jobs on the Range, while protecting our environment and quality of life in Northern Minnesota. This unified approach is exactly the kind of leadership needed to make progress. As a lifelong resident of the Iron Range, I have a strong interest in supporting responsible mining projects that will breathe new life into our region while protecting our natural environment. I am not a scientist or engineer but recognize that PolyMet's reverse osmosis water treatment design is well tested and used in many applications today. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources is a respected agency responsible for determining that the PolyMet project will meet our state's strict standards. They along with the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers have been deeply involved with the evaluation of the state of the art technologies that will be used by PolyMet. Senator Paul Wellstone was a champion of both economic and environmental justice and did a great deal to help my family and so many others after the LTV plant closure. As with the late Senator, I believe the economic opportunity represented by mining and environmental stewardship are not mutually exclusive. PolyMet represents an opportunity to create hundreds of direct jobs supporting families on the East Range, as well as thousands of additional jobs statewide. And make no mistake, our Range communities want this in their backyard and fully believe we have the ability to do this project right. Personally I am offended when the opposition uses fear tactics and suggests that our communities are divided. What better way to stand up for environmental and economic justice than to create mining jobs in a state with some of the strictest environmental regulation in the world and labor and safety laws designed to protect workers. Senator Wellstone fully understood that Iron Rangers are fighting for a way of life that balances our love for our natural environment as well as our desire to see families stay in the region because they have economic opportunity. Like my daughter Hailey who is currently enrolled in the heavy equipment operator program in Staples with the hope and dream that she will be able to come home to work and raise her family. I commend the agencies for doing their homework and using their professional expertise to ensure this project will be held to our State standards. Dave Lislegard 720 Arrowhead St Aurora MN, 55705

Dave Mills

45008

Dear Lisa Fay, Firstly, thank you for your time. Secondly, down to business: Please reject the Polymet project. I grew up in Grand Rapids, MN. It wasn't a mining town, but had had a little mining nearby - close enough to bike to. The tailings piles were an eyesore, but they also gave the land some character. They were fun to explore. The pits were fun to swim in, kind of scary deep, but fun. They almost seemed exotic. The land had been torn up and not yet restored, but the danger was minimal. There was no toxicity to treat. Just pits to fill, but it wasn't done. Not the worst consequences from what I can tell, but a lack of follow through with a lasting impact. The Iron Range had a reputation of not quite being stable. Mines were shut down while I grew up, and sometimes re-opened, but then shut down again. Mining is not a economically sustainable industry. Sometimes a boost to an economy can help revitalize a community, but if there is significant potential harm it would seem a dangerous wager. Minimizing risk seems to be in the best interest of the community. I would suggest minimizing the environmental risk of the area from a safety standpoint(potential leaks, leaching, drainage - the Fukushima radiation is still not contained as an example of how technology, albeit different, can fail) as well as minimizing the environmental risk from a financial standpoint, if bankruptcy occurs (and it has been occurring around the globe quite a lot lately). The safest way to do that would be to reject the project altogether. The consequence of rejecting the project seems to be the status quo, and my understanding is that the economy of the area is not flourishing. The area HAD flourished while more mining operations were happening, but like previously stated, mining is not sustainable. The Polymet project would potentially improve the economy for less than a lifetime, yet the potential hazards will last for much longer than a lifetime, much longer than Minnesota has been a state, and much longer than any living thing in our State. The EIS of the project does not sufficiently cover our interests. There is too little evidence supporting the project, especially considering the real potential harMs Please reject the project for the good of everyone and all things good. Thank you for you time and hard work. Sincerely, Dave Mills Grand Marais, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Redelman

43605

Subject: Comments on the PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement From: David Redelman 2115 E. River Terrace – 202 Minneapolis, MN 55414 I have some general comments about the SDEIS concerning the process that will be followed by four issues that are not adequately addressed in the SDEIS. I feel the comment period for the EIS should be 180 days. The comment period for the SDEIS should have been longer than 90 days due to the complexity of the document and the modeling used in the document. You could make EIS easier to follow by including all relevant information in the document and not refer back to SDEIS or DEAS. Also, when the EIS is released, the List of References should include links to those references with the references stored and easily accessible on the DNR website. Users of the website should be able to download these reference files. My general comments on the SDIES regard my feeling the process is basically cooked with a predetermined outcome. The presenter for the introduction at the open house on January 26, 2014 at the River Center, St Paul, mentioned four reasons why the SDIES was completed. He made it sound like the SDIES was the idea of the State of Minnesota or Polymet. He neglected to mention that the DEIS was basically rejected by the EPA. In addition, answers to questions by representatives of the State or their contractors at the booths seemed like a sales pitch to approve the mine. This concern is heightened considering the MN DNR and MN PCA signed off on the DEIS followed by the EPA giving the DEIS in inadequate – environmentally unsatisfactory ranking. My primary concerns involve addressing long term water quality issues. Sulfide mining has a generally poor record leaving long term water pollution after closing the mines. I am sure the proposals for these polluting mines also looked good on paper but still resulted in long term pollution problems. There have also been many mining companies going bankrupt with inadequate financial assurances resulting in taxpayers paying for the cleanup. The proposed PolyMet mine would be the first sulfide mine in Minnesota. Everyone is learning as we go through this process so we need to proceed with great caution. If errors are made, these errors should be on the side of caution. Specific issues that are not adequately addressed in the SDEIS: Financial assurances are not adequately addressed. Detailed financial assurance calculations with the associated risk analysis need to be completed for the EIS. This risk analysis is crucial in the EIS and any decision to proceed forward to the permitting process is dependent on this risk analysis. Section 3-2-2-4 of the SDIES states “The level of engineering design and planning required to calculate detailed financial assurance amounts is typically made available during the permitting process and was not available at the time that this SDEIS was prepared.” What is typical of this process as the SDEIS is for the first sulfide mine in Minnesota. Also, forgive me but it seems absurd that more detailed engineering and analysis of risks would only be completed during permitting. Again, the engineering design and the risk analysis are both crucial in the EIS. Any decision to proceed forward to the permitting process is dependent on this risk analysis. I do not understand how the financial arrangements between PolyMet and Glencore results in Glencore getting a free pass and not accountable for any financial assurances. Glencore seems to be getting an increasing ownership stake in the operation with the right to sell the metals. PolyMet has not operated a mine but chosen a partner that seems to leave pollution problems in its wake. At the open house, DNR staff was confident that lessons have been learned from past mining pollution and that financial assurances would be adequately addressed. I do not share that confidence. Sulfide mining h

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Salo

18085

Hi. I'm Dr. Dave Salo. I currently reside in Mountain Iron, Minnesota. This is an introduction to the medical and pharmaceutical applications of these local metals, that's going to include cooper, nickel, platinum, palladium, gold and some other isolated isotopes. First off, copper we see as a pharmacological category as a trace element. We see it in over-the-counter supplementation; we see it in total (inaudible) nutrition; and most importantly, is going to be the anti-bacterial property that copper has because it is much cheaper than silver yet acts just like it. Along with that, nickel. Nickel is present in stainless steel, and it is a durable stain-resistant surface. It's easily cleaned and we've used this quite a bit within the hospital settings and other areas of healthcare. We also see it implemented in a number of our instrumentation, especially in the surgical suites, and it's also used in drug eluting and/or bare-metal stents after somebody has a coronary event. Anyone had a heart attack? Probably got a stent; okay? That's what some of these metals are going to be used for. Platinum. Anything with a platin on the end of the molecular name is going to have a platinum molecule attached to it. We use these as far as anti-cancer agents, alkylating agents. We have three of these available on the market, now, as pharmaceuticals; cisplatin, carboplatin and oxaliplatin; and we've got one in phase two of clinical trials, satraplatin. If anyone has had cancer before and known someone who has had cancer before, they more than likely have had one of these drugs or at least considered as part of the drug regimen. Some of the indications include but are not limited to bladder, ovarian, testicular, colorectal, cervical, in vitro, head and neck, mesothelioma, lung, non-Hodgkin's, et cetera. Palladium. Palladium is a radiopharmaceutical. We implant these into the prostate. It's a alternative to a prosthetic in removal of a prostate. And also, too, anyone who's a diabetic, or knows some who's a diabetic, this is present in their electrodes in their blood-glucose meter. This results in electron flow that is measurable and directly proportional to the concentration of glucose in the blood resulting in quick and accurate measurements for which we are familiar with today. Now, in conclusion, we know these metals are not readily available on the surface, but we need to extract them from the ground, and we need to do this to maintain the current manufacturing of these drugs and these products. Also, to foster the future pharmaceutical manufacturing and/or development of drugs, advance the practice of medicine and to treat -- in an effort to treat cancer, control infection and diagnose and monitor the path of physiology of affected individuals. And I will state one thing about statistics; there is lies, dam lies and then statistics. So the science is very good.

Dave Sandstrom

9560

Please find my Polymet Op Ed published by the Hibbing Trib 1/28/2014 attached. Thank You, Dave Sandstrom 3747 Hwy 5 Hibbing, MN 55746

Dave Semerad

18158

My name Sam Burke. I'm a third-generation ironworker from Local 512. And I yield my time to Dave Semerad. Thank you, Sam. My name is Dave Semerad, S-E-M-E-R-A-D. And I'm the CEO for the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota. We're the state's oldest and largest trade association representing the building and highway heavy-construction industry. Collectively our members perform the vast majority of heavy highway construction, and commercial and public building construction in the state. Today our members employ over 75,000 construction workers. We are construction professionals who since 1919 have built Minnesota schools, places of worship, stadiums, roads, bridges, hospitals and clinics, locks and dams, power plants, refineries, water treatment facilities, pipelines, municipal utility projects, airports, hotels, retail centers, factories, high-tech manufacturing facilities, shopping malls, and countless other projects. And if you worked on one of those projects, let me hear it from you. For years, and before it was vogue, we practiced industrial recycling and conservation. We have partnered with environmentalists on the job site to develop practical and effective rules and regulations to preserve our environment; and worked with our partners in labor, engineering and design to develop best practices that enhance safety, improve quality, and maximize value and efficiency. We believe this project near Hoyt Lakes represents an extraordinary opportunity for the Iron Range communities and for Minnesotans. As in any project, there are risks. And we believe these have been carefully vetted and mitigated in the planning and review process. We believe this project will infuse economic vitality into the communities that understand and embrace the importance of clean air and water and the conservation of forest and wildlife and countryside. Not only will meaningful projects be created across a wide spectrum of careers, but confidence and faith in Minnesota industry will be uplifted finding its way into communities, schools, and families. For every \$1 million of investment, 28,500 jobs are projected. We urge that this project proceed without further delay. It will be safely and responsibly by proud men and women who believe their efforts will contribute (inaudible).

Dave Vukson

58164

I think the format of this meeting was very misconstrued people should not be able to give away there time to speak. If they don't want to talk they should pass. Not give it to politicians. I didn't come here to here politicians I came to here the people speak.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave Worshek 42566

See attachment

Dave Zins 45274

David Zins 307 Kent Road Hoyt Lakes MN 55750 I would like to begin by stating that i am a life long resident of Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. My father started working for Erie Mining Company (which later became LTV) in September of 1957 a year before I was born. I have lived in Hoyt Lakes my entire life. I am currently serving in my tenth year as a member of the Hoyt lakes City Council. I was elected to office in 2004, this was around the time many of the former LTV employees were running out of unemployment and leaving the area to find work. I state this because I know what the economic impact of Polymet getting permitted would mean for our city, schools, and local businesses. We in city government have had to face the financial decisions of not replacing several of our retiring employees and still provide the basic services our residents had grown accustomed to. i am confident that the agencies involved in the decision making on this project have thoroughly reviewed all of the scientific data on this project and are well aware the project can be done environmentally safe. The project has been designed to have minimal environmental impact and yet utilize a an existing processing facility where my father was able to work for forty years and raise a family of five children. Restarting this existing plant site would be one of the largest recycling projects that has ever happened in the state of Minnesota. Polymet's mine site is one which is surrounded by mining company properties. The only way the public could ever utilize the mine site for recreation would be by trespassing. This is the reason I believe the land exchange with the US Forest makes sense. This land exchange would open up lands that have been privately held, for the general public to use and enjoy for generations. I believe that the technology exists for this project to move forward now and start a new generation of mining with sustainable jobs for years to come. In closing I would like to state that I feel i am confident that Polymet will adhere to the strict regulations that the agencies have laid out. I also believe they have answered all of the concerns and will operate while protecting the natural resources which I consider are in my back yaRd Respectfully submitted, David Zins

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dave/Lynn Horwath

39156

Speak the Truth by Donella Meadows Material accumulation is not the purpose of human existence. All growth is not good. The environment is a necessity, not a luxury. There is such a thing as enough.” Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 FR: David and Lynn Horwath 1612 kingsbury Rd Washington, IL 61571 RE: PolyMet SDEIS Response To whomever it may concern: Our family owns property and resides seasonally near Ely, Minnesota. We believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and that this destructive project must not proceed as currently proposed because of the 1) widespread and severe environmental damage inherent in the PolyMet project and 2) the failure of the SDEIS to include a cost/benefit analysis and specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. We believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: “Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted.” SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. 3) Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures -The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. -The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife,

davec

19912

Dear Sirs, Just a note to let you know I am for the Polymet mining proposal. My whole life, 58 years, has been spent here living around mining. This industry has enhanced our environment and my standard of living. Many areas within 20 miles of my home have been mined, mother nature has done a great job reclaiming the old mines, pristine water, and beautiful trees growing right out of rock piles, and where mines have been reclaimed by man the results are outstanding. The government agencies are doing a wonderful job insuring the mining companies currently running are following the rules and leaving the environment as good as or better than the original terrain. The process required for Polymet’s proposal although time consuming has left no stone unturned. The time for uncertainty has passed, government inspectors will make sure this mine is done right. It is time to let them get going, they will follow the rules set forth by the EIS, otherwise our government will shut them down. Our community and country will be better for allowing this project to move ahead. Thank you for your time. Sincerely yours, Dave Clement Minnesota Farmer, hunter, and construction worker 2372 N Yoki Road Zim, MN 55738

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David 7736

TO: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Lisa, After observing Polymet Minings efforts over the past several years and carefully reviewing the recent SDEIS, I feel the company has met the environmental requirements and should be issued a permit to proceed. Although, I do have empathy for the long term concerns of the projects opposition, I am far more concerned about the negative economic affects (loss of jobs in Logging and Mining) caused by the creation of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the closure of Erie Mining Company have had on the people and communities of Northeastern Minnesota. I have no doubt that environmental issues beyond the future closure of Polymet Mining can and will be dealt with in a responsible manner. Thank You David Krings 1329 Isleview Road Grand Rapids, MN 55744 Phone: (218) 327-8289 E-mail: gofishingmn@msn-com

45117

Dear Ms Fay, I would like to make a comment against sulfide mining. My objections are based on: - This type of mining has never been done without polluting the surrounding area. - The owners of the companies proposing the mining project are foreign owned, and almost impossible to go after once problems arise. - Your Department and the other regulating entities can't be trusted to to protect these areas. The incestuous relationship between regulators and the businesses they regulate make that impossible. You can see it when you look at the DNR website which does not mention the flaws in the water model, which I believe underestimated the river flow rate on purpose. - The taxpayers will be on the hook for the reverse osmosis mitigation. Estimates show that we will have to provide mitigation for at least 500 years. The average corporation like Polymet has a much shorter lifespan. They will be sold or go out of business, and we will be left holding the bag. There is no way the companies can make enough money to build the infrastructure to change public opinion, start up the mine, pay salaries, buy equipment, ship and process the ore, close the mine, and treat the ground water forever. It doesn't make any sense. - These proposals always wildly inflate the number of jobs that will be created. I believe that these objections, and many more not included here make this project totally unacceptable. There is no change I could offer except to scrap the plan. I would like to see a way to "claw back" the revenues of this project from the corporations, officers, employees, shareholders, unions, vendors, and public employees who supported this project. In the absence of all of these entities guaranteeing the safety and environmental protection, we can't go forwaRd I also believe that the DNR should work to protect the environment and not be a spokesman for private, for profit corporations. Thank You. David Mykkeltvedt 4900 W 86th Street Bloomington, MN. 55437

David & Alison Edgerton 46933

Comment: I urge the State of Minnesota to deny the permits and leases for the nonferrous mining proposed by PolyMet. It has too many risks to our environment- the flora and fauna of the area including the people who live or recreate in the region. There are too many unknowns about the process, the heavy metals that may be released, and the cleanup and reclamation required for years and years after the actual mining. Please protect our northern forests and lakes, our world-reknoned recreational area, and the people who live there. Alison Edgerton 2009 Hogans Island Dr NW Backus, MN 56435 218-947-4709 HYPERLINK "mailto:edge02@tds-net"edge02@tds-net
_____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

David & Ardis Eide 42718

See attachment

David A and Dianne K Kuiti 42876

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Abazs

43078

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am an Alternative Energy consultant and installer and live in the Lake Superior watershed. Although copper is an essential element in alternative energy components, no respectable alternative energy advocate would ever trade the kind of environmental damages inherent in the PolyMet proposal. Sulfide mining in the water rich environment of northern Minnesota is not worth the risk. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Abazs David Abazs 5879 Nikolai Road Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Abazs

47781

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am an Alternative Energy consultant and installer and live in the Lake Superior watershed. Although copper is an essential element in alternative energy components, no respectable alternative energy advocate would ever trade the kind of environmental damages inherent in the PolyMet proposal. Sulfide mining in the water rich environment of northern Minnesota is not worth the risk. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, David Abazs
David Abazs 5879 Nikolai Road Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Alexander

47598

I stand with my representative Phyllis Kahn in her statement of concerns (listed below the MPR link) and I believe: We have plenty of copper to recycle already. I'm not confident of the protection of people and environment. A reputable third-party insurer, such as Lloyd's of London, must be found. We need a robust public debate. MPR asked Are you confident that the proposed PolyMet mine would avoid polluting. Read others comments from the mpr "today's question" Sincerely, David Alexander of Minneapolis, MN 612-666-5532 <http://blogs.mprnews-org/todays-question/2014/03/are-you-confident-the-proposed-polymet-mine-would-avoid-polluting-minnesotas-water/> My answer: No, I'm not confident the proposed PolyMet mine would avoid polluting Minnesota's water. If we need to boost our economy and protect the environment let's beat Colorado's projected gain of 100 million dollars in taxes by repealing the prohibition of cannabis/hemp altogether. My representative (who also is for repealing prohibition) Phyllis Kahn's statement is: The scope of the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS [Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement] is seriously lacking. This is especially the case when the issue of financial assurance is concerned. I have three points:

- I. In chapter 3, pages 136 to 138, you list information that includes the preliminary cost estimate of closure. The source cited is "Foth 2013-" I've looked at the Foth memo cited in the SDEIS. The Minnesota DNR has simply copied information from PolyMet's hired consultant without confirming or fact-checking their work. If the Minnesota DNR and its co-lead agencies are unable to fact-check the work they presented on financial assurance, how are we to expect that they are capable of the adequately protecting the citizens of Minnesota.
- II. This project should not go forward unless a third-party insurer, such as Lloyd's of London, can be found. The simple fact is, if a third-party private entity will not take on PolyMet, the state shouldn't. Private insurers have expertise in managing risk that the State of Minnesota can't match. Additionally, policymakers could tap the assurance funds for other purposes. Private insurance is clearly superior to a state managed approach in this case.
- III. In the SDEIS you say that financial assurance will be done in the Permit to Mine stage. Looking at the most recent MinnTac Permit to Mine document, there is one short paragraph on financial assurance. This project shouldn't go forward without robust public debate, and the opportunity for legislative hearings, if what we can expect is a paragraph from the DNR in the Permit to Mine phase. You must ensure that the public, including financial experts and those elected to represent the citizens of Minnesota, have a chance to weigh in on financial assurance. It has not been your practice to do so in the past; will it be in this case. <http://blogs.mprnews-org/todays-question/2014/03/are-you-confident-the-proposed-polymet-mine-would-avoid-polluting-minnesotas-water/>

David And Alicia Newell

38974

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs David And Alicia Newell 826 N 9th St Saint Peter, MN 56082-1264

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Anderson

17418

Feb 16, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Aquilina

45421

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 From: David Aquilina 4817 Vincent Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410 [HYPERLINK "mailto:davidaquilina@q-com" davidaquilina@q-com](mailto:davidaquilina@q-com) PolyMet is seeking approval to mine and refine 32,000 tons of copper-nickel ore per day in Northeastern Minnesota. If the state allows them to proceed, there should be no doubt that sooner rather than later, PolyMet will be back, pushing the state's elected officials and regulators to let them scale up their operations to 90,000 tons per day. Moreover, they will put their considerable weight behind other companies' efforts to open even more copper-nickel sulfide mines. Why. Because the company's investment advisor has concluded that given the capacity of their proposed processing facility, such a huge expansion is necessary in order to achieve maximum operational efficiency, maximize their return on investment, and thereby boost the company's stock price by 300-400 percent. With such an increase in shareholder wealth at stake, who can doubt PolyMet's real intentions. PolyMet's spokesperson has claimed that enlarging mining and processing operations are not part of their current discussions or plans. To characterize that statement as disingenuous is way too Minnesota Nice. Even if expansion were not under discussion, it should be. And, that discussion should involve all citizens of our state. I know that the government can only review the EIS for the company's plans as currently proposed. But we should be clear that if they get the go ahead to mine and refine 32,000 tons day, the government is opening the door to triple the size of that scale of mining and refining. A chemist with more than 30 years of experience at the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the US Environmental Protect Agency summarized the hazards of chemical contamination from copper-nickel mining and processing in a letter to the Star Tribune ("A chemist speaks of the dangers," December 2, 2013). After PolyMet ceases operations in 20 years, measures to monitor and manage the tailing wastes and regional water quality will be required for 200 years at the mine and for 500 years at the processing facility. The total estimated cost today is about \$3 billion. In the decades ahead, who knows what the costs might be – especially if PolyMet is just the first of many copper-nickel mines in the region. As the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy has made clear, the environmental impact statement only addresses PolyMet's proposed plans at present. However, the actual scale of their operations is sure to be vastly bigger. What is the environmental impact of a threefold increase in the volume of ore dug up – at the PolyMet mine and at other mines that would need to be opened to supply their processing facility. Do we know. The impact of shipping more and more tons of ore by rail every day from its mine and from other mines to PolyMet. Do we know. How will doubling or tripling the amount of ore processed affect the scope and costs of current and future environmental controls at the plant. Do we know. What we do know is that for decades and decades after PolyMet's shareholders – including Glencore Xstrata, PLC, the Anglo-Swiss multinational commodity trading and mining company that is PolyMet single biggest stakeholder – have extracted their profits from the rocks of Northeastern Minnesota, our children, grandchildren and their descendants will be left with the rubble of the environmental consequences and costs.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Arbeit

42935

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet open pit mine project proposed to extract copper, nickel and other metals from northeast Minnesota is more than “groundbreaking” in a literal sense; for better or worse, it will set Minnesota on an irreversible path that will define our future. With so much at stake, it is appropriate that state rules and regulations guiding the review and approval process provide for an admirable degree of public involvement. And with more than 40,000 comments submitted in response to PolyMet’s Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I expect that most issues regarding the project’s impact have been identified and addressed in some form or another. Still, one fact remains: The right decision hinges on the trade-off between a reasonable expectation of economic benefit over a short twenty-year period in exchange for an unreasonable expectation that mitigation will prevent incalculable and irreversible environmental damages, economic costs and human health issues that will be felt by generations. Can anyone seriously doubt that this is a terribly risky bet. Minnesota needs a healthy economy and our people deserve rewarding, well-paying and safe jobs. But opening the State to open pit sulfide mining will not get us there and represents a trade-off that we should not make to achieve more limited goals. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is impressive in many ways, but it also is dramatically inadequate in a number of ways and should be rejected, along with related proposals for open-pit sulfide mining. Among them are inadequate assessments of long-term risks, a bias towards “best-case” scenarios that convey a false sense of prospects for mitigating risks, a complete failure to analyze risks to on-site workers, the absence of a Health Risk Assessment of the effects of toxic pollutants on people and habitat downstream, and the absence of compelling evidence that technologies needed for reducing long-term risks to acceptable levels will be capable of achieving that outcome. PolyMet’s 2,169 page SDEIS documents PolyMet’s plans for three impacted areas: a mine site, transportation and utility corridor, and a plant site. It covers 18 months of construction, 20 years of operations, and reclamation, closure and post-closure maintenance “if or when proven effective” for a period that PolyMet acknowledges “would last for an unknown duration.” This last sentence is telling: what if no effective method exists for putting the genie back into the bottle when a toxic contaminant is leached or released – especially once operations have ended. To PolyMet’s credit, the SDEIS represents a significant investment of intellectual resources and makes the case that copper-nickel sulfide mining can be pursued with close to zero risk to the environment, supported by extensive analysis and complex modeling marred by often questionable assumptions, mitigations that involve many untested technologies, and promises of an enduring commitment to reduce risk to implausibly low levels. If the SDEIS were an academic exercise, it would probably deserve an A-plus. Yet, the assumptions made and scenarios used to demonstrate a low-risk result defy what we already know – even under “blue sky” conditions, risk cannot be reduced to zero. So what about the cost of a highly improbable scenario should it occur. Can it really be measured and who, if not the public, will end up paying for it. Must we forget the results of catastrophic failures such as Fukushima, Exxon/Valdez or Deepwater Horizon. Or on a more modest scale, but perhaps more germane, must we forget the effects of the Elk River chemical spill on water supplies affecting residents of nine West Virginia counties. Yes, PolyMet has depicted scenarios that might possibly be effective, but sulfide mining

David B Puskala

54553

I would like lakes and streams as clean as my grandfathers enjoyed for my grandchildren’s grandchildren. Water is a precious resource. If you have ever been a real fisherman you understand that. The trout sure as hell do. If you must know, I mined on the Iron Range like my father & grandfathers did.

David B. Edgette

46258

Please DO NOT issue a mining permit to PolyMet. The St Louis River and Lake Superior already have too much pollution flowing into them as a result of past and present industries. Potential additional pollution from PolyMet should not be allowed. In fact, more clean up of all fresh water should begin ASAP. The copper concentration in the ore body that PolyMet plans to mine is of such low concentrate that a large amount of material will need to be removed for a very small return of copper. Minnesota should not permit any mine of this type. The destruction of forest and pollution produced for 100's of years is not worth 15-25 years of mining jobs. Sure it might be profitable for corporations like Minnesota Power to sell more electricity produced from their polluting coal burning power plants. This also would not be good for the environment. Mining should not be allowed in the Superior National Forest. A land exchange does not replace the location and original forest as was intended when it was set aside for the future. Recreational land is one of Minnesota's largest long term assets. Please DO NOT issue a permit to allow PolyMet to profit for a short term by shipping their copper to China, leaving Minnesota with another polluting hole in the ground. Thank you for your consideration, David B. Edgette 12049 East County Road B Lake Nebagamon, WI 54849 [HYPERLINK "mailto:dbasil2@gmail-com"dbasil2@gmail-com](mailto:dbasil2@gmail-com)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Bergerud 42720

See attachment

David Brown 18290

David Brown. I'm just against the mining just simply because of the 500-year exposure and what it would mean to the wetlands and the water there. I think ultimately that's all going to come to be billed to the taxpayers. And I would -- I think like my wife said, I would rather use that money to create other programs for the people that would essentially benefit from this. So, I understand that they make some comments about nobody is saying we should use less copper, but I would say, yes, we should use less copper and all sorts of industrial products. And I don't think the fact that people aren't yet ready to give up copper is a reason to create more mines for copper. The end. Thank you.

42119

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Brown

42122

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

david burrow

47221

) > >>>> >>>> >>>> In 1991 my wife and I purchased a 3 acre lot on White Iron Lake. Clean >>>> water and access to the BWCA attracted us to the area. We built a cabin the following year where we now spend about 6 months of the year. We fish, swim, canoe, Kayak, sail, bike ride, camp and cross country ski. Clean water is critical to everyone in Northern Minnesota that enjoys these activities. >>>> The Northeastern area of Minnesota, currently being considered for >>>> the NorthMet project, is a unique land and water resource. So >>>> unique that a significant portion of the area has been designated >>>> as a National Wilderness Area (BWCAW). As a result, there are >>>> limits placed on the area with respect to how it can be used with >>>> the intent of preserving it for the long term. Copper/heavy metal >>>> mining will put the BWCAW in jeopardy. This area has a great many >>>> lakes and includes two watersheds, one emptying into the Hudson Bay >>>> and the other into the Great Lakes. These watersheds represent a substantial amount of the >>>> fresh water reservoir on the planet. Fresh water is an increasingly >>>> scarce and essential resource for life itself. It is for this >>>> reason, I believe, that copper mining should not be introduced into Minnesota. >>>> >>>> The copper deposits throughout the Duluth Complex are embedded in >>>> rock containing sulfide. Large amounts of sulfide bearing rock >>>> will be extracted along with small amounts of copper (and other minerals). >>>> Oxidization of sulfide bearing waste rock resulting from extraction >>>> and processing will create sulfate. Sulfate contact with surface >>>> or groundwater, accidental or otherwise, results in acidification of the >>>> water. Lakes and wetlands in NE Minnesota are very sensitive to >>>> changes in pH. Small changes effectively "poison" the water and >>>> will kill fish and wildlife. >>>> >>>> There is no denying that copper is a vital component of many of the >>>> devices we use everyday. That said, studies have shown that there >>>> is a great deal of copper in the earth's crust distributed around >>>> the planet; enough to last thousands of years at current rates of >>>> use. In addition, we continue to increase our recycling rates for essential >>>> minerals. The SDEIS acknowledges that the environmental impact of >>>> untreated waste rock and water as a result of the NorthMet project >>>> could be serious and perhaps devastating. As such, multiple >>>> treatment and containment techniques detailed in the SDEIS will be >>>> employed to manage the threat of environmental damage. However, >>>> despite best efforts at protection, every existing copper mine has caused >>>> significant environment damage. Worse still is that the possibility >>>> for damage exists not just during the mines operation but for many, >>>> perhaps hundreds of years into the future. >>>> >>>> In an anticipation of the possible future cleanup costs, there are >>>> suggestions, not detailed in the SDEIS, of a surety bond or some >>>> financial instrument that sets aside monies to pay for ongoing >>>> management/treatment of the mine's waste products. Given that few >>>> corporations remain in business for hundreds of years, including >>>> those involved in mining or backing bonds, how then can Minnesotans >>>> be assured that we collectively will not be responsible for future >>>> cleanup/ treatment costs associated with copper mining. >>>> >>>> In conclusion, given the potential devastating impact to our scarce >>>> freshwater resources, I believe that the risk of introducing copper >>>> mining into Minnesota is too great. We should increase our >>>> recycling efforts and/or mine copper in areas where there is less >>>> freshwater than in the "land of 10,000 lakes." It is for that >>>> reas

David Carlson

42595

See attachment

45601

There are hundreds of reasons to say no to this mine. Reasons for it. Maybe a couple hundred non union jobs for 20 years. The risk to the waterways of this state are just not worth it. The costs the taxpayers will end up picking up to clean up their mess when they leave will be endless. The damn copper won't even stay in this country. This company can not be trusted. We have something far more precious than the copper in the ground. It's the liquid gold that flows all around us. Clean water is far more useful than any metal, and we are very lucky to have as much as we have in this state. And this will be even more true in the future. Just say NO to this damn mine..

David Cartwright

42793

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Christenson

47994

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Once again the shiny empty promises of international conglomerates are distracting Minnesotans from the harsh and inevitable consequences of a poorly planned industrial project. No copper-sulfide mine has ever operated without polluting its environment. Not one. Ever. What is in the history of the backers of PolyMet, or their plans, to make us think they're the exception. Nothing. There's a weird short-sighted Minnesota exceptionalism that prevents us from seeking out the experiences of other states when a controversial issue like this comes up. We need only look to the U.P. of Michigan, right up Highway 2, where 'Copper Country', potentially an outdoor paradise, is littered with abandoned mines and their long-lasting pollution. The latest: fish consumption warnings for Torch Lake in the heart of the region, where fish with "tumors of unknown origin" have been caught - nearly 50 years after full scale mining in the area shut down. Sure, the PolyMet mine will bring money and profit - mostly for the mine execs and investors of course - but PolyMet -and other mining operations that will surely follow whatever precedent you set - are more than likely, long term, to turn the region into another abandoned 'Copper Country' - chronically polluted, chronically depressed, decaying and depopulated. Thank you for your attention, David Christenson 3615 35th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

52376

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Once again the shiny empty promises of international conglomerates are distracting Minnesotans from the harsh and inevitable consequences of a poorly planned industrial project. No copper-sulfide mine has ever operated without polluting its environment. Not one. Ever. What is in the history of the backers of PolyMet, or their plans, to make us think they're the exception. Nothing. There's a weird short-sighted Minnesota exceptionalism that prevents us from seeking out the experiences of other states when a controversial issue like this comes up. We need only look to the U.P. of Michigan, right up Highway 2, where 'Copper Country', potentially an outdoor paradise, is littered with abandoned mines and their long-lasting pollution. The latest: fish consumption warnings for Torch Lake in the heart of the region, where fish with "tumors of unknown origin" have been caught - nearly 50 years after full scale mining in the area shut down. Sure, the PolyMet mine will bring money and profit - mostly for the mine execs and investors of course - but PolyMet -and other mining operations that will surely follow whatever precedent you set - are more than likely, long term, to turn the region into another abandoned 'Copper Country' - chronically polluted, chronically depressed, decaying and depopulated. Thank you for your attention, David Christenson 3615 35th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

David D Cameron

57224

The motivation for sulfide mining is greed, monetary, and political. There is no justification to mine low grade sulfide for the benefit of a few and ruin the environment for generations to come. And , if they think PolyMet or any other mining company will clean up their mess just look at the mess in the Yukon. David D. Cameron 9397 91st Ave SW Staples, MN 56479

David D. Thomas

10318

If there is a significant chance of environmental destruction and human health hazards, this project can not be worth the projected modest short-term economic gains, for a small number of people, many of whom are not Minnesotans and will not be affected directly by the destruction and hazards. David D. Thomas William F. Dietrich Professor Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and Biophysics University of Minnesota Office and mail: [HYPERLINK "http://www1-umn-edu/twincities/maps/NHH/index.html"](http://www1-umn-edu/twincities/maps/NHH/index.html) NHH 5-124, 312 Church St SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455 Office: (612) 625-0957 fax: 624-0632 cell: (612) 308-7410 Email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:ddt@umn-edu"](mailto:ddt@umn-edu) ddt@umn-edu Web: <http://biochem.umn-edu/> Home address: 4744 Thomas Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55410

David Davison

44816

Polymet has few ties to Minnesota and is foreign-owned. The corporation has little incentive to fix any damage it causes. The company should be required to create an escrow account for damage repair that is acceptable to most Minnesotans. If the company falls short on its obligations, Minnesota should be able to shut it down. - David Davison -- This email is free from viruses and malware because avast. Antivirus protection is active. <http://www.avast-com>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

david diedrich

9480

Jan 30, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

David Donch

39907

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Hundreds of thousands of Minnesotans like myself vacation near this area every year and support the local economies with our tourist dollars. I myself have family that lives in the area and do not wish to have their ecosystem harmed for the sake of a few thousand jobs that one day will be replaced with massive clean-ups that cannot leave the ecosystem nearly as pristine as it is now. I am against this mine for profit . David M. Donch, Sincerely, Mr David Donch 1792 Duluth St Maplewood, MN 55109-4310 (651) 771-0895

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Evans

903

David Evans 1093 12 Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414 The HYPERLINK

"http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/sdeis/fact_sheets/commenting.pdf" fact sheet located on the DNR website states that "All comments must be made by 4:30 PM on March 13, 2013-" I believe that should read "March 13, 2014"

52263

Dear DNR Review Board: I strongly oppose the proposed mining operation. There is every reason to believe there will be unintended consequences and hidden costs. Having personally seen the toxic waste problems in Butte Montana, Kevin Montana, and Libby Montana go without resolution for decades I cannot support this current proposal. The permit request in front of you is disguised with assurances that a clean up program will be adequate, funded and carried out. All of the aforementioned sites in Montana were abandoned by the "responsible" corporations and after years of lawsuits the American public is facing the costs of ill-health and decades of clean up. There is also reason to believe that some of the toxins that will enter our waters will be neurotoxins. While these will potentially effect children as yet unborn one of the decisions you are making is if you should risk the future intelligence and health of our grandchildren for a few jobs and the short term profits for a few shareholders. I hope you will think of them as you cast your vote. Sincerely, Thomas Evans 13231 Arcadia Ct NE Bemidji, mn 56601

David Farr

42023

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, David Farr Minneapolis, Minnesota

David Ferenci

57976

I feel this is a bad idea for many reasons and should not be allowed. The following are just a few of my reasons. 1) Production of Sulfide Acid. 2) Never has there been a copper/nickel mine anywhere in the world that has not polluted water. 3) Polymet has never operated a mining operation. 4) The mine would be located 20 miles upstream from the largest fresh water lake in the world. 5) 20 years of mining with 500 years of monitoring is an unrealistic thought. 6) Threat to thousands of jobs in the recreational and tourist industry over the next 200 years, for a handful of 20 year mining jobs.

David Flessner

31822

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Sulfide mining is illegal in Wisconsin, in fact, until it can be proven safe This project will impact the region's natural resources and public health, including risks to water quality, loss of wetlands and harm to both wildlife and people. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit would be an ecological disaster. No matter what PolyMet says about their environmental practices, they will inflict severe damage on the area and bring a significant level of toxicity to a pristine area. This outweighs the benefit of any jobs that might be created. Sincerely, David Flessner 3565 S 83rd St Milwaukee, WI 53220-1027 (414) 545-2744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Frame

11358

Below are my comments: Mining in northern Minnesota I am not against metal mining in northern Minnesota as long as it's done properly. I have read the articles that suggest that there will be acid based runoff and leaching for up to 500 years. That tells me that the process was not done properly. When iron ore was first made into taconite pellets the 'waste' product was piped into Lake Superior. The mining process was not done properly. Steps were taken to correct the process. The 'waste' product, tailings and water, was then deposited on land. The tailings were dumped on land as the tailings were produced. At all government levels we have accommodated business by allowing them to reduce their profits by accelerating their costs and pushing the final disposition of their spoils into the future. I think it's time that we make both the cost causer and cost payer the same, and tie the time line of the process to the time line of the fix. By that I mean that the waste product created each time period, I suggest each quarter of the year, be neutralized during the next time period (or before). The companies and Minnesota know from the test drilling and from the details of the extraction process the volume of the waste product and the possible quantity and pH of the 'waste' and possible leachate. The DNR should require the mining company to mix their 'waste' with a substance that is similar in consistency to the 'waste' and in a quantity that will neutralize the 'waste' so that any runoff or leachate will be have a pH that will not degrade the environment. From what I've read the 'waste' products produce an acid waste or a 'waste' that produces an acid product when exposed to air and/or water. If that 'waste' were mixed in something like a hot mix asphalt plant with crushed limestone then as the resulting mix was exposed to air and water the acid products would be neutralized as they are created. I am sure that PolyMet will say that it can't be done. What they are really saying is that doing this will reduce our profits. They would rather gain the high profits now and then, as the chemical company out east did, declare bankruptcy, when the cost go up and the profits down. If you present the problem to several universities and their chemists and chemical engineers say that it is impossible to treat or process the waste as it is created to reduce or eliminate acid runoff or leachate I would read their reports. Engineers see 'can't' as opportunities to find a way David Frame 25826 Skyline Circle Elko, MN 55020 952-461-2909 dframe@integra-net

David Franseen

6185

Greetings, I have reviewed the executive summary of the Northmet SDEIS, as well as the Major Differences of Opinion and the supporting SDEIS sections. It appears reasonably certain that this project can move forward without undue or significant impact on the environment. Or it may even have positive outcomes for the site and surrounding ecosystems. Double win if that can be achieved through permitting and development. I support moving this project forward to the Final EIS and ROD. I also support diligence from the Co-lead agencies in assuring desirable environmental outcomes. Thank you for your efforts, David Franseen 2411 W Skyline Parkway Duluth, MN 55806

David Freeman

18312

My name is David Freeman from Ely, Minnesota. The following comments apply to the SDEIS and the Clean Water Act Section 404. The SDEIS is wholly inadequate in scores to reflect the real environmental and economic costs of the proposed project. My comments focus on the inadequacy of the SDEIS with respect to the major associated economic costs of the proposed project. The perpetual treatment costs. An inescapable conclusion from the SDEIS is does the water treatment to remove toxic pollutants and the maintenance and monitoring of water treatment will require hundreds or thousands of years. The SDEIS is wholly inadequate to provide definitive information about the total cost of such treatment, the mechanisms for providing for or requiring for payment and ensuring payment of such costs. And the socioeconomic costs to the people in Minnesota and the nation when it seem likely that the mechanisms for ensuring payment are insufficient or failed entirely. The SDEIS acknowledges that toxic water pollution from mine sites, tailings piles, and waste piles will require treatment for a very long time. The mechanical water treatment is part of the model proposed to action for 200 years at mine site, 500 years at the plant site. The SDEIS states that while the exact period is uncertain, it is expected to be long term. End quote. After noting that, "Financial assurance would be required indefinitely." The SDEIS states in section 3.2.2.4 that, "The level of engineering design and planning required to calculate detailed financial assurance amounts is typically made available during the permitting process and was not available at the time that this SDEIS was prepared." Indeed a major flaw in the project is the cost of engineering, designing, planning, building, and maintaining the water treatment is unknowable. Any project for which the cost of water treatment is unknowable, but according to the project proposer will be in the billions of dollars, should not be considered for approval by the state. It is irrational to believe that any water treatment facility or corporation will last for hundreds of years, but any financial institution or instrument can provide credible guarantee for hundreds of years and that there will be no catastrophic failure by humans or equipment over hundred of years. Take for example just last week the chemical spill in West Virginia, the Fukushima nuclear reactor destruction, the Deepwater Horizon explosion, or the I-35W bridge collapse. Thank you very much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David French 10803

I have been following the progress of Polymet Mining since I first heard of the Company in the UK 3 years ago. I have been most impressed with the professional approach of the Company to systematically dealing with the very valid concerns of the environmental lobby, particularly with the subject of water pollution. As a professional engineer, I applaud the Company's reverse osmosis solution, and I doubt if there is a mining operation anywhere where environmental concerns have been given such a high priority. On the positive side, the mine clearly contains large quantities of very valuable minerals which will benefit the whole community and the country, and the creation of hundreds of well paid jobs in an economically deprived area could only be a major boon. In summary, I would hope that the whole community takes this project to their hearts, invests in the Company and shares in the prosperity that the project will bring. Air Vice- Marshal David French CB, MBE, CEng 109, Yarmouth Road Blofield Norwich UK Sent from my iPad

David G Nelson 54896

See attachment

David Garelick 39464

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The negative impacts of sulfide mining upon surrounding environments is beyond debate. Credible science corroborates the extreme environmental risks of these operations. Those that purport to tell a different story are bought and paid for by mining dollars and lobbying. Who's kidding who. Even a child doesn't trust fake make-believe. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr David Garelick 2116 Randolph Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1333 (612) 690-4042

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Givers

45537

From: David Givers Moorhead, MN 56560 “Mechanical water treatment is part of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action for the duration of the simulations (200 years at the Mine Site, and 500 years at the Plant Site). The duration of the simulations was determined based on capturing the highest predicted concentrations of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action. It is uncertain how long the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be long term; actual treatment requirements would be based on measured, rather than modeled, NorthMet Project water quality performance, as determined through required monitoring.” (ES-11) As you know, the scientific method requires a testable hypothesis. This condition is missing from the SDEIS. The uncertainty described in the document (see above quote) means that it is impossible to model the scenarios that can occur given enough time. For example, there is no way for DNR to certify that a postulated containment wall drilled into bedrock will keep water within its boundaries over the unknown length of time that the SDEIS cannot and does not specify. Other unspecified events, while they seem improbable, can still occur. Geoscientists can estimate the probability on an earthquake on the Laurentian shield. That probability is not zero, but given enough time an event could occur that fractures or shifts the steel wall thereby allowing water to escape. These events do not include the climate change we are destined to experience. Climate scientists are clear that climate change is on us and will continue to escalate over what was the Cenozoic Era. This is borne out by the following statement and shows that the SDEIS is seriously flawed: “For example, the Continuation of Existing Conditions Scenario model does not include future expected additional mitigation at the existing LTVSMC Tailings Basin, because these mitigation measures have not yet been determined, nor does it try to account for climate change. The No Action Alternative, on the other hand, is not static and anticipates for other predictable changes in the NorthMet Project area, such as other planned projects, required mitigation, and climate change (5-2) There is an error in this statement and an error in logic. (a) it implies that the science can determine the climate change impacts in the No Action Alternative. This is a basic error in the understanding of climate change at the local level. Climate models do not at this time tell us what will happen in Northeast Minnesota. We only know that the climate as we experience it today is likely to deviate from historical climate normals and, also, that there is a likelihood of extreme events, which can not be predicted. (b) The statement also errs because it does not take its purported finding of climate change in the No Action scenario and apply them to the PolyMet scenario. this is a logic error and misrepresents the purported reasons to approve this SDEIS. If this study subsumes these modeled climate changes within the SWM (Gold Sim) models, then the written report needs to spell them out in the narrative so that the citizens of Minnesota, and the rest of the United States, can read the results.

David Grande

39360

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, David Grande W11322 Schultz Dr Beaver Dam, WI 53916-9521 (608) 243-8527

David Greene

23427

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I want to comment on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Great Lakes are a valuable and irreplaceable resource for the central mid-west and should be cleaned-up not made more dirty. Mining is one of the worst sources of toxic materials known and should not be allowed to contaminate these lakes. Minnesota is largely unspoiled and should remain an important drainage source for two of the great lakes. Sulfide mining can destroy wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This area is home to a wide variety of animal and plant life and should continue to supply clean water to the lakes. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, David Greene 806 Francis Ave Columbus, OH 43209-5412 (614) 231-8417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David H Hopper 54759

See attachment

David Homans 47312

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“PolyMet SDEIS”) fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota’s Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction of t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Hopper

43037

Members of my church's Caring for Creation Committee at Macalester-Plymouth United Church have discussed the proposal for a large scale copper-nickel sulfide mine near the BWCA, to be conducted by PolyMet. We have shared our concerns about the long-term and destructive impacts on this special area of Minnesota. We are concerned about: 1. The major loss of wetlands, primarily bogs, that cannot be replaced. The SEIS already makes it clear that wetland "restorations" will not take place in the Lake Superior watershed and are highly unlikely to replace bogs. The wetlands at the site have been rated as "having high wetland quality." How can they possibly be "replaced?" 2. Predictions of chemical pollution, not just from sulfate and its acceleration of toxic mercury conversions, but also heavy metals like nickel and aluminum, that kills fish. 3. The long term need to clean up water from pollutants, possibly for 200 years. How can that be assured, especially with more mines ready to ask for permits in that area? 4. The questionable suggestion that a company, that plans to mine the proposed site for 20 years, could possibly provide "financial assurance" to cover the expensive costs of water treatment for 200 years or more into the future. And can such treatment truly control all the sorts of pollutants that will come from the mine site? The SEIS predicts the company will excavate 307 million tons of bedrock in 20 years, at 70,000 tons per day. 5. We are concerned that a lot of the proposed PolyMet site area has been designated by MN DNR as "Sites of High Biodiversity Significance" and support eleven state-listed species of plants. Destruction of such an area cannot be rectified, nor justified. We urge our government officials to take courage and SAY NO to this mine and to others waiting in the cue for permits. There are other ways to secure jobs in this fragile and unique area of Minnesota than this. One suggestion is to create metal recycling facilities and hire people to work on recovering the metals we need. Please reject the PolyMet mine. It's a short term venture with long term harm to MN. 20 years of extraction and "360" jobs—followed by 200+ years of monitoring for pollution makes no sense to me. Then there is the history of delaying litigation that follows any unforeseen problems [illegible]... Short term gains for corporations and the job [illegible].

David J Bombich

42849

See attachment

David J Hampton

54541

Ms. Fay: Please take extreme care while assessing the environmental impact of the PolyMet mining project. Constantly keep in mind that you are dealing with an extractive project of limited duration that, in all probability, have centuries of environmental impacts.

David J McMillan

54487

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David J. McMillan

40758

Dear Ms Fay: My name is David McMillan. I am a 25-year resident of Duluth. My wife and I attended UMD and raised a family here. In addition to my roles in the local and regional energy sector, I am heavily engaged in non-profit, public and private sector leadership and governance roles at the regional, statewide and national levels across the transportation, higher education, and health care sectors. All of these sectors are vitally important to our region as well as our State and all are integrally linked to the environmental and socioeconomic health of this region that so many of us call home. My reasons for submitting written comments in this proceeding focus on each of the following. First and most importantly, I want to express my fundamental interest in preserving and protecting the natural environment that is at the heart of the region I call home - NE Minnesota. Second, I believe the regulators charged with investigating and developing a record regarding PolyMet's plans for mining and processing the NorthMet Deposit ores east and north of Hoyt Lakes, MN have done an exceptionally thorough and comprehensive job. Led by Minnesota's own Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the Army Corps of Engineers, the USFS and the DNR have thoroughly and competently assessed PolyMet's project and applied the stringent standards set forth under state and federal law. This process has been long and arduous at times and expensive for PolyMet to be sure. Nevertheless, protecting our natural environment warrants considerable time, resources to ensure that the Supplemental Draft EIS is accurate, comprehensive and complete. Third, I feel that it is critically important to highlight the resources and infrastructure we have here in NE Minnesota that will enable us to responsibly and effectively support expansion of mining in our region should PolyMet's Permit to Mine be issued by the DNR - which I believe it should. Minnesota has a long and rich heritage of timber and mineral resource development and processing. We have the infrastructure, the know-how, the support industries and the workforce to responsibly mine and process these non-ferrous ores. "Infrastructure" means much more to me than railroads, ports, drills, trucks and businesses that supply all of those industries. It also means a K-12, technical college and higher education system that can train the workforce, produce the chemists, the welders, the engineers, and environmental experts needed to safely and economically extract and process these minerals. "Infrastructure" means the research engine that is our University of Minnesota and, in particular, University of Minnesota-Duluth's Natural Resources Research Institute right here in Duluth and Coleraine. Both have needed expertise and know-how to bring to bear on the challenges associated with mining. Most importantly, infrastructure also includes the Minnesota DNR and other state and federal agencies charged with permitting and then regulating the ore mining and processing work that will occur over coming decades. No state in this country is better prepared to assure that PolyMet mines and processes ore in a safe and environmentally secure manner than Minnesota. Indeed, I daresay that no place in the world is better able to assure that the strategic minerals needed for today's technologically and energy savvy world will be extracted with more care for the environment than right here in northeastern Minnesota. As a citizen and long-term resident, as a parent, as a business leader, as a member of governing boards for many of the region's leading employers, I am fully supportive of PolyMet's proposed project being permitted to move forward at the tail end of what has been a thorough, transparent and well-managed regulatory process. Sincerely, Dave McMillan 2724 Greysolon Road Duluth, MN 55812 David J. McMillan 2724 Greysolon Rd Duluth, Minnesota 55812 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely an

David K Wickstrom

54705

See attachment

David K. Nelson

47595

MN DNR PolyMet Mining I would not like to see the MN DNR or the state give a permit to do any copper, nickel or other metal mining in Minnesota. I have been to the meeting in St Paul. At that meeting NO one had shown me a true safe way of mining without poisoning our great state of Minnesota. Lets think about it, this state has a lot to offer everyone in the whole United State. Water recreation for one, camping, fishing, hunting, tour guides, lodges for people to get away from the big city life. No one can predict the out come for the generations to come, our young people are at stake. The miners said the only thing they no is mining. Come on now what about cross training. Hunting, fishing, camping tour guides and lumbering just to name a few. I had cross training before. Why not put the people to work building some of these things. I know money talks, lets look beyond poisoning Minnesota. When it comes down to do copper mining in our Minnesota. My answer would be NO. Because its not a safe bet in my book not for 500 years. David Nelson MN Mater Naturalist 2574 4th Ave E. North St Paul, MN. 55109

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Kane

18309

Hello. My name is David Kane, K-A-N-E. I grew up on the Iron Range. I graduated from Mesabi East 1990 from Biwabik. I'm the kind of person that, you know, was pro-mining. I started looking into what sulfide mining entails. I switch sides. I don't think it's wise to mine toxic material on top of a (inaudible) that straddles the continental divide. Your lives are important. Your health is important. People on the Iron Range's health is important. I'm also concerned about who is going to be paying for the perpetual water mine. We are talking about a Canadian mining outfit backed by foreign banks. 20 years of mining. And then basically we are not talking about cutting down a tree, we are talking about blasting into a toxic rock formation and leaving tailings piles forever. Sulfide plus oxygen equals sulfuric acid just like one plus one equals two. So we're talking about -- I don't know -- thousands, millions of tons of sulfides baking in the sun, water. Everybody knows how much it rains in Minnesota. We're not only talking about surface water but we got a lot of aquifers underground. I grew up close to the Embarrass River in Lakeland and chain of lakes, close to Bass Lake, which is a spring-fed lake. I'm curious what kind of study has been done with the underwater type studies of this kind of mining and fracturing of rock formation like this. I am also concerned about, you know -- I think it's a noble cause to stand up for the little guy without a voice, the wilderness or the tourism industry. You talk to somebody on the Iron Range and somebody needs jobs. Polluting your environment for 20 years' worth the jobs and then taking care of that water for 500 years -- a number pulled out arbitrarily -- to me I don't know who is going to be paying for it. I think it's going to be dumped on the taxpayers. I'm a taxpayer of Minnesota. You're taxpayer of Minnesota. The Federal Reserve prints, you know, money out of thin area. Keep that in mind when you're thinking about poisoning our waters for 20 years of jobs. This is going to set a precedent for the future proposed mining on the other side of the continental divide. So if we set a precedent here and stop this in its tracks, hopefully (inaudible). Thank you.

David Kranz

42485

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr David Kranz 2401 34th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1426

David Kremer

47027

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. "I didn't know a place like this existed," commented my international friend on a recent BWCA canoe trip. As a union member myself, I value good jobs, but not at the expense of this Minnesota/national/international treasure. Sincerely, Mr David Kremer 3838 Fremont Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412-2043 (612) 396-8643

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Krings

7628

I would like to extend my support for approving the Polymet mining project. I have followed the project closely for years, and my family has been a presence on the Iron Range for many decades. based on the data that has been provided, I feel comfortable that the environmental concerns have been largely addressed, and that those remaining are as well managed as they can be with the current technology. Certainly, I have a great deal of respect for those who disagree with my view, and I also share their wish to protect our environment and leave our children with clean water and access to the wonderful outdoor experiences we have always enjoyed in Minnesota. At the same time, I think it is important that we balance those values with a belief that good, secure and well paying jobs for our citizens are a necessity, or no one will be able to live here productively. We must come together to achieve both goals, not crush the goal of one group to claim victory for our own. There is no perfect option, and mining is somewhat disruptive to the environment by its very nature. However, I believe that we need to take advantage of the resources that exist under the ground, the forests growing on the ground, the water flowing over the ground and the air we breathe above the ground. The key is to put into place plans for recovering the land after the mine is retired, and I am convinced that this will happen in such a way that the current landscape will be healthier than it is now. Since the area is already impacted by previous mining activity, this is our chance to recover more metallic ore and to fund a true rehabilitation of the land so our grandchildren will find it in a better condition. I don't think many people are aware of the current site conditions, and they picture a pristine wilderness in their minds. It is far from that, in fact is quite a barren, scarred place, and this project is a chance for much of the existing mining equipment to be used for a good purpose for decades to come. Please approve the project and let it proceed with all due speed. The Iron Range needs the jobs, and the economic value that follows a good business will help us all. Kind Regards, David W. Krings II Kenyon, MN

David L. Ivonon

53223

Protect our water! Hooded Mergansers swim in northeastern Minnesota's pristine marshes, ponds, and rivers, feeding on fish, crayfish, frogs, and insects. PolyMet Corporation is proposing to destroy thousands of acres of pristine habitat to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St. Louis River - a major waterway that flows over 180 miles to Lake Superior. PolyMet's proposal calls for 20 years of mining, and they acknowledge that 500 years of toxic runoff will need to be collected and treated. Just like the Hooded Merganser, our children and grandchildren all deserve clean water. Let clean water be our legacy - not toxic pollution from mining! Dear Governor...I was born & raised in the Iron Range; I love the area, people, & work ethic I was raised in & around. I would love nothing more than to see good paying jobs...However, NOT at this expense. The majority of the X I vote DFC; I will not vote for anyone backing Polymet.

David Langfeld

43343

I would like to stress my opinion that I believe that the Polymet project be given full approval by the State of Minnesota agencies involved for permitting. I believe enough scrutiny has been applied to the project by all of the agencies involved over the many years that it has been waiting, not to mention the vast amount of money spent by the company to address the environmental concerns of those special interest groups who, I believe, don't have valid argument against the project. I believe the Aurora and Hoyt Lakes communities have patiently waited long enough through the various delays that have been placed on this project. They have waited far too long for the day that good paying jobs would return to the former LTV site that once sustained a good quality of life. I know this first hand, as my father worked at LTV and retired from there in 1992- I have observed the closures of schools and businesses, as well as the losses of the various civic organizations that made for an enjoyable upbringing in these communities. Thank you for your consideration of an approval to the Polymer project. Sincerely, David Langfeld 706 1st Avenue N.W. Chisholm, MN 55719 Telephone: 218-254-0032

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Lankinen

39241

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Lasecke

3429

Dec 21, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I want to know who really stands to benefit from sulfide mining in the Arrowhead Region. Do the taxpayers of Minnesota benefit. Does the state benefit. PolyMet and other companies seeking to mine in the region are not Minnesota companies, nor are they even US companies. Does the tourism industry in the region benefit. The Boundary Waters and other lakes and parks in the region draw thousands of visitors each year from around the country and around the world. Some businesses in the tourism industry are already experiencing a decline in business because of test-drilling sites located nearby, What will happen to the tourism industry once sulfide mining begins production. Do we really want to trade one viable industry that can continue and flourish for generations (tourism) for another industry that will only provide jobs for a couple of decades yet will scar the region for centuries. Do the locals in the region who are pro-mining really have the chance to benefit as much as they are being promised. PolyMet's operation is estimated to provide a few hundred jobs only, and only for 20-some years. How many locals can realistically expect employment. Do we really want to trade a few hundred temporary jobs for 500 years of cleanup. Do the property owners in the region benefit. I'm one of those property owners, and I pay a small fortune each year in property taxes that help support the region. I view my own property, and the region as a whole, as a JEWEL, as a LEGACY to pass on to the generations that follow me. I do not want to see this jewel poisoned by poorly managed sulfide mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, David Lasecke 3124 Christopher Ln Shoreview, MN 55126-4146 (651) 486-7625

51635

Dec 21, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I want to know who really stands to benefit from sulfide mining in the Arrowhead Region. Do the taxpayers of Minnesota benefit. Does the state benefit. PolyMet and other companies seeking to mine in the region are not Minnesota companies, nor are they even US companies. Does the tourism industry in the region benefit. The Boundary Waters and other lakes and parks in the region draw thousands of visitors each year from around the country and around the world. Some businesses in the tourism industry are already experiencing a decline in business because of test-drilling sites located nearby, What will happen to the tourism industry once sulfide mining begins production. Do we really want to trade one viable industry that can continue and flourish for generations (tourism) for another industry that will only provide jobs for a couple of decades yet will scar the region for centuries. Do the locals in the region who are pro-mining really have the chance to benefit as much as they are being promised. PolyMet's operation is estimated to provide a few hundred jobs only, and only for 20-some years. How many locals can realistically expect employment. Do we really want to trade a few hundred temporary jobs for 500 years of cleanup. Do the property owners in the region benefit. I'm one of those property owners, and I pay a small fortune each year in property taxes that help support the region. I view my own property, and the region as a whole, as a JEWEL, as a LEGACY to pass on to the generations that follow me. I do not want to see this jewel poisoned by poorly managed sulfide mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, David Lasecke 3124 Christopher Ln Shoreview, MN 55126-4146 (651) 486-7625

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Litsenberger

38778

To whom it may concern, As one who has a master's degree in biology and lives up north for the beauty of the lakes and wildlife, it concerns me to see the Polymet proposal. My wife and I had a very unique experience this February to have a female lynx, a Minnesota threatened species, entertain us in our back "yard" for a good three hours. She spent most of that time about six feet away from our house. As a "threatened" species, it is of concern to the DNR to see that this species is successful in reproducing and able to forage for food. However, the proposed Polymet project would add on to the fence-like barrier the Iron Range mines present to lynx and other mammals in this region. Lynx are known to avoid disturbed areas and occupy spacious territories of 4 to 20 square miles. In times of food shortages they will migrate as much as 250 miles (Kurta's Mammals of the Great Lakes Region). The mining activities of the Iron Range, a rather vast disturbed area, therefore, acts to restrict the movements of lynx. Further extension of the Iron Range will further restrict the lynx when it comes to breeding and seeking food. Should the Polymet project win approval it is easy to see that more projects of this type will then be approved to where this barrier will extend from Grand Rapids to the Boundary Waters. You folks at DNR are in a poor situation. On one hand you are here to serve and protect the wildlife, while on the other hand you are here to encourage mining of natural resources for the benefit of people. In the situation of the lynx, you have a built in conflict of interest That shouldn't be. It would be nice if our wonderful politicians could find a way to solve this problem separate departments. Of course, the lynx are not my only reason I oppose this project. Environmental concerns alone should stop this folly. Also, the fact that Polymet has never had a mine and doesn't have the financial resources for assurances in case of (and they will occur) environmental mishaps, well, this project should not be allowed to go forward Dave Litsenberger outside of Ely

David M Windseth

47697

I am strongly against the proposed sulfide mine in northern Minnesota. This mine has a strong potential to pollute northern Minnesota waterways, including areas of the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior, and is not worth the risk to the wilds of northern Minnesota, which many people depend on for tourism to make a living. These types of mines have a bad track record in wet environments like Minnesota, and should not be allowed to compromise the state we all live in and enjoy. Most of the money used to mine will not remain in MN, and if the tailings dam does leak many times the company will take the money and declare bankruptcy to avoid having to pay for cleanup costs, putting the responsibility unfairly on the citizens of MN. I implore the DNR not to allow the permitting of this mine in Minnesota to make sure the state may be enjoyed by all future generations of MN. 50 years of jobs is not worth the 500+ years of monitoring and risks it puts on one of the cleanest water systems in the world. For the good of all Minnesotans, present and future, please deny the permitting of the Polymet copper mine. David M. Windseth 11410 53rd Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

David M Zimmerman

58082

Please don't destroy our natural habitat. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Maki

39035

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to provide public comment concerning the Polymet Mining "NorthMet Project". I am a Civil Engineer who has worked in cultural resource management in Minnesota for more than 20 years. I am deeply troubled by the prospect of Sulfide mining in one of the most environmentally sensitive areas of the United States. As an engineer, I am fully aware that there is not a single case study documenting Sulfide mining that did not lead to long lasting watershed pollution involving increased acidity and heavy metal contamination. PolyMet is a new company with no mining experience or track record of responsible pollution management. However, the track record of PolyMet's parent corporation Glencore is riddled with environmental disasters, labor violations, and human rights abuses around the world. The company was founded by Marc Rich, who was Federally indicted on 65 criminal counts, including income tax evasion, wire fraud, racketeering, and trading with Iran during the oil embargo (at a time when Iranian revolutionaries were still holding American citizens hostage). The charges would have led to a sentence of more than 300 years in prison had Rich not been controversially pardoned by President Clinton on his last day in office. The Chairman of Glencore's board of directors is former BP CEO Tony Hayward, the man who presided over the largest oil spill in US history and BP's subsequent efforts to avoid responsibility for the disaster and clean-up. I strongly urge you to consider the history of Sulfide mining in general, and Glencore's record of environmental stewardship when considering this issue. Furthermore, as a cultural resource professional I have deep reservations concerning the effects Sulfide mining will have on the natural and cultural resources of the Partridge and Embarrass Rivers. Both rivers contain significant wild rice resources. Wild Rice is a traditional cultural property of the Anishanabe people. Heavy Metal contamination, both real and perceived, will have a negative impact on this traditional resource for the next 200 to 500 years. I strongly urge you to reject PolyMet's shortsighted plan for polluting Minnesota's public waters. Short-term profits do not justify centuries of pollution. Thank you. David Maki 4150 Dight Ave #110 Minneapolis, MN 55406

David Martinson

38708

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr David Martinson 3000 W River Pkwy Apt 207 Minneapolis, MN 55406-2355

38761

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr David Martinson 3000 W River Pkwy Apt 207 Minneapolis, MN 55406-2355

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Mccue

31504

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. My god, this is an area where motor boats are restricted. How is it even possible that a proposal like this even gets drawn up on paper. If industrialists had their way the whole world would be a turned over waste land. Between oil, sulfur, and fracking this country is under attack. Leave the forrests alone .. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest In fact only the interest of those who would be making money. Go elsewhere and earn a living. Sincerely, David Mccue 1602 Remington Rd Rockford, IL 61108-6227 (815) 543-9769

David McGraw-Schuchman

16174

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Mcmillan

18350

Thank you. My name is David McMillan, MCM (phonetic). I am a senior vice-president of External Affairs for Elite (phonetic). I am a 25-year resident of Duluth and I went to school here at UMD. My wife and I are fortunate enough to raise a family here in Duluth. In addition to my role in the regional and local energy sector, I have also been engaged in a not-for-profit, private and public sector, internship (phonetic) regarding the transportation, higher education and healthcare industries here in northern Minnesota. Each of these sectors and industries is vitally important to the economic well-being for northern Minnesota. And upon that, I want to speak tonight. I have three purposes to my comments. The first being that I am fundamentally committed to the environmental well being and protecting our national resources of northern Minnesota, that we all call home. Secondly, I want to say to the lead agencies and the DNR that the roles you have been charged with, you have done a thorough and comprehensive job in looking at this and applying the stringent standards in regard to the state's applicable laws, and that the SDEIS and the EIS is accurate, comprehensive and complete. Finally, the point I want to highlight the most is the resources and infrastructure that this region can bring to bare, to make certain that we do this in an environmental and economically responsible manner. As far as the construction and resources goes, we have a long and rich heritage of mining and timber resources in northeastern Minnesota. We have the infrastructure, the support industries and the workforce to responsibly mine and process these resources. What do you think of when you think of infrastructure? Well, it means a lot more to me than railroads, ports, ships and tailings basins, and all the businesses it supplies by those. What else does it mean? It means a K12 and Technical College and a higher education system that can train a workforce that can do the work, the welders, the engineers, the environmental experts that we need to extract these minerals safely. And it is the University of Minnesota, and very specifically, the Natural Resources Research Institute, right here in Duluth (phonetic), who have the expertise and the experience and training that we need to help us safely move forward in addressing the challenges associated with mining. Most importantly, the infrastructure also means the Department of Natural Resources and the other state and federal agencies in charge of permitting, and secondly, regulating the unknown processes that will occur in the coming decades. No state in this country, in my opinion, is better equipped and better prepared to ensure the quality of the mines throughout the process are safe and environmentally secure in northern Minnesota. I dare say that no place in the world is better ready to pull the resources out of the ground, with the technology and the safe processes that are needed. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Miller

40832

To the Co-Lead Agencies: I wish to respectfully submit the following comments on the NorthMet Project and related SDEIS. I am a property owner on a lake in Lake County. I came to Minnesota over 35 years ago because of its abundant and clear waters. But the Proposed Connected Actions pose a grave threat to our State without meaningful corresponding public benefit. To those who proclaim our long history of mining, I would say simply “this is not your grandfather’s mining.” The SDEIS, populated with inadequate and self-serving PolyMet-provided data, offers the following summation: “In summary, the Proposed Connected Actions would produce some additive effects on certain resources.” This grossly understates the cumulative and perpetual damage the PolyMet mine would visit upon the area and Lake Superior watershed. Further, the SDEIS fails to consider a range of common sense risks by making rosy and unsupported projections concerning water capture and treatment, wetland mitigation, air pollution and other side effects of a massive, industrial mining zone in the heart of the Superior National Forest. The existing taconite mining discharges have resulted in elevated concentrations of pollutants that persist downstream in the St Louis River-one of America’s largest fresh water rivers. The NorthMet Project will contribute additional sulfate to the groundwater from tailings basin water that is not captured and treated, water that seeps through fractures in the mine pit walls and stockpile infiltration and run-off. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin and 5 million gallons from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. All of the PolyMet predictions regarding discharge from the mine pits and waste rock piles, including the more reactive waste rock piles and the ore surge pile as well as the unlined permanent Category 1 waste rock pile, are made without considering the effects of documented fractures at these sites on discharge to groundwater and surface water. Groundwater contamination from the previous mining activities is still an issue near the LTV tailings basin and mine pits. Engineering controls that are planned for the mine must function perfectly for hundreds of years to meet applicable water standards. The assumed performance of these critical water capture systems in the SDEIS is over 90% effectiveness. This assumption is neither reasonable nor realistic. PolyMet’s favorable water modeling is also based on groundwater base flow data that now appears to have significantly underestimated the likely speed and volume of water flow and resulting sulfate discharge around the mine and processing plant. The modeled rate of water movement at the site is completely unreasonable and does not come close to reflecting actual conditions. The water infiltration rate is lower than the design targets for engineered controls at landfills, has never been observed in any known wetland system, and accounts for only five percent of precipitation falling at the site. Nor is the assumption reasonable that human constructed water capture and treatment facilities will operate at any level of effectiveness for hundreds of years. Even the most reasonably foreseeable problems at the site, including pipeline breaks, dam or slope collapse and problems with waste water treatment go unaddressed in the SDEIS. Design for the 100-year storm also fails to account for the current state of our climate and is insufficient. Although PolyMet’s testing indicates that its waste rock leaches mercury at more than four times the water quality standard, it proposes not to conduct an analysis of the amount of mercury that will enter the watershed. Yet it has done this analysis for each of the 28 other solutes, many of which have nowhere near the potential impacts that mercury does. This appears to be a clear attempt to avoid federal and state regulations that do not allow

David Miranowski

6253

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. We cherish our beautiful lakes and are all very afraid that if PolyMet fails to be thorough/convincing in their pre-planning efforts, they will be even more reckless in their physical treatment of our land. Sincerely, David Miranowski
David Miranowski 290 Commonwealth Ave Boston, MA 02115

David Moen

36338

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I am a physician who has seen patients in Minnesota for over 25 years. I’m writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The study of potential health effects has been inadequate and I am VERY concerned that 10% of infants born in St Louis County have mercury toxicity today and this project will likely put more citizens at risk. The SEDIS study has several deficiencies including inaccurate assumptions about seepage of toxic metals into surface and ground water. Health impacts include complex neurological changes that are irreversible. You each have a responsibility to safeguard the public and future generations from poorly planned insults to our public and individual health. I ask you to exercise leadership on behalf of those of us who are concerned. Thank you, David W. Moen, MD 290 Laurel Rd Mahtomedi, MN. 55115 David Moen 290 Laurel Rd Mahtomedi, MN 55115

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Moen 49524

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I am a physician who has seen patients in Minnesota for over 25 years. I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The study of potential health effects has been inadequate and I am VERY concerned that 10% of infants born in St Louis County have mercury toxicity today and this project will likely put more citizens at risk. The SEDIS study has several deficiencies including inaccurate assumptions about seepage of toxic metals into surface and ground water. Health impacts include complex neurological changes that are irreversible. You each have a responsibility to safeguard the public and future generations from poorly planned insults to our public and individual health. I ask you to exercise leadership on behalf of those of us who are concerned. Thank you, David W. Moen, MD 290 Laurel Rd Mahtomedi, MN. 55115 David Moen 290 Laurel Rd Mahtomedi, MN 55115

David Morris 58028

Keep all these mining companies away from the boundary waters! The risks are much too great to this treasure of nature! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

David NN 58133

I have spent 3 summers of my life guiding canoe trips in the BWCA. I know firsthand how valuable this resource is to the resort owners to tourists. This industry is a proven, reliable economic engine for northern Minnesota. To risk losing and [ILLEGIBLE] damaging this precious resource in favor of Polymet CEO's and 300 employees is absolutely not worth it. No Mine has ever successfully run without major environmental effects. For everything that will happen, pollution, environmental degradation, it will be MN taxpayers footing this bill. This mine will cost Minnesotans more [ILLEGIBLE] it pumps into our economy. Bad idea, where is your conscious and common sense?

David Oliver 38390

Lisa Fay Please see attached. Regards, David C. Oliver PO Box 543 Ely, MN 55731

David Olson 18142

My name is Alan Hanson. I live in Maplewood. I represent the International Union of Painters Allied Trades GC82, which we have glazers, drywall finishers, painters, and sign display. And I would like to yield my time to David Olson. Thank you. My name is David Olson, O-L-S-O-N. President of the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce. Also a eagle scout. Minnesota Chamber represents more than 2,300 companies around the state of Minnesota. Businesses that care about Minnesota and want to see it succeed. We support copper-nickel mining and more specifically PolyMet Mining in its proposed project in Northeast Minnesota. Minnesota is famous for our natural resources. How we use them, how we take care of them. Copper-nickel mining should be no different. We enjoy one of the richest deposits in the world for copper nickle. We have been waiting a long time for the right time, the right technology, the right reasons, and the right people to mine it. We have the technology. We have the Right rules and regulations in place. We have a need for these metals in our modern lives. They are integral in winter events, electric and hybrid cars, solar panels, and a host of other important technologies and uses. Now is the time to mine them here in Minnesota. We support the environmental review process that this project has been involved in for seven years. It is thorough and it is complex for a project like this. But seven years is long enough. We have reached a point where an important decision needs to be made based on sound science, and to be true to the process set forth by state and federal law. We have confidence in that process. We applaud the DNR and other agencies for the ample time -- twice what the law calls for -- for interested parties to review and provide feedback on the environmental review. PolyMet has already invested \$150 million in this state and will invest hundreds of millions more. Their investment will return billions of dollars with economic benefits to Minnesota. An estimated 300 million in new local and state tax revenues, and an estimated \$900 million in new federal tax revenues. We must continue to move forward in the review and permitting process, uphold our high environmental standards -- nobody has asked for them to be reduced -- and bring real economic expansion to Minnesota. This project will diversify our economy and create hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. An economic impact that will be felt not only on the Iron Range but throughout the state, which is why the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and so many local chambers and their members support this project. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Olson

40011

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr David Olson 6454 Poplar Rd Gilbert, MN 55741-8154

David Ortiz

16210

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Osteraas 26247

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I want to express the following thoughts on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. It boggles my mind that this type of mining would be allowed in the state of Minnesota and specifically the Arrowhead Region, Lake Superior and canoe area wilderness. This mining project would have potential impacts that would include risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, David Osteraas PO Box 1178 Gualala, CA 95445-1178 (707) 785-9633

David Passmore 13875

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr David Passmore 4000 Creighton Ridge Rd Cazadero, CA 95421-9500

David Plotnicky 54664

See attachment

David R Gadbaw 54728

See attachment

David R Gregorich 54888

See attachment

David R Witte 42846

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Rannetsberger

47110

To Lisa Fay, I have read much of the SDEIS and would like to make the following comments regarding the project. I feel the SDEIS has addressed all possible environmental concerns in a manner that will protect the environment from harm. The enormous amount of effort and study that went into this SDEIS is mind boggling. Spending over 8 years and \$100 million dollars to prove that you can run a mine in a safe manner should be commended by Polymet. I feel they have taken all necessary steps to comply with the state and federal standards and will continue to do so into the future. I also feel that this project, once operational, will attract more intense scrutiny by State and Federal agencies, environmental watchdog groups, and the local communities, which will further strengthen the environmental stewardship that Polymet has committed to, and continues to show throughout this process. I trust that our State and Federal agencies have followed the permitting process to a tee, and that your review and involvement in this process will produce a mining permit that will ensure all aspects of the environment are protected. After all of the years of study, restudy, and further review, I feel the time is now for the project to move forward and begin providing the crucial raw materials that today's world demands. We cannot produce the much wanted green energy without the copper, nickel, and other precious metals in our world. We also cannot import these metals from other parts of the world without knowing that they were produced with more environmental impact to the environment. We would be harming future generations if we decided to leave this treasure of green energy in the ground, while importing it from a country that has lax environmental regulations. Why would we do this. Why wouldn't we take advantage of this opportunity to help our world and at the same time avoid environmental problems in other parts of the world. I know our regulators won't allow problems to occur here. We live in an area that values and regulates our environmental protection more than anywhere in the world. We all want wind power, solar power, green power to succeed for our future generations, they all need copper, and they all need nickel. Let's do our part to help our local and global environment by allowing this mine to produce the green power products that will further reduce our impact on the world for centuries to come. Sincerely, David Rannetsberger P.O. Box 2185 Tofte, MN 55615 218 663-7111 rannets@wildblue-net

David Reisenweber

46436

Date: Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 1:35 PM Subject: Comments on PolyMet's NorthMet SDEIS 3/12/2014 Dear Ms Fay (MN DNR), Mr Bruner (USACE), Mr Dabney (USFS), and Ms Hedman (Adm., EPA): SUBJECT: Weather extremes affects on the proposed NorthMet mining operation A major omission in the NorthMet SDEIS that particularly concerns me is the affects of weather extremes. A lightning strike or a windstorm could destroy equipment used to move polluted material to the right place at the right time. Is there a backup plan. How will the mountains of sulfide ore be successfully contained when catastrophic precipitation events occur. The NorthMet SDEIS lacks plans for accidents and emergencies that will happen, when something goes wrong with ponds, pipes, pumps, filters, etc needed for water treatment. If the questions of pollution, monitoring points, health effects on workers, long-term treatment, employment provided, and tax revenues had viable answers and solutions, why hasn't it happened at existing mines of this type. I have lived through two 500-year and one 200-year precipitation events over a 20-year period. I also was working for the city of Grand Forks, ND, when the flood of 1969 crested there at 45-69 feet, just inches from the top of dikes protecting downtown Grand Forks. The 1997 flood breached the dikes and caused \$3-5 Billion in damage to North Dakota and Minnesota. The crest was 54 feet and destroyed most of downtown Grand Forks. The Duluth flood of June 2013, has been called a 200-year event. Did anyone predict the damage done, when upwards of 10 inches of rain fell. We lived in Watertown, SD, when a 500-year flood ravaged the town in 1997- Much of the town was flooded and the sewage system overflowed into lower areas of town. I've farmed all my life, and one night in July 1993, our place received over 10 inches of rain. There was widespread flooding from western ND through Missouri covering 9 states and 400,000 square miles causing \$15 Billion in damage. The 1993 event on our farm caused hydrological changes that took two years to become apparent, as excess moisture from higher ground 9 miles away seeped to lower elevations in our area. Our topsoil is silt and the subsoil is clay, and our aquifer is 155 feet deep. This happened underground. It was not surface movements, as basements and pothole sloughs began filling with water in 1995 two years after the 10-inch rain event. The bedrock of northeastern Minnesota has many cracks and water will probably move differently depending on amounts of precipitation received. Is there flexibility in the SDEIS to find what is moving where. I could not find it. Does the state of Minnesota have maps of the complete hydrology of the Duluth Complex where this mining is proposed. The certainty is that all water in that area moves toward Lake Superior, which holds one tenth of the world's fresh water. This is not in the public's best interest. Reject the plan. I appreciate your listening to my concerns. Sincerely, David F. Reisenweber 111 Garden Street Duluth, Mn. 55812 HYPERLINK "tel:218-20728-1508"218- 728-1508 HYPERLINK "mailto:bigwater@clearwire-net"bigwater@clearwire-net

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Robert Ott 18249

I'm David Robert Ott, last name O-T-T, Minneapolis, Minnesota. I'm here tonight. I would like to voice my opposition to the PolyMet plan. In my opinion, my humble opinion, I feel like -- I feel like it hasn't been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the water quality issues will be adequately addressed. Therefore, I think the risks are too high, and I think it would spoil a great treasure of our state, being the water quality of the whole drainage ultimately going to Lake Superior. So quite simply, I just don't think it's safe. That's essentially my comment. Thank you.

David Ross 42673

See attachment

David Sandbeck 11449

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity DNR hydrology data show that the PolyMet water model significantly understates the amount of water flowing in the nearby Partridge River. If this information is wrong, predictions about water pollution are in question. If the model is incorrect, and there is more water flowing through the site than it assumes, the polluted water from pits and waste rock will move more easily through the soil, and reach lakes and rivers more quickly. The water could also carry more pollutants than the PolyMet model predicts. David Sandbeck 245 West Baker Street Saint Paul MN 55107 Sincerely, Mr David Sandbeck 245 Baker St W Saint Paul, MN 55107-2704 (651) 428-2736

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Schaezner

47910

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Schaezner 2456 west 24th street minneapolis, MN 55405

48359

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Schaezner 2456 west 24th street minneapolis, MN 55405

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Schaenzer

52386

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Schaenzer 2456 west 24th street minneapolis, MN 55405

David Schluchter

47510

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. After assisting with flood disaster clean up in / and around Duluth in 2012, I am very much against the PolyMet mine, and the connection between many interconnected watershed districts, and the topography of Northern Minnesota - is too precious to chance. Allowing mining in this very sensitive eco system is not the legacy we would want to leave for future generations. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr David Schluchter 4433 46th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-3617

David Shaw

39606

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr David Shaw 960 27th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55418-2962

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Shea

15912

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Shea 200 S. Olive Street, #205 #205 Waconia, MN 55387

David Simpson

38943

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr David Simpson 2322 31st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1455

David Snyder

58065

Keep the mines away from BWCA! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Stack

40620

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr David Stack 3306 W 46th St Minneapolis, MN 55410-1717

David Steinhorst

54715

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Stever

41747

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Stewart

17218

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Stewart 2549 Cedar Hills Dr Minnetonka, MN 55305

50484

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Stewart 2549 Cedar Hills Dr Minnetonka, MN 55305

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Tomasoni

18107

Thank you, Karin. I'm David Tomasoni. I'm State Senator representing Senate District 6, which you are all sitting in right now. On behalf of the Iron Range delegation, as Representative Dill (phonetic) originally talked about, I'm also speaking for the Iron Range delegation. And I'm here to tell you that we all support this project. As I was saying in Duluth last week, this DEIS is 2200 pages long and it has cost PolyMet upwards of 65 million dollars and has been in the works for over eight years. There have been over six agencies involved. There have been six agencies involved both on a state and federal level, as well as the tribes, in order to ensure that all of the "I"s are dotted and all of the "T"s are crossed. We want it done right. And our laws require it to be done right. And our people want it to be done right. This SDEIS addresses subaqueous storage, refutes acid rock drainage and includes a financial assurance reference, which are unique to an EIS. You know, we have been mining up here for 125 years. In fact, it is a result of mining proceeds that the Delta Airlines Reservation Center was built. You know, John D. Rockefeller once said that, "Had it not been for the Mesabi Iron Range, we never would have won World War II." Well, man, how much copper is being used in our high-tech military today? PolyMet is an open-pit mine, which will provide 500 to a thousand construction jobs, 366 direct jobs and over 700 spin-off jobs. Some people say it is not worth it. Well, tell the people of Aurora and Hoyt Lakes that these jobs aren't worth it and see what kind of reaction you get. Tell the people of the Iron Range that mining jobs aren't necessary and see what kind of answer you get. Try to even imagine living on the Iron Range without mining. The entire area would be a huge ghost town. PolyMet is mining. This is not sulfide mining, this is precious metals mining. These will be conflict-free metals. In other words, no ten-year-old kids will be employed at 50 cents per day, no wars will be fought to overthrow regimes. But rather, we will have an environmentally considerate mine in a region where mining has existed and provided for our economy for over 125 years. And after all of these years of mining, we still have some of the cleanest water and air in the country. And that was noted recently by a previously referenced University of Minnesota study. Yale University just concluded that of about 62 different minerals that they studied, that there is no good substitute for these minerals. Well, guess what, folks? All of these minerals don't fall out of the sky. Every single one of them has to be mined. The National Academy of Science just released the finding that pollution in China makes its way to the U.S. They wrote -- We can do this thing right. We can do it right here, right now, in the right way, with jobs and the environment working hand-in-hand and side-by-side.

David Tomassoni

18167

Steven Biondich, (inaudible). I yield my time to Senator Tomassoni. DAVID TOMASSONI: You don't have to "boo." I'm David Tomassoni State Senator from Senate District 6, home of five of our six taconite plants where mining is our way of life. The SDEIS, of approximately 2,200 pages, costing more than \$65 million, eight years in the making with seven agencies, both state and federal involved, is extremely a comprehensive analysis of the proposed PolyMet Mine. It's hard to imagine that more can be done. The agency has done a very good job and deserves credit for making sure it was done right and for even going further and having three such public meetings as opposed to the one that is required in law and doubling of the comment period to 90 days. PolyMet will be done right and jobs and the environment will co-exist to the benefit of everyone in the state. Mining is the Iron Range's economy. It has been for more than 125 years and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. Our water is clean and our air is clean. PolyMet is mining. 500 to 1,000 construction jobs, 366 direct jobs, over 700 spinoff jobs. This is not sulfide mining. This is precious metals mining. These will be conflict-free minerals. The National Academy of Sciences has just released a study on pollution from China that simply stated, "When we outsource our jobs, we import China's pollution." We have a perfectly good alternative right on the Iron Range. PolyMet. Our green economy demands copper, nickle, platinum, palladium, gold, and more. There are four tons of copper in a windmill. There is copper and precious metals in solar panels, computers, electric cars, medical devices, catalytic converters, TVs, and, yes, broadband. At this very moment many of you may be texting, Tweeting, surfing, and maybe just talking on your i-Phone. There are 39 different minerals in that cell phone. Every one of them must be mined. With never-ending technology advances our society needs these minerals more every day. And in this turbulent world of seemingly never-ending conflict our country must have its own source of these minerals. Really. Now do we want to continue outsourcing jobs, importing pollution, and buying our minerals from countries in a constant state of conflict, and worse yet, employs 10-year-old kids by the millions or do we want to have great-paying, environmentally friendly jobs on the Iron Range with all the benefits to go along with them to develop a domestic source of precious metals to advance our green economy? The choice is clear, it's PolyMet. The SDEIS is a complete document done according to the toughest environmental laws in the country; and it shows that we can do it right, right here, right now, the right way with jobs and the environment working hand in hand, side by side. The SDEIS has my full support and the support of the Iron Range delegation.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Tomassoni

18361

Thank you, Tony. And thank you all for coming. It's quite an event when you see a room like this full, because people are very, very interested in what is going on in the state of Minnesota. How we're going to address this particular issue. I'm the state senator for Chisholm. I've been in the legislature -- I'm in my 22nd year now. I'm the chairman of the economic development, environmental, and agricultural finance committee. I am also the co-chair of the LCCMR. And I can tell you that for the people who say 90 days isn't long enough or 2200 pages is too long and too complicated, well, regardless of what the DNR decided it wouldn't be right. The 90-day comment period the DNR has put out there is twice as long as they need to put out there. And so now people are saying "That's not long enough. We needed longer." Well, if we went 180 days, people would say, "That's not long enough. We need 360 days." So these types of comments I don't believe are valid comments. I've been watching this over and over again. I've been watching people say, "This is too complicated. It's 2200 pages. We can't understand it." If we a 100-page document, that wouldn't have been long enough, wouldn't have been complete enough. And so I have to give a lot of credit to the DNR and the agencies doing this, because those of you that don't know, this thing has been going on for eight years. The company has spent \$65 million hiring scientists and engineers to analyze this in a way that has never been analyzed in this country. And the fact that we have six different agencies involved, Minnesota DNR, the PCA, the Army Corps of Engineers, the federal EPA, Federal Forest, fish and wildlife, the tribes that have been involved, PolyMet is involved. How much more analysis by experts do you want here? This is a good document. This is a document that has been scrutinized and gone over and over. Wetlands have been mitigated. There will be no acid drain off that has not already been decided. You people are who are saying this is sulfide mining, this is not sulfide mining. This is copper-nickel mining (inaudible) sulfide in the sand way less than anything that they had in any of the other places that you're all alluding to that have had problems in the world. Quite frankly, this copper, there's four tons of it in these windows. There's copper all over the place in solar panels. Cobalt -- I got lot more to say. But I'm for this thing. It can be done, and we can do it right on the Iron Range.

David W Johnson

18233

My name is David W. Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N, and I'm from Ely, and I worked in the mines and in logging, and we have four generations of relatives buried in the Ely cemetery, and I have reviewed EIS, and I feel all the conditions have been met and let's start mining, stop whining. Thank you.

David Walsh

43371

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, David Walsh 1463 Portland Avenue #2 St Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Warfield

15952

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, David Warfield 608 2nd St SE Roseau, MN 56751

David Welch

18262

David Welch, W-E-L-C-H. My non-substantive comment is I am not in favor of the proposed project. That is my comment. My substantive comment is a comprehensive analysis of water flow cannot be done. Climate change is progressing so rapidly that it is not possible to predict with accuracy the extent of pollutant migration into the hydrological system. Mitigation must be planned from the basis that passive water treatment is not applicable due to the inability to accurately project rainfall and to accurately project future rainfall and climate change. That's my comment. The action I urge is what I already said, which is that I am not in favor of this and to not permit it. Thank you so much for your time.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Williams

39370

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the introduction of copper mining into Minnesota and the NorthMet Mining Project. Having reviewed the SDEIS and listened to a great deal of the discussion and exchange regarding the project, I find that I cannot support this project or the introduction of copper mining into Minnesota. The Northeastern area of Minnesota, currently being considered for the NorthMet project, is a unique land and water resource. So unique that a significant portion of the area has been designated as a National Wilderness Area (BWCAW). As a result, there are limits placed on the area with respect to how it can be used with the intent of preserving it for the long term. Copper/heavy metal mining will put the BWCAW in jeopardy. This area has a great many lakes and includes two watersheds, one emptying into the Hudson Bay and the other into the Great Lakes. These watersheds represent a substantial amount of the fresh water reservoir on the planet. Fresh water is an increasingly scarce and essential resource for life itself. It is for this reason, I believe, that copper mining should not be introduced into Minnesota. The copper deposits throughout the Duluth Complex are embedded in rock containing sulfide. Large amounts of sulfide bearing rock will be extracted along with small amounts of copper (and other minerals). Oxidization of sulfide bearing waste rock resulting from extraction and processing will create sulfate. Sulfate contact with surface or groundwater, accidental or otherwise, results in acidification of the water. Lakes and wetlands in NE Minnesota are very sensitive to changes in pH. Small changes effectively "poison" the water and will kill fish and wildlife. There is no denying that copper is a vital component of many of the devices we use everyday. That said, studies have shown that there is a great deal of copper in the earth's crust distributed around the planet; enough to last thousands of years at current rates of use. In addition, we continue to increase our recycling rates for essential minerals. The SDEIS acknowledges that the environmental impact of untreated waste rock and water as a result of the NorthMet project could be serious and perhaps devastating. As such, multiple treatment and containment techniques detailed in the SDEIS will be employed to manage the threat of environmental damage. However, despite best efforts at protection, every existing copper mine has caused significant environment damage. Worse still is that the possibility for damage exists not just during the mines operation but for many, perhaps hundreds of years into the future. In an anticipation of the possible future cleanup costs, there are suggestions, not detailed in the SDEIS, of a surety bond or some financial instrument that sets aside monies to pay for ongoing management/treatment of the mine's waste products. Given that few corporations remain in business for hundreds of years, including those involved in mining or backing bonds, how then can Minnesotans be assured that we collectively will not be responsible for future cleanup/ treatment costs associated with copper mining. In conclusion, given the potential devastating impact to our scarce freshwater resources, I believe that the risk of introducing copper mining into Minnesota is too great. We should increase our recycling efforts and/or mine copper in areas where there is less freshwater than in the "land of 10,000 lakes." It is for that reason, I feel the state of Minnesota and/or the federal government should deny any applications for mining of copper or other heavy metals in Northeastern Minnesota. Sincerely, David Williams 2639 Humboldt Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55408 Sent

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Wohlfeil

16044

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Poor planning in Japan has already put one ocean in danger and it looks as though the number of oceans effected may be two possibly three very soon. The Atlantic. Pacific and Indian oceans will just be large bodies of poison where any food we normally get from these beautiful waters will be infected with radiation. Now you want to build and open a mine here in my home state. You have got to be kidding me. A company with a track record like yours, you expect us to bend over and take it up the keester. I guess companies like yours just won't be happy until you totally destroy this planet. Do you even think about that shit before you plan a project. I don't see it or any planning to protect the earth from you people. Oh you'll just clean it up if a spill occurs. Well there is no way you can clean it all up before it damages the water animals fish and any other life forms here. I only know one way to stop this from happening and that is to stop you from before you even start. If you do start I know what needs to be done its isn't pretty and I get know happiness out of doing it but I will take any action needed to stop you. Lets start by dangling you in the courts for a couple of decades. Then enlist the power of the catholic church to do some damage as well. I'll bet they have enough money to keep you busy until the three horsemen arrive. Just don't build it stay away put your building equipment away and find some thing else to waste your money on. Maybe even think of another way to make the world just a little better. Sincerely, Mr David Wohlfeil 1427 Hazel St N Saint Paul, MN 55119-4218 (651) 307-7560

David Yount

42703

See attachment

David Zelinski

58166

I am a professional engineer in metallurgical engineering. My review of the PolyMet draft EIS and SEIS is that the report and [ILLEGIBLE] of data appears as a thorough evaluation of the project, potential impacts, and how to mitigate the impacts has been completed. They will use the best available technology to create an effective operation. These technologies need to more efficient use of water, [ILLEGIBLE] and a [ILLEGIBLE] stack of tailings.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

David Zimney

18996

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, David Zimney 7110 Excelsior Way 7110 Excelsior Way St Louis Park, MN 55426 6125010968

Dawn Baker

38725

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Dawn Baker 4708 Oakland Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3538

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Baker

40162

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Dawn Baker 4708 Oakland Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3538

Dawn Brink

42035

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Dawn Brink Brooklyn Center, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Demaske

40205

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dawn Donahue

54519

Please be very careful about the decisions you make about the Polymet Mine in the Northern Lakes Region. Our vacation there last year was a wonderful memory and we'd love to return to see the unspoiled beauty again.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Drouillard

9637

My name is Dawn Drouillard I am originally from Grand Marais and currently own a business here in the Twin Cities. My dad is a Grand Portage band member and a former employee of Erie Mining and LTV Steel in Silver Bay. My mom's dad, Bill Burge, moved to Taconite Harbor in the 1950's to work on the development of that mine. While our family has a historical connection to taconite mining, we have a much deeper connection to the land and to Lake Superior and the surrounding watershed. Lake Superior is already under siege from mercury poisoning created by coal fired power plants, invasive species, climate change and the pollution left behind by early mining activities. The addition of non-ferrous mining, which has never been done safely without polluting the surrounding waters, could very well be our Lake's point of no return. I reject the PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) because:

- The SDEIS greatly underestimates groundwater flow rates. Real and accurate numbers are needed to predict the actual pollution and seepage from mine pits and the actual size of waste rock piles to be added to the Partridge River watershed.
- There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin failure and extreme rain events, like the one in 2012, are not covered in their plan.
- During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down.
- The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates.
- The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure.
- 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A plastic sheet placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of deep-rooted woody plants that might perforate the synthetic material.
- A pit “lake” and tailings basin pond would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River and the Embarrass River. I don't believe that PolyMet will see this situation through for 500 years or more.
- A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored for hundreds of years. I don't believe that PolyMet will see this through for 500 years or more.
- Details about financial assurance — a “damage deposit” the company provides — are not provided in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost. According to Grand Portage Water Quality Specialist Margaret Watkins, this number could be in the 100 billion dollar range, a figure she calculated using the mining company's own financial assurance formula. The SDEIS does not address how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment — or how the public will be protected from liability. And these are just some of the technical flaws within the SDEIS. There are many other unanswered questions and related issues that are important to consider, including:
- The threat that an enormous industrial zone in NE Minnesota will have to a thriving and growing tourism economy. 200 or 300 jobs compared to over 245,000 jobs in the tourism industry seems like a very bad trade.
- The effect that increased sulfates will have on

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Hofstrand

14649

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Jensen

39804

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dawn Jensen 4119 normanna rd Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Jensen

39807

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Mulle-Friday

40376

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Dawn Mulle-Friday 262 chemin de Dabiou Cintegabelle, ot 31550 FR

dawn oz

39488

good - i look forward to the updates. On Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:14 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Snyder

10055

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dawn Snyder 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd Sioux City, IA 51104

18803

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dawn Snyder 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd Sioux City, IA 51104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dawn Snyder

50877

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Dawn Snyder 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd 4007 Glen Oaks Blvd Sioux City, IA 51104

Dawn Trexel

39255

Hello, I would like to make a comment about the proposed PolyMet mine. I believe that Minnesota should be a leader in sustainability. That means thinking about what is best for the state in the long-term, not just the short-term. Just because there is a company interested in mining our minerals doesn't mean now is the best time to do so. The minerals are not going anywhere. Perhaps in the future we will have more sustainable methods for extracting such minerals. Just because iron mining is socially acceptable in Minnesota doesn't mean that all mining should be. Copper-nickle mining is very different from iron mining, and those differences and long-term impacts need to be taken seriously. Dawn Trexel 7717 Hwy 169 Virginia, MN 55792

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dayna mase

9999

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, dayna mase po box 746 ely, MN 55731

18744

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, dayna mase po box 746 ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dayna mase

50818

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, dayna mase po box 746 ely, MN 55731

Dean & Peggy Erzar

44366

To all involved; I feel that the governing bodies that are involved in watching over PolyMet will do a good job and enact policies that will be enforced for the good of all who live here. I have been a miner for 35 years, 31 at Minntac and 4 at Northshore Mining, while working at Minntac I was involved in much of the process and worked under some of those that run Polymet. I can tell you that environmental rules always played a big part in any changes we made. The same holds true at Northshore. The governing bodies did a great job on the SDEIS and should continue making changes and watching out for us as the process goes on. You have my full support in this project. Please continue on.

Dean Erzar

1280 S. White Iron Rd

Ely, Mn 55731

Dean And Tristan Jacobson

38731

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I also think that this never needs to be done anywhere in the USA, due to the fact that all it is doing is ruining the environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Dean And Tristan Jacobson 420 Old Farm Rd Saint Paul, MN 55126-2052 (651) 248-1363

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dean Borgeson

16711

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dean Borgeson 9208 Erickson Ct N Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

50080

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dean Borgeson 9208 Erickson Ct N Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dean Erickson

18385

Thank you. Well, I will be submitting more technical comments in writing. I just want to make the point that in the late 1970's the St. Louis River (inaudible) and the entire watershed, including the upper watershed was designated by the International Joint Commission, which manages the air and water concerns in the United States and Canada, as an area of concern. So an area of concern basically means you all got a big mess and you got to clean it up. And so we've been working since that designation to develop a plan through decades really at this point of input to clean up the lower St. Louis River. And that's continuing right now. It just came up with a new draft of remedial action plan for the St. Louis River area of concern. That puts us delisting the beneficial (inaudible) the area of concern in about 25 years or so if we can make it. Some of the beneficial use includes mercury contamination, degradation which basically means the critters in the water that are the basis of the ecosystem in the food chain can't survive due to mineral and salt contamination in the water. We already see pretty marketed impact in conductivity, which inhibits the growth of pretty much everything that lives in the water at the streams that flow out of the Iron Range and below the Iron Range. It looks fine. Because it looks fine doesn't necessarily mean it is fine or that we're sustaining the amount of life that we should be sustaining in that ecosystem. The addition of potential sulfuric acid drainage into the St. Louis River Watershed, which is the largest watershed in the United States, flowing into the largest body of fresh water on earth seems unacceptable. And the MEPA and the other organizations that are collaborating to do this, we are spending -- we expect to spend \$420 million cleaning up our mess in the area of concern. \$420 million. That's our money. And it seems contradictory I guess I would say to be spending that much money to be cleaning up something when we're not tending to the 11 headwaters. I also just want to point out that we base our predictions of water flow on the past. What we're seeing in the future is not the same as what we've seen in the past. We have minimal understanding at the revolution we need of climate change impacts in our watershed. And the flush scenarios are likely inadequate. And then finally I just want to say that we are a ceded territory. And we have a lot of things that we need to take care of on behalf of the original people on this land.

Dean Evenson

42479

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Dean Evenson 35 Luverne Ave Minneapolis, MN 55419-2623

Dean Flugstad

15811

I can scarcely believe that it has come to this, that one of the most treasured jewels in the crown of outdoor America, the BWCA, is being threatened by the mining industry again. But the poison this time is thousands of times worse than iron ore mining could ever be. How will retention dams hold back sulfide and toxic metals for hundreds of years. This mining has no place in or near the place we hold dear in our hearts. Mining of all kinds has a very poor long term record in environmental integrity. It is get in, extract, get out and let the people pay for the clean up and mourn their lost environs. A 2200 page document perhaps was intentionally made so long it could hide all sorts of sins. Sorting this out Should be allowed to take years to be done. Be careful and cautious please, Dean Flugstad 72243 300 th Ave Lake City, Mn 55041 Sent from my iPad

Dean Graveel

10714

Gentlemen, I could not make the comment section of your Email on the "Mining Meeting" work. So I am writing you separately. I travel to the BWCA two to three time a year and guide various groups. I love the area and think it is one of God's greatest creations, besides the birth of a child. I also am a Mechanical Engineer with about 50 years experience. I do not like all the negative reporting and the negative groups that are trying to stop the Mining proposal for the BWCA. They do not seem to have many truthful facts to support there "NO" answer to everything that is presented on this subject. As an Engineer, their is always many ways to solve problems and remove all dangers. We must work together for the solutions and keep everybody satisfied and still accomplish the "Mining " goal. Dean A. Graveel Alexandria, IN 46001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dean Halverson 18331

My name is Dean Halverson. I am from Barnum, Minnesota. I have no script or anything. I'm a mill worker. I'm a taxpayer. And I live in one of the greatest states in The Union. I am going to take my hat off to the DNR people, department of natural resources, for timber, taconite, copper. It's natural resources, folks. God gave it to us for a reason. We're going to use it. Good luck to everybody involved in this project. My hat off to you.

Dean Mohs 16064

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dean Peterson 42666

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deanna Erickson

20103

RE: Technical comment on the Polymet Draft EIS In the early 1980's, the St Louis River was designated by the International Joint Commission (which manages air and water concerns between the United States and Canada) as a Great Lakes Area of Concern, making the river mouth one of 43 areas slated for clean up and delisting of Beneficial Use Impairments. With momentum behind this clean up building as a result of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, a newly updated Remedial Action Plan developed by the Wisconsin DNR and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency lays out a plan to delist the Area of Concern by 2025, spending over 420 million dollars in public funding to accomplish the cleanup efforts. In order to delist the St Louis River Area of Concern (which includes the entire watershed of the St Louis River), MPCA and the MN and WI Departments of Natural Resources will need to delist the following Beneficial Use Impairments that could be made considerably worse by the impacts of sulfates and sulfides in river water: BUI 1: Fish Consumption Advisories. In order to delist this BUI, "There are no Area of Concern-specific fish consumption advisories issued for the St Louis River by the State of Minnesota or the State of Wisconsin. Tissue concentrations of contaminants of concern in representative samples of resident fish are not significantly elevated from regional background samples" The two contaminants of concern are mercury and PCBs, as those are the reasons for current consumption advisories in the AOC. (Text from the Remedial Action Plan). Sulfates and sulfites are essential components in the methylation of mercury. BUI 2: Degraded Fish and Wildlife Populations. An essential component of delisting this BUI is to "(Develop) a wild rice plan and wild rice restoration at Rask Bay and additional sites in the estuary in Minnesota" in order to foster wildlife habitat. The growth of wild rice is severely inhibited by over 10mg/L sulfites in the water and sediment. The Polymet Draft EIS does not make any mention of the Area of Concern or the Beneficial Use Impairments, nor does it adequately address how these impairments might be mitigated in the event that sulfuric acid enters the water column of the St Louis River. In order to ensure that the Polymet proposal does not impede progress on delisting the Area of Concern, impacts to the St Louis River Beneficial Use Impairments should be clearly addressed in the Draft EIS. I am not in favor of this proposal and believe that on behalf of the largest US river entering the largest freshwater lake in the world, we are internationally obligated to deny permits for the Polymet operation. Sincerely, Deanna M. Erickson 3138 Minnesota Ave, #2 Duluth MN 55802

Deanna Greene

42529

See attachment

Deanne Roquet

43827

Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Deanne Roquet 315 W Oxford St Duluth, MN 55803-2235

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deb Blair 46373

I am concerned with the Polymet proposal and am fiercely opposed to this project moving forward in Minnesota. Best regards, Deb Blair Business Manager Sunny Hollow Montessori 636 S. Mississippi River Blvd St Paul, MN 55116 651-690-2307 x110

Deb Brinkman 19960

We do not oppose sulfide mining, per se, it must be done without polluting our environment. The SDEIS is inadequate; it does not provide any reassurance that this mining will not result in irreparable harm to the watery environment in our Arrowhead. PolyMet's proposed mine threatens our clean water and public health. To keep pollution out of the environment, the only sustainable option is to clean the environment while mining is in progress. We need to promote an environment beneficial to life through the protection and wise management of natural resources in the public interest. Pollution should be controlled to preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health. Deb Brinkman 4327 Alabama Avenue South St Louis Park, MN 55416 612 803 6142

41406

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: 500 years of pollution is unacceptable. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Deb Brinkman 4327 Alabama Avenue South St Louis Park, MN 55416

Deb Bryant 45866

I am vehemently opposed to the prospect of a copper sulfide mine being developed in Minnesota for many reasons to include the poor track record of the Glencore corporation, the risk to habitat and water quality, and the direct disruption such activity would create next to a wilderness area. The estimated gain of a limited number of jobs for a mere 20 years is not worth the huge risk of damage done that will last potentially for centuries. It has become a well known fact that whatever precious metal is produced through this mislead endeavor will not be available for use in the United States and will be shipped overseas, most likely to China. There is huge weakness in the environmental draft statement pertaining to water quality, and based on the unsuccessful track record of preventing environmental damage as demonstrated through other such mines, there can be no assurance that the proposed mine will be any different. Deborah Bryant, DVM Greater Minnesota Veterinary Behavior Services ["http://www.gmnvetbehavior.com/"](http://www.gmnvetbehavior.com/) [HYPERLINK "http://www.gmnvetbehavior.com"](http://www.gmnvetbehavior.com) [HYPERLINK "mailto:info@gmnvetbehavior-com"](mailto:info@gmnvetbehavior-com) [info@gmnvetbehavior-com Ph: 320-292-6608](tel:320-292-6608) [Fax: 320-529-9696](tel:320-529-9696) P.O. Box 168 Sartell, MN 56377

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debbie

7726

Dear MN DNR, Please accept these as my comments since due to health issues I am unable to attend the public hearing in Duluth. Outlined below are my main concerns regarding this specific mining project and subsequently any similar mining projects that involve mining for primarily copper, nickel and other metals from sulfide ores. 1). Mercury: Fact: Minnesota already has substantial mercury pollution, mainly from air deposition that has polluted our water, land and air and the food we eat. This project will significantly increase mercury pollution. In my opinion the EPA, DNR and the MPCA and MN Health Dept. currently have not done enough to lessen mercury pollution from its sources. No agency has done any significant research which has looked at the accumulated effects of mercury pollution on children and women of childbearing age and why there is a higher rate of autism and other neurological disorders around the Great Lakes and in particular Lake Superior and Minnesota than in other areas of the United States. Therefore: Because of the magnitude of this proposed mining project and because if this mining project is approved it will open the doors to over 35 other similar mining projects being proposed in Northern Minnesota - this EIS should not be accepted and/or approved until a long-term (20 year minimum) research project be conducted in Minnesota on the accumulated effects of mercury on children and women. 2). Watershed impairment: This project will adversely effect the Partridge River watershed and the St Louis watershed by eliminating over 900 acres of pristine wetlands and by the potential for contaminating this watershed with sulfide ore runoff. This watershed is part of the Lake Superior watershed and the Great Lakes watershed. Millions of people and including businesses live "downstream" from this proposed mine and depend on the clean water of its entire system to survive. Therefore: Since there has never been a sulfide ore mine in the world that has not polluted and has not left a polluted site for taxpayers to bare the burden to live with and try and clean up; why does the DNR and the state of Minnesota think that proposed Polymet project will be any different. The MNDNR has never not approved any EIS permit and both the MNDNR and MPCA have a poor record of monitoring permits and enforcement. A check over the past 10 years shows a clear record of many abuses by industry - including our existing iron ore mining industry of violations of their existing permits which end up polluting our rivers, land and air. Therefore: If the MNDNR and MPCA can't prevent current industries from continually violating state and federal permits how are they going to be able to hold Polymet accountable. Note: I would like the MNDNR and the MPCA to show one existing mining operation in Minnesota that has never, I repeat never - violated one of their permits. They can't because it doesn't exist Approving this proposed mine is a ludicrous based on the past history of mining operations in Minnesota and based on the poor record of the MNDNR and the MPCA in effectively monitoring and enforcing federal and state laws to protect our environment. 3). Wetlands When Rep. Willard Munger and other state legislators passed the MN Wetlands Act it was to insure that we protect existing wetlands within the watershed(s) where they exist If he were alive today he would be appalled at how his legislation has been watered down. He and other legislators original intent was never to allow wetlands in one county to be replaced in another county. We need to preserve and protect existing wetlands not use gravel pits (which has been done) to try and build new ones that will never replace natural wetlands that took years to make. For every acre of wetlands that is impacted a natural, existing wetlands must be permanently preserved forever. I was on a Wetlands Technical Committee and was involved in testing the quality of man-made wetlands and our rese

Debbie Brown

37305

Mar 1, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I write as a Minnesotan who advocates for protecting our clean water far into our future. Citizens such as myself have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it lacks information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest, the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. I personally care a lot about birds and view them as an indicator of the health of our land. I advocate on behalf of birds because they have no voice in decisions made about their habitat and homes. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject the proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining could result in long-term water pollution and negative (harmful or fatal) impact to sensitive birds and habitats. In my opinion, which considers the long term, this short term trade-off is not worth the risk. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Mrs Debbie Brown
449 Pascal St S Saint Paul, MN 55105-2520 (713) 351-9220

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debbie Engel 42833

See attachment

Debbie Legan 57236

As I watched on the news the river in West Virginia and the town's impacted by the contamination spill, I thought "perhaps NOW the individuals who can stop the PolyMet mining in Minnesota will rethink this." Do not destroy the best of what Minnesota has to offer. Debbie Legan 1004 Glen Paul Ct Shoreview, MN 55126

Debbie Meister 15978

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debbie Mucklow

41819

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Debbie Mucklow champlin, Minnesota

Debbie Neimark

40363

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Debbie Neimark 6018 N. Oakley Ave Chicago, IL 60659 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debbie Thompson

40828

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Debbie Tilman

54666

See attachment

Debbie Wall

41950

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Debbie Wall Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debby 7655

PolyMet is the worst thing that could come to fruition. Please do NOT do this to our beloved state. Protect our environment for generations to come. I live in Cook County six months of the year, and I want all of our 11 grandchildren to enjoy a natural environment. Debby Rebiscke MAR-COM and Associates 612-419-7546 cell 952-925-9132 fax drebis@comcaStnet

Debby and David Ortman 54685

See attachment

Deborah A Ramos 54528

I am totally against the sulfide mining in northeastern Minnesota. Question? If Canada is own by the Queen of Enland and that Enland rejects exports from the USA pertaining to international laws, (example) if I wanted to send cookies-cereal-smoked sausages to a friend in England I cant because of the chemicals in our food. Then we have the right to stop the company from Canada coming here and destroying MN.

Deborah Cheek 32765

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt There are things in our lives and in the world that are much more valuable and precious than money. The National Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior are considered by some to be one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. My heart aches that some corporation thinks that it is right/moral to seek permission to put an open pit sulfide mine on this land. Please act now to block this proposal put forth by PolyMet. Sincerely, Deborah Cheek 503 W Center St Mount Morris, IL 61054-1315 (815) 734-6228

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Crocker

9873

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My God, I am horrified that this has gotten this far. If this goes through it will COST US big time It will destroy our great north woods, animal life, AND the money from tourism It will also cost us money to clean up It will probably never really be clean or will we have our great north woods ever again, at least in my life time. It seems to me the costs are TOO great just for a few jobs. Unless some people are getting paid alot of money who make this decision Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Deborah Crocker 3012 Darling Dr Alex., MN 56308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Crocker

18642

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My God, I am horrified that this has gotten this far. If this goes through it will COST US big time It will destroy our great north woods, animal life, AND the money from tourism It will also cost us money to clean up It will probably never really be clean or will we have our great north woods ever again, at least in my life time. It seems to me the costs are TOO great just for a few jobs. Unless some people are getting paid alot of money who make this decision Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Deborah Crocker 3012 Darling Dr Alex., MN 56308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Crocker

18881

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Bottom line The people of MN. do NOT want or need this company in our state. The CONS far outway the pros I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Deborah Crocker 3012 Darling Dr Alex., MN 56308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Crocker

50717

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My God, I am horrified that this has gotten this far. If this goes through it will COST US big time It will destroy our great north woods, animal life, AND the money from tourism It will also cost us money to clean up It will probably never really be clean or will we have our great north woods ever again, at least in my life time. It seems to me the costs are TOO great just for a few jobs. Unless some people are getting paid alot of money who make this decision Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Deborah Crocker 3012 Darling Dr Alex., MN 56308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Flanders

39522

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Deborah Gibbons

43573

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner and Dear World The reason I am writing is because I noticed the logo for the US EPA is a clump of blueberries. I am an Interpretive Naturalist in Ely MN taught at Vermilion Community College. A Blueberry shows us and tells us and gives us our picture of health. Blueberries are a SUPERFOOD and shared on every health food site and David Wolfe magic smoothies. Main ingredient - BLUEBERRIES. Blue berries support our basic need for health, even the bear knows this.. The bear taught the people how to keep their digestive system ALIVE. Blueberries, blueberry leaves and blueberry plant stems all give us a SUPERIOR sense of health. How do we know that. A bear eats a bushful of blueberries, leaves and stems and the goes to sleep for 6 months. What retains his health. The superfood, blueberry. We know this. Why would anyone put their own health at risk for a little gold when we have all the golden blueberry medicine we need for all time. Since I am a Naturalists, I'd like you to know that i also have similar information about total sustainable health relating to WILD RICE, CEDAR, WHITE BIRCH AND ESPECIALLY YELLOW BIRCH . MY MESSAGE IS TO ASK YOU TO SAVE IT ALL. And save the wolves that help it all stay healthy and disease free. My presence and my vote will always be against destruction of the native forest in any way. Reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Yes, our ability to keep ourselves healthy is our prime intereSt Deborah Gibbons Ely, MN Very truly yours, Deborah Gibbons 429 S 4th Ave E Ely, MN 55731 218 235 7146

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Gibbons

43575

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner and Dear World The reason I am writing is because I noticed the logo for the US EPA is a clump of blueberries. I am an Interpretive Naturalist in Ely MN taught at Vermilion Community College. A Blueberry shows us and tells us and gives us our picture of health. Blueberries are a SUPERFOOD and shared on every health food site and David Wolfe magic smoothies. Main ingredient - BLUEBERRIES. Blue berries support our basic need for health, even the bear knows this.. The bear taught the people how to keep their digestive system ALIVE. Blueberries, blueberry leaves and blueberry plant stems all give us a SUPERIOR sense of health. How do we know that. A bear eats a bushful of blueberries, leaves and stems and the goes to sleep for 6 months. What retains his health. The superfood, blueberry. We know this. Why would anyone put their own health at risk for a little gold when we have all the golden blueberry medicine we need for all time. Since I am a Naturalists, I'd like you to know that i also have similar information about total sustainable health relating to WILD RICE, CEDAR, WHITE BIRCH AND ESPECIALLY YELLOW BIRCH . MY MESSAGE IS TO ASK YOU TO SAVE IT ALL. And save the wolves that help it all stay healthy and disease free. My presence and my vote will always be against destruction of the native forest in any way. Reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Yes, our ability to keep ourselves healthy is our prime intereSt Deborah Gibbons Ely, MN Very truly yours, Deborah Gibbons 429 S 4th Ave E Ely, MN 55731 218 235 7146

Deborah Hendrickson

15878

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Deborah Hendrickson 301 N 18 1/2 Ave W Duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Hendrickson

16929

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Hendrickson

18901

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Deborah Hendrickson 301 N 18 1/2 Ave W Duluth, MN 55806 218 391 5133

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Huskins

18232

I'm Deborah, D-E-B-O-R-A-H, Huskins, H-U-S-K-I-N-S, and I live in Woodbury. My family has been involved for four generations in north woods activities, and I want to make these statements because I'm very concerned about the proposed NorthMet/PolyMet project. Any large undertaking requires us to plan and hope for the best but to prepare for glitches and unanticipated events. While we all hope sulfide mining can be done without damaging the environment, experience throughout the world shows otherwise. There are foreseeable problems. Just one example is the Duluth flood event that occurred in 2012. Nearly 7 inches of rainfall fell in 24 hours, causing flash floods, widespread flooding, tearing apart roads and river beds, et cetera. This rainfall exceeded the 100-year flood records. PolyMet says that they can capture all of the contaminated water on site and treat it before it's released into the environment. Their own mine plan shows they will have millions of gallons of polluted water that will seep offsite untreated. PolyMet will be collecting some of the water in pits lined with membrane -- membrane liners. These liners will eventually leak. What will happen if we have a flood event like the Duluth flood event? Contingency plans are important. No one has explained how the damage can be retracted once it occurs. If leakage occurs, or worse, a spill, how can the acidified water be pulled back? It can't. It proceeds downstream and down into the groundwater killing plants, fish and all aquatic life it contacts, leaching dangerous heavy metals and mercury into the environment. How do you reclaim water that has been acidified and the plants and animals that are killed off? Reclamation costs are used to determine what the financial assurance is that will be required. But how can we give a dollar value to the damage once it's occurred? Financial assurance must be enough to protect Minnesota taxpayers in the future; long after the mining company is gone. Protection from bankruptcy is important, also, because Minnesotans otherwise would be left liable for any costs. The SDEIS is inadequate. It doesn't provide a financial assurance plan that will remain viable for 500 years and account for all unanticipated liability. How can it? How can a corporate entity be held accountable for these costs over centuries? The answer is get all costs up front. But we really don't know what the costs of the water treatment monitoring maintenance and repair for decades and even centuries are. This mine plan still fails to provide details on the amount and form of financial assurance that is needed to fully protect taxpayers. The actual cost of monitoring, maintaining, replacing equipment and protections over the course of hundreds of years needs to be built into the costs and the financial assurance estimates. The PolyMet's Director of Environmental Permitting and Compliance says that we don't need to know how long water treatment will be needed. They will -- the company will prepare for treating the water for as long as it takes. This doesn't make sense. How can the state be assured that sufficient financial assurance will cover the costs if we don't know how long these costs will last? And so we can't know the total costs. The SDEIS is inadequate for that reason, as well. Another reason the SDEIS is inadequate is that the economic analysis is not complete. What jobs really will go to Minnesotans and which ones will go to non-Minnesota, non-U.S. employees? What about the jobs that are displaced or disappear when the mining starts, and what about those jobs that disappear afterwards? A cost-benefit analysis is needed. When the mine closes, there will be costs due to the impact of lost jobs, unemployment and other societal costs. The SDEIS does not take these into account. Displacement of other economic activities should be part of the cost-benefit analysis, including activities associated with hunting, fishing, ecotourism and outdoor recreation. In conclusion, the SDEIS is inadequate in multiple ways and doesn't provide insurance that our water and our environment will be protected, despite the mining for the entire period of time that the damage will occur. We must be strong and vigilant to protect these precious natural resources. Thank you.

42918

Hello, this message is addressed to Ms Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Mr Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Mr Tim Dabney, US Forest Service. My comments on the SDEIS for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange are attached. I will also send a paper copy to the mailing address listed for Ms Lisa Fay at the DNR. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this extremely important SDEIS. Please keep me on all mailing lists/groups regarding the NorthMet/Polymet proposal. Sincerely, Deborah Huskins 2624 Windsor Lane Woodbury, MN 551225

54482

See attachment

Deborah J Rasmussen

42740

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Kleese 42542

See attachment

Deborah Meyer 39913

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Deborah Meyer 4970 150th Ln NW Ramsey, MN 55303-4293 (763) 323-9338

Deborah Morse 54508

See attachment

Deborah Robinson 58142

I, Deborah Robinson (774 Timber Lane, Shoreview MN 55126), do not support copper/nickel mining in northern Minnesota because:#1) The risk to water quality is far too great (sulfuric acid pollution for many years, perhaps centuries, into the future) for the limited number of jobs (350) that would result over such a limited time (20 years); There are many less risky ways (both financially and environmentally) to revitalize the economy of northern Minnesota without copper/nickel mining;#2) Hardrock mining history in other U.S. states has proven that hardrock mining companies usually declare bankruptcy long before mine site cleanup is done leaving tax payers, such as myself, paying for the long-term cleanup costs - there is no reason to believe that PolyMet would or could do better;

Deborah Walsh 16392

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Deborah Walsh 1124 N 2nd street Stillwater, MN 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Walsh

49950

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Deborah Walsh 1124 N 2nd street Stillwater, MN 55082

Deborah Webster

28650

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm sure you've read many similar messages from other Sierra Club members. My main concerns are irreparable environmental damage and lack of a good plan to prevent accidents, along with sufficient funds being set aside to clean up the mess after PolyMet has stripped the earth of anything valuable. History has shown that other mining interests have simply declared bankruptcy to avoid paying clean up costs. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Deborah Webster 2298 Snowshoe Ln E Saint Paul, MN 55119-5900 (651) 731-4662

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deborah Winter

40137

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Deborah Zeleznik

26407

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please consider these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota, but we must learn from past mistakes. Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters everywhere sulfide mining has occurred. It threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams and will affect the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I'm concerned about our region's natural resources and public health, risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, not to mention the cumulative effects from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet not in the public's interest, only PolyMet's. Sincerely, Deborah Zeleznik 1200 Beach Ave La Grange Park, IL 60526-1243 (708) 352-3141

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debra Barnhardt

9802

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Debra Barnhardt 3416 Zenith Ave North Robbinsdale, MN 55422

18601

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Debra Barnhardt 3416 Zenith Ave North Robbinsdale, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debra Barnhardt

50677

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Debra Barnhardt 3416 Zenith Ave North Robbinsdale, MN 55422

Debra Cless

18117

My name is Debra Cless. I'm a resident of Ely, Minnesota. And I would like to address some issues that have come up again and again in this discussion. Science-data-driven outcomes and socioeconomics. My comments will really focus on what I perceive to be flaws in two interactive parts of the SDEIS, modeling of water movement at the mine site and current hydrology. And the impact of these model errors on another section, which is the socioeconomic section. After reviewing the information -- I have read the whole SDEIS, and I have especially paid attention to Chapter 8 and Appendix C. And in there there are scientific studies. And the ones I found most compelling were the five letters and memos contained in the hydrology section of Appendix C. I contend that these problems in the model -- and we've heard some questions about the importance of modeling -- and I would also call attention to the fact that it's PolyMet's modeling itself that has contained 200-year and 500-year outcomes. However, the model water quality at 500 years is only the point at which the water doesn't get worse. The predictions in these models create serious challenges to prediction of critical economic components. Future mitigation and remediation costs. Risk assessment cannot be separated from risk management. Therefore, critical flaws, present in the assessment of risks, will lead to critical flaws in estimations of future costs. I will highlight the flaws briefly. I included them in my comment that I submitted. First of all, when we're looking at the model, the major tenet of the model is that computer simulations are discredited if the things you are looking at have not been tested and do not reflect adequate field conditions. The surface water model failed to do that. Secondly, the (inaudible) model, which predicted water quality at the mine site also did do (inaudible) that's it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debra Eypm

40738

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Debra Frasier

22723

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The slew of recent tragedy-inspiring broken pipes, holding tanks, and containment systems should be warning to us enough: There will be an accident. It is a matter of time. What happens then. Will this company be around in 50 years to take care of the problem. No. And we are talking an extension of 500 years for possible containment problems. We trade all this for jobs that will last at best 20 years, and the bulk of the profits will be exported. It does not make sense to open the flood gates of permits to the dangers of this kind of mining. But let us at least have a fair idea of the health dangers, not brush this under the rug for after the fact. I have read the materials on both sides and understand what it means to be without work in a community. We must do better than this. Please do not proceed with this mining effort without the health assessment. Sincerely, Debra Frasier 45 Barton Avenue SE Minneapolis, MN 55414 Sincerely, Ms Debra Frasier 45 Barton Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-3511 (612) 379-0424

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debra Frasier 58098

I have come to this meeting because I am 60 years old and grew up in Florida. After 30 years in Minnesota I can tell you that the pristine beauty of your state is the most valuable treasure you have. It seems, from the present, that job here-and-now is the gold --- it is not. Look at Florida, my homeland ---sold for jobs and now plagued with natural disasters in water quality run off, and soil erosions, contaminating water ways. Now, water is the gold. Minnesota has a chance to keep its gold. Every protected area of this country has proved its value and that will only increase. Don't sell to the short sighted job – protect the gold – we cannot sign up for a “plan” that counts on 500 years of cleanup for a job today. The math does not work.

debra haveri 4410

People just have to check out what happened in Ladysmith Wisc. The Flambeau river.. Maybe then theyandapos;ll take their head out of their as___es and realize we should not allow polymet here.. “*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)” wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Debra Thurlo 41858

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Debra Thurlo 1135 Loma Linda Ave Mound, MN 55364-9759

Debra Wilde 40030

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the “evaluation locations” used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Debra Wilde 902 3rd Ave S Virginia, MN 55792

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Debrah Billmeier

18270

Deborah, D-E-B-O-R-A-H, B-I-L-L-M-E-I-E-R, Mound. I've never been able to find the words to adequately express the value that the wilderness has on, from as far as I can tell, everyone that has ever been there. That is the wilderness of northern Minnesota would probably be a little more accurate. There is no amount of money that could ever replace this ancient wilderness. I think if everyone could have the amazing experience that the peace and freedom nature provides, they would agree it is stupid and reckless to open mines that would endanger this rare and interesting environment. I find the history of the Polymet/Swiss owner's mining company's practices extremely disturbing. Despite the sulfide mineral mining company's promises, they have never proven that they can prevent the extremely toxic waste and the sulfuric acid from entering into the surrounding environment. With fresh water being the most valuable resource, this mining project, it is like the worst location for it to be a test site. It is near Lake Superior, the largest freshwater source in the world. It seems like a pretty stupid place to just see if it is not going to do it. I hope that we will continue to protect the wilderness and truly leave a better Minnesota for future generations.

Debsonstage

10358

I am concerned about the sulfide mining that is proposed on the range due to the great risk of our ecology from Babbit through The Great Lakes. Not one of the mines that has done this type of insult to the land has contained the pollution and my question is why is this even on the books waisting tax payer money. Todd Gremmels 1626 London Road Duluth MN 55812

Dee Ann Christensen

41890

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Dee Ann Christensen Coon Rapids, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dee Awe

16535

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dee Ray

3162

POLYMET IS A COMPANY THAT DOES WHAT THEY SAY. THEY ARE A GREAT EXAMPLE OF BUSINESS AT ITS BEST. THE LEADERS ARE ETHICAL, SINCERE AND HONEST. MINNESOTA NEEDS THESE JOBS AND IT WILL HELP THE STATE IMMENSELY. Dee Ray

57424

POLYMET IS A COMPANY THAT DOES WHAT THEY SAY. THEY ARE A GREAT EXAMPLE OF BUSINESS AT ITS BEST. THE LEADERS ARE ETHICAL, SINCERE AND HONEST. MINNESOTA NEEDS THESE JOBS AND IT WILL HELP THE STATE IMMENSELY. Dee Ray

Deidre Moderacki

26851

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please include climate change expectations in your plan. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Therefore, please justify the anticipated loss of fresh water, wetlands, wildlife and public health in your plan. Show me where you stand in regard to America's water. Sincerely, Deidre Moderacki 626 E 14th St New York, NY 10009-3312

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Deja White

54213

I don't think you should allow this mine to be done. The boundary waters is the only natural and beautiful land here in Minnesota. Digging this mine will intamenate the waters. Ruining the habitat of the animals around it and in the waters. Your polluting the waters with sulfuric acids making the pH go down. Which means no more fishing for the people who love to do so. The wilderness is a very historic place being open since 1978. What about the future generations? Building this mine will polute multiple lakes and rivers.

Delia Santiago-Stulc

41822

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Delia Santiago-Stulc Circle Pines, Minnesota

Delores Dufner

38736

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Delores Dufner 104 Chapel Ln Saint Joseph, MN 56374-2020

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Denise Coviello

40287

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Denise Coviello 1338 Virginia Trail Youngstown, OH 44505 US

DENISE KASTNER

40304

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, DENISE KASTNER 17667 GRANT ST LOWELL, IN 46356 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Denise Marlowe

39196

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Denise Mueller

16152

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Denise Perry

58039

Explore more options for disposal! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Denise Thomas

41749

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Denise Wunderlich

31534

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Allowing sulfide mining to begin would pose a threat to wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, as has been demonstrated by the heavy metal contamination that has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. This proposed project has major potential negative impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, and harm to wildlife. Allowing PolyMet to build an open pit sulfide mine, using a Federal land exchange that includes protected Superior National Forest land is not in the public interest. I beseech you not to move forward on this project. Sincerely, Denise Wunderlich 13730 Vernon St Oak Park, MI 48237-1387

Dennis Cleaveland

37282

Dear Sir or Madam: I have read the SDEIS and attended a public meeting regarding the Polymet Northmet Project at Hoyt Lakes, MN. My conclusion is that as a result of the treatment facilities and methods proposed by Polymet, the industrial water returned to the St Louis river basin will be cleaner than the water currently in the river and its basin. In the chapter of the SDEIS labeled "Major Differences of Opinion", detractors arguments often include "we don't know . or . has not been addressed". The totality of the SDEIS belie those statements. The project is environmentally responsible and should go forward lest I think all reason is lost in Minnesota. Dennis Cleaveland 2454 Cliff View Circle Two harbors, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dennis DesMarais 54674

See attachment

Dennis Dietzel 3099

There are many concerns I have about the proposed Polymet nickel and copper mine. The main concern is around the subject of ongoing water quality. From my reading of the environmental impact statement there would need to be water remediation for 200 to 500 years. I don't understand how one can plan for remediation that would last that long. The United States as a country is just over 200 years old, and, to my knowledge there are no corporations that have ever existed nearly that long. I cannot support a project that compromises water quality of the area and Lake Superior that far into the future. We have no idea how many resources would be required 100's of years from now to handle such a situation. Based on my comments above, I would like to register my opposition to the proposed Polymet nickel and copper mine project. Dennis Dietzel 2954 Hamline Avenue Roseville, MN 55113 651-633-0432

Dennis Dunphy 50934

The DNR has not been able to answer any of my questions on the Poly Met Mine proposal. Now, Let us stop this madness. The DNR continues to back a project without being able to answer basic and important questions. Such as, how to they plan to forecast the value of a human life lost due to pollution from the mine. How many mines will open up. How can Poly Met open a mine when they have not money to do so. Why would we let a Canadian mining company like Poly Met open a mine in Minnesota since they have no ties to the United States. How can they predict the success of technology never used in the Boundary Waters area. Have they looked at the pollution of other mines and told the public the truth about the pollution from these other mines. Why has the DNR used numbers given them by Poly Met without doing their own analysis. How can they not look at the action needed when pollution takes place which it will. What are the actions that will take place when a river is polluted. It is stupid to continue on with this political game when Mr Brad Moore used to work for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and not is a mouth piece for Poly Met. He has a degree in political science. And we know how politicians lie all the time. It is insane. Stop it. Dennis Dunphy 1-320-290-5330 [HYPERLINK "mailto:dunphy@cloudnet-com"](mailto:dunphy@cloudnet-com) 535 6th St Apt. 101 Avon, Mn. 56310

50935

I have proof that Poly Met, DNR, and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency don't hAve History. History is the real story of truth and pollution. Pollution that takes place when those know it all said that technology will make certain pollution will not happen. Look at the mines in Nevada. Look at Reserve Mining and the asbestos in Lake Superior some forty years ago. If you don't remember you are to young to remember it. Look how the Gulf of Mexico turns red from pollution. Technology fails all the time. Look at how the Titanic was unsinkable. The Poly Met Mine will pollute and kill. It will kill a large area right off the bat. As soon as the first shovel is dropped to remove rock, it is dead forever. Look at the zebra muscles spreading like wildfire from lake to lake. OK. The water from northern Minnesota goes all the way to the ocean and is used several times by cities on its way to the ocean. Once that water is polluted it is no good anymore. You wouldn't be able to drink it or swim in it. You wouldn't be able to fish it. So, nobody comes to Minnesota anymore to fish or camp. Because politicians set on their duffs and let it happen. The Chamber of Commerce and their buddies wanted the jobs. I can't see any future or benefit here at a Poly Met Mine. Finally, Poly Met has not money to do what they keep promising along with the DNR to do. Poly Met is a Canadian company with not legal or moral ties to Minnesota or the US The only source of money for them is the American citizens. NO. Now, People have been warned and they need to stop this catastrophe from happening to our beautiful state and other states.

Dennis Falk 39977

I am writing to oppose the NorthMet (Polymet) Mining Project. As I read the SDEIS and understand state statutes and regulations, this project will not meet the allowable standards for water quality. The mining activity will last perhaps 30 years, but the need to treat water to bring it to an allowable standards will likely last 200-500 years. I do not believe this situation meets the letter or spirit of the law, and I urge you to NOT issue a permit for this project to proceed at this time. Sincerely, Dennis R. Falk 16 South 25th Avenue East Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dennis Ferche

43089

To: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Fr: Dennis S. Ferche, Phd-Chemical Research and Life in General Re: The possibility of the mining of copper and nickel in Minnesota as proposed by Polymet Mining Inc.-The related Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). NOTE: In December of 2007, The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency released a report for public environmental review of a proposed Ash Disposal Facility in West Lakeland Township of Washington County- (this is as near the St Croix River). I compiled and made my comments before the MPCA at that time. Now we have the current mining proposal and this again involves the hazards of exposure to heavy metals via land, air, and water contaminants. My concerns with the heavy metals, at that time, carry over to this SDEIS. Therefore, I won't take the time from preparations for gardening (food production) and other worthy endeavors. Instead I offer some philosophy and some proposals that I believe pertain: 1) As I see it this proposal projects to give our youth another task into perpetuity. 500 years for monitoring and maintaining quality control seems almost comparable to tending to nuclear waste facilities for thousands of years. It seems time to review the nature of such endeavors, versus bringing on new ones-(How is the atoms for peace initiative working out around the world-as 400 tons of radioactive water escapes from the Japanese plant daily). I contend our creative youth may want to do otherwise. Note: This is evidenced by many choosing pathways where the ownership of an automobile can be avoided. 2) It has been reported that a ton of typical high tech equipment contains much more gold and other resource material than does several tons of related ores. I contend we need to get at reclamation in a proper manner. Currently, I understand that many items get sent to China for recycling-Reports are that much of this is done in a manner that is not respectful of the Earth or the life upon it. Meanwhile, over the years, I have listened to the statement via the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: "All people deserve a healthy and productive life". I concur, and we need to work that philosophy into current and future activities-Here, in China, and Everywhere. For this purpose, I propose that before any mining might be provided for that Reclamation of related resources be done and evidenced near the 100% level. Further, if any mining is to be allowed, that an accounting of resources be provided for-Meaning: Mined resources shall be tracked and followed through production and reclamation. Those planning to use the minerals need to provide the plan and the means for their reclamation in environmentally sound manners. 3) These days, as in much of the past, we hear jobs, jobs, jobs as the mantra-I contend that now we need to put the emphasis on evolving more worthy jobs. My top priorities are for the production of healthy soils and healthy foods-and grown locally as first preference. Secondly, in the worthy job category, we need to get on with the production of our fabrics, and related materials, via the growing and processing of industrial hemp-In contrast to importing these products. ∴ Gotta go now-Worthy Endeavors to Everyone, With Appreciation, Dr Dennis S. Ferche, Phd 1535 Stagecoach Trail South Afton Mn. 55001-9703; 715-338-2342

Dennis Good

38576

To whom it may concern: In case this e-mail or attached letter encounter any problems in the sending, a paper copy is also on the way Thanks for your time Dennis good

54729

See attachment

Dennis Hansen

57516

Dear MN DNR, As an aquatic biologist and resident of Duluth MN, I would like to voice my support for the mining industry in northern MN. There are several people that are rightfully concerned about the degradation of water and habitat in the mining areas. However, with proper mine planning, the short and long term effects can be turned into positive assets. In the short term, the extra air emissions from processing can be mitigated with today's technology, it will not cost too much more. Sulfide runoff can be reduced with proper mine contouring, wastewater treatment (even something as simple as limestone treatments). In the long term, the abandoned mine pits can be contoured properly and be turned into new lakes, lake homes and property tax revenue. The catchment areas for these new lakes can be contoured and coated with bentonite and/or top soil and replanted. These mines are future lakes. Even though I am a proponent of mining in northern MN, I do recognize, in the past, mining companies have taken MN's resources, siphoned the profits away from MN, declared bankruptcy and left a mess behind. Today's mining industry should come out with short term and long term plans to alleviate these concerns and gain public support. In short, most everyone agrees that northern MN needs the industry and nobody wants mining to leave our water and habitat degraded, but with today's technology, we can turn the future abandoned mines into lakes and recreational assets. Thank you for your time, Dennis
Dennis L. Hansen M.Sc Aquatic Biologist and citizen 4284 Kingston Road Duluth MN 55803 218-626-5944 [HYPERLINK "mailto:dlhansen@d.umn.edu"](mailto:dlhansen@d.umn.edu)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

dennis kaleta

40838

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources March 10, 2014 I am a resident of St Louis County, Minnesota and for many months now I have been listening and reading about the pros and cons of the proposed PolyMet copper mine in my county and region. After much thought and study, I've come to the conclusion that, while this development, like any of this scale and investment, would provide good-paying jobs in my part of the state, I see this mine as doing much more harm than good. I have seen copper mine operations in the American West and am aware of the long-term consequences. Copper mining is fraught with environmental problems There's a long history of toxic tailings and wastes, and mining companies that simply "take the money and run", leaving others to deal with the problems they've left behind. And these mines aren't placed like this one would be, in fragile wetlands near protected wilderness and the Lake Superior watershed. The minerals are there, but is this the right place to unearth them. There are far too many unknown variables with this project. The very process proposed to treat the toxic wastes is in question. Doesn't it border on insanity to talk about treating mining wastes for hundreds of years. This is not something that's been done before and planning to do such a thing, for this length of time, only proves how strange this type of thinking is. The health effects of this project, unearthing toxins and exposing these to air and water are unknown, and this has not been addressed in the EIS. Recently a group of health care specialists in Duluth pointed this out. Some of these concerns are mercury, toxic metals, arsenic, and asbestos-like fibers. What are the cumulative effects of pollution/toxins from the proposed operation along with current iron ore mining operations. A Health Impact Assessment should be required and it is surprising that this hasn't been done. We should know how many lives will be affected by these environmental toxins, and the sociological and economic costs. It is my understanding that native wild rice areas are already impacted by problems linked to water quality. I think it is of utmost importance that wild rice be protected and managed for no further loss and, in fact, wild rice should be re-introduced where it's been lost It is unknown how this project will affect wild rice, hence our water quality and our quality of life in Minnesota, where water is our life. Some talk about changing our environmental standards and regulations to accommodate this new form of mining, but that is terribly misguided and shortsighted. How will this development affect the tenuous moose population. Thousands of acres of wetlands and moose habitat will be destroyed, with an impact that reaches beyond this immediate development. Critical Canada lynx habitat will be lost, as well. These concerns should be addressed. It is not required in this EIS, but considering the scope of this project and the pervasive pollution it will create, the technology and costs of containing and remediation of this pollution for hundreds of years MUST be part of this permitting process. It seems likely that more jobs would be created to clean up the pollution over hundreds of years, long after the twenty years of active mining. Ultimately I feel the question is: Are we in Minnesota willing to take a gamble on hundreds of years of toxins in our environment for a few hundreds jobs that will last a couple of decades. It has become an emotional issue for many on the Iron Range, an "us versus them" attitude, but this activity would have an impact far beyond the immediate area. One generation of good jobs is not worth twenty generations of pollution and health risks. Sincerely, Dennis Kaleta 1424 W. Knife River Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616

Dennis Kittock

21459

We are very much against the opening of N.E. Minnesota to any mining. You can be sure that the mining companies will figure out a way to leave us with a big mess. We are also very concerned about water contamination. All we need to do is look at past history. Dennis and Helen Kittock 401 Creekview Lane Arlington, Mn 55307

dennis mackey

7741

I used to work at LTV and do support polymet 100%, its about time to let them start building and mining. Thanks Dennis Mackey 501 N Auburn Ave Eveleth, MN 55734 218-744-3498

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dennis Mashuga

19820

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dennis Mashuga 754 Havenview Ct Mendota Heights, MN 55120

49557

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dennis Mashuga 754 Havenview Ct Mendota Heights, MN 55120

Alphabetical by sender's first name

DENNIS NELSON

28040

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, For what it is worth, being an experienced wildlife observer (including a "birder" with a "life list" of over 500 bird species), I have enjoyed visiting Illinois Beach State Park and Indiana Dunes State Park/Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, besides Northerly Island Bird and Butterfly Sanctuary on Chicago's South Side, along Make Michigan-especially during the spring migratory bird season. As a naturalist and an environmental researcher who has lived in the Chicago Metropolitan Area since the Winter of 1982, the entire Great Lakes Region MUST be immediately protected from ALL forms of toxic pollution. Therefore, please accept my comments on the PolyMet Mining Corporation's proposed NorthMet open-pit sulfide mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Lake Superior-a vast freshwater resource unique among the Great Lakes-and the millions of acres of wildlands, about 1,000 pristine lakes and streams, and around 1,500 miles of canoe routes within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness MUST BE PROTECTED FROM THE PROPOSED OPEN-PIT SULFIDE MINE. The destruction of fish and wildlife habitat from polluted lakes and rivers, contaminated drinking water, huge cleanup costs (preventing the toxic chemical pollution in the first place is always the best option), and "hundred-year recovery" make ANY (AND ALL) OPEN-PIT SULFIDE MINING JUST TOO 'TOXIC' AND 'HAZARDOUS' FOR THAT REGION. (In fact, inherently 'dirty' sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. Again, this threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.) Continuing on, acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has happened. I have really serious concerns about this project's potential impacts on that region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife species/populations (like the threatened Lynx and declining Moose populations), and the cumulative impacts from open-pit sulfide mining. (Even according to the PolyMet Mining Corporation's own study, the water from the open-pit sulfide mining site will require at least 500 years of treatment.) Finally, the federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open-pit sulfide mine is NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST-AND SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED. Sincerely, DENNIS NELSON 3817 S Winchester Ave FL 2 Chicago, IL 60609-2011

Dennis Purkat

18102

Good evening. My name is Dennis Purkat. I was born and raised in McKinley, Minnesota. The only reason I'm here is because my father raised eight children on a miner's salary, in a three-bedroom house. We didn't kill each other. We have all gone on to successful careers and lives here. I am fully behind this project because I work for a company. I am an independent sales rep and a lot of my friends and business associates are here tonight. I would just like to say thank you for all of the support they give me. I could raise my children. They have already -- they are going on to bigger and better things. I want to stay here. I just passed a 20-year milestone for the company I work for. I firmly believe this is a good project and I think that PolyMet is also going to support me in my endeavors in being a sales rep, and I just wish them well. And I hope that everybody here that is young and looking for a good job, that is willing to stay here and pay their taxes, I think it is a win-win situation for all of us. Thank you for your time.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dennis Szymialis

18326

My name is Dennis Szymialis. My great-grandparents homesteaded in Northeastern Minnesota in (inaudible) township (inaudible) had a cross versed economy in agriculture. Today the St. Louis River is polluted by iron mining, runoff from the iron mines; and it's led to a situation where that once rich land of the St. Louis River Valley no long enables us to feed ourselves. I want to say that my mother was a sergeant in the Army Corps of Engineers. And I'm disappointed that there wasn't anybody with a uniform on that she wore that's here for me to ask questions of at this hearing today. Myself I'm a graduate of the University of North Dakota School of Law where I took courses in oil and gas law, agriculture law. I want to assure people that there will be downstream victims of the sulfide mine runoff that will occur at PolyMet. And I want to point out a couple of things with the EIS. I want to emphasize that it's vague and ambiguous. That the liners are called geo liners because they're merely packed down on dirt of some sort. The reverse osmosis procedure that's being promised won't filter out arsenic, which is (inaudible) at a neutral level. Filter out another carcinogen, nickel sulfate. And these will get into our drinking water downstream and the downstream consumers of that water will be the victims. In addition to our natural environment, the plants and animals that rely on clean water. The Federal Land Management Policy requires that the EIS -- if you read it, there's a number of places where excuses are made for the economics not favoring the proponent, the mining company. They're not required under case law to be allowed -- they're required to do all mitigation regardless of the cost under the Federal Land Management Policy Act. And when this case comes before (inaudible) I want you to all look at the decisions being made by the court and make sure that they follow the Federal Land Management Policy Act and require all mitigation rather than what is economically beneficial to the mining companies. Last of all, I want to talk about jobs. This is isn't a job promoter, this is a job killer. First of all, we've been asked and we are currently subsidizing PolyMet to the tune of 12 percent (inaudible).

47215

POLYMET SDEIS COMMENTS Allowing only 90 days for public comment for this project is inadequate to fully vet objections to the project which PolyMet and lead agencies have allegedly spent tens of millions of dollars and more than 9 years. The comments given below should be given deference for judicial review under these circumstances or be determined to violate due process notice and comment requirements. The comments given should be regarded as conservative objections and be given a broad reading. The lead agencies are being paid to provide an SDEIS that will be permitted. This payment conflicts with their permitting and monitoring responsibilities. For them the permitting of PolyMet is nothing less than employment featherbedding. They have an pecuniary interest in permitting PolyMet including the promotion of future projects that will go through licensing and which they will have to monitor. The agencies are denying cumulative impacts because they want to hide their own misconduct. Why should we have to tolerate "evaluation criteria" that they created in the first place. Is every watershed available for contamination of "evaluation criteria." "But no one is sure if arsenic levels below the 10-microgram threshold are completely "safe." And researchers are still studying whether there could be health effects at those concentrations." at <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/24/us-chile-cancer-idUSTRE80N1YJ20120124-> While most sources attribute lower cancer rates from arsenic in Chile there was one at least source that I read that indicated it was from a change in water supply. Future monitoring and the filling in of some very substantial gaps of the SDEIS will be left to these lead agencies that have contracted with PolyMet to act on their behalf. These agencies have already in the DEIS written an EIS that was rejected by the EPA. This does not mean that the EPA will continue to save us. It only means that the EPA will be the focus of pressure to capitulate. Because environmental organizations rely on donations they are also subject to the pressure of being financially influenced. Volunteers cannot be relied on to continue to carry the load. There is little hope without drawing a line in the sand to stop PolyMet. Unlike Bangladesh we have a choice <http://www.bmj.com/content/342/bmj.d2431-> The MDNR that told us that the DEIS would protect us is going to be the agency that will be paid to monitor compliance. They will present us with test results that are self serving. The only thing worse than being poisoned is being poisoned and told to drink the water anyway because it won't hurt you. At their most hoped for best these agencies deal in an imperfect world of subjective standards and judicial over-site. The arsenic standard in particular is unreasonably low as it was the standard adopted from that set by the World Health Organization at a time when detection technology was limited and as a result was set at 10 parts per billion. We should not be threatened by claims that PolyMet will meet government standard that are third world at the outset. The primary obligation of the lead agency is to protect public health and any cutting corners or exception to that rule is a violation of their social contract with individual citizens, undermines their constitutional legitimacy and is a betrayal of the american revolution. What is the deal with putting the filtrate from the mechanical treatment in "licensed landfills." This simply delays the release of toxins like thousands of tons of arsenic into the environment. What licensed landfill would take the stuff and what kind of vicious monster would be doing the licensing anyway. Maybe the Duluth Chamber of Commerce will volunteer the Gary New Duluth landfill that emits a plume down Sergeant Creek into the St Louis River. Reliance on sorption or absorption of arsenic by iron compounds currently is not taking place in the tailings basin or at the mine site. Releases of arseni

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dennis Szymialis

48162

Dennis, Thank you for the discussion during the Duluth meeting and for your comments. Your comments will be included in the administrative record and considered as the state and federal co-leads for the project update the SDEIS. Sincerely, Doug Bruner ---Original Message--- From: Dennis Szymialis [mailto:shrimpshadow@hotmail-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 9:47 AM To: Bruner, Douglas W MVP Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: NorthMet Comments- Szymialis Dear Mr Bruner; I am the person that you talked to after giving my spoken comments in Duluth. You encouraged me to write comments so I am forwarding them to you after e-mailing them to the MDNR. I am convinced more than ever that the PolyMet project will be an economic and health disaster for Minnesota which will most adversely impact N.E. Minnesota. I think the process including the 90 day comment period limitation is offensive and dangerous to the public. The process presents a callous disregard for the public generally. If any of the agencies are offended by my comments they well should be as that was my intention. Sincerely Dennis Szymialis _____ From: shrimpshadow@hotmail-com To: northmetsdeis.dnr@state.mn.us Subject: NorthMet Comments- Szymialis Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2014 10:23:12 -0400 POLYMET SDEIS COMMENTS Allowing only 90 days for public comment for this project is inadequate to fully vet objections to the project which PolyMet and lead agencies have allegedly spent tens of millions of dollars and more than 9 years. The comments given below should be given deference for judicial review under these circumstances or be determined to violate due process notice and comment requirements. The comments given should be regarded as conservative objections and be given a broad reading. The lead agencies are being paid to provide an SDEIS that will be permitted. This payment conflicts with their permitting and monitoring responsibilities. For them the permitting of PolyMet is nothing less than employment featherbedding. They have an pecuniary interest in permitting PolyMet including the promotion of future projects that will go through licensing and which they will have to monitor. The agencies are denying cumulative impacts because they want to hide their own misconduct. Why should we have to tolerate "evaluation criteria" that they created in the first place. Is every watershed available for contamination of "evaluation criteria." "But no one is sure if arsenic levels below the 10-microgram threshold are completely "safe." And researchers are still studying whether there could be health effects at those concentrations." at <http://www.reuters-com/article/2012/01/24/us-chile-cancer-idUSTRE80N1YJ20120124-> While most sources attribute lower cancer rates from arsenic in Chile there was one at least source that I read that indicated it was from a change in water supply. Future monitoring and the filling in of some very substantial gaps of the SDEIS will be left to these lead agencies that have contracted with PolyMet to act on their behalf. These agencies have already in the DEIS written an EIS that was rejected by the EPA. This does not mean that the EPA will continue to save us. It only means that the EPA will be the focus of pressure to capitulate. Because environmental organizations rely on donations they are also subject to the pressure of being financially influenced. Volunteers cannot be relied on to continue to carry the load. There is little hope without drawing a line in the sand to stop PolyMet. Unlike Bangladesh we have a choice <http://www.bmj-com/content/342/bmj.d2431-> The MDNR that told us that the DEIS would protect us is going to be the agency that will be paid to monitor compliance. They will present us with test results that are self serving. The only thing worse than being poisoned is being poisoned and told to drink the water anyway because it won't hurt you. At their most hoped for best these agencies deal in an imperfect wor

Denny FitzPatrick

7377

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Hi, I wanted to submit my public comment on the Polymet project: The possibility of water contamination for hundreds of years is not worth the risk. They should have to PROVE IT FIRST that it is a safe environmental project. We taxpayers could be left with the burden of cleanup, after Polymet is long gone. Please resist the big corporate pressure, money and power to fast-track this project. Don't just take their word for it. Protect our clean water. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion, Dennis FitzPatrick PO Box 563 Grand Marais MN 55604-0563 dfitz@boreal-org 218-387-9000

Derrick Passe

44876

Polymet is proposing to construct a mine in NE Minnesota. Their model predicts and increase in mercury concentration in the Embarrass River. While the Embarrass River is not currently considered impaired for mercury in fish tissue, most of the lakes and many of the streams Northern Minnesota are impaired. This includes downstream resources such as Embarrass Lake and the St Louis River. Given the existing mercury impairments and the likelihood of fish to pass between Embarrass Lake and Embarrass River, I would ask that the Polymet proposal be revised to demonstrate NO increase in mercury to any receiving water. Derrick Passe 763-286-0570

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Devin Vosdingh

54356

Dear Lisa Fey,EIS Project Manager,The PolyMet Mining, Inc. can be a very good thing and a very bad thing for Minnesota. They have a sturdy plan in place. Mining can be a good thing. it can skyrocket economies, it provides jobs, and it's a good way to get natural resources. Some advantages to PolyMet Mining are a better economy. And, it will provide Minnesotans with more jobs. Some disadvantages are that it could seriously damage the environment and Minnesota's amazing wild animals. Waste could run off into the mighty Mississippi. You need to weigh the pros with the cons and come up with the best decision for all of us.This will also affect cultural resources. I'm part Native American and even though my family doesn't celebrate their traditions, it's still a big part of my life. even though the project does not take place on reservation land it still affects all Native Americans and Minnesotans in general. Will all the waste from the sites affect the people? Will people with seasonal and environmental allergies to dust be affected? I'm affected by it because two of my uncle works in mining and I hardly ever see them. One of them plans on moving to PolyMet if they start up. I don't know if his family would ever see him.I do agree with the Land Exchange.This affects me because lots of my family is in the mining business. This will also affect me because some of my family lives in Fond du Lac and Vermillion. A segment of the Vermillion Trail will be affected. Will that cause a chain reaction to the people being affected? Will people be affected because of the noise, vibrations, dust and access restrictions? These are the questions you need to ask yourselves. Is this the best thing for Minnesota? And, if not, how can you improve the situation so we get the maximum amount of use out of the deal?One of my questions is why did PolyMet pick the state Minnesota? Why did they pick Northern Minnesota? Is that where the maximum amount of ore is? I think the project can be a very good thing for Minnesota. it can make some peoples lives easier and others harder. You need to make sure this is what you want for Minnesota. Because, not matter what you choose it will impact all of us.Devin Vosdingh,

Dewayne Townsend

39742

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Dewayne Townsend 3222 39th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2212 (612) 724-7010

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diadra Decker

40125

From: diadra@att-net [diadra@att-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:58 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Diadra Decker PO Box 2472 Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-8472

Diana

43368

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Minnesota is blessed with water. THAT is a valuable resource. Just because it is not a resource to be "owned" by a for-profit company it is not a resource to be wasted on the environmental disaster proposed by PolyMet. If this proposed mine was on the outskirts of Minneapolis and proposed to use water from chain of lakes it would have been dead a long time ago. Out of sight, out of mind does not apply to water. Sincerely, Diana Wright

Diana Anshakov

23151

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Northern MN and the BWCA are one of few unspoiled wilderness areas left. Please protect them for future generations to enjoy as I have. Sincerely, Diana Anshakov 2928 N 4425th Rd Newark, IL 60541-9123

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diana Moore

57333

My statements almost come across as questions. I am Diana Moore. So, like I said, I think that my concerns come out more as questions. One would be I am concerned about how long these mines will actually -- this mine that we are coming here tonight for would actually be operating, in the whole scheme of things. And, also, after it does close, or it is closed, who is going to be taking care of the land and the water that will be exposed and potentially polluting? After the closing of the plant, I am concerned about the length of time that the purification is going to be necessary. I have read that it could be up to 500 years, 200 or 500 years (indicating). And who would be responsible for this? Who would actually be accountable or who would actually take care of it? Who is taking care of it? I would -- I don't think that the underground mining has been examined thoroughly. It has not been looked at as a choice; an alternative. And I think that there needs to be a study for that. And I am wondering about the number of jobs that it actually does create. The number that would be at the beginning of the project, when the infrastructure and when all of it is getting actually built, and then the mining. But after the initial operations get started, is there going to be a great difference in the number of jobs? I sort of foresee that perhaps there will be a lot of jobs at first, and then when the operation gets going normally, that there will be a lot fewer jobs. That's it. Okay. Thank you.

dianadarc@provide.net

43333

You may include me using the email address of my original note. That is [HYPERLINK "mailto:dianadarc@provide-net"](mailto:dianadarc@provide-net)dianadarc@provide-net Thank you. on Mar 13, 2014, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Diane

45411

To: NorthMet [HYPERLINK "mailto:SDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:SDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)SDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us From Diane Klinefelter Date: March 12, 2014 The PolyMet mine plan should be altered to include greater protection and replacement of wetlands. The peat bogs that will be destroyed are habitat to many animals and plants and the plan does not adequately address replacement of the unique habitat of the peat bogs in the nearby area. I would like the DNR to provide in greater detail and with more accuracy the length of time that water polluted by the Poly Met mine will need to be treated. My understanding is that even after hundreds of years there will be polluted water from a closed mine that will be entering the watershed. A longer projection and plan for protecting the watershed must be included. Another way that PolyMet would affect the environment would be using a large amount of electricity, more than likely from dirty coal power plants in Minnesota. In keeping with Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions, the PolyMet mine plan should be required to use clean energy. The Canada Lynx is a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act. Lynx have been found in the mine area. The mine would destroy 1,450 acres of critical habitat and cause fragmentation of the remaining habitat. I would like the DNR to further analyze the effect of Polymet's plan on the Canada Lynx. The effect on human health from the PolyMet mine should be considered with a health impact assessment that would be included in the PolyMet mine plan. Many hazards could directly affect public health due to exposure to arsenic, mercury, and asbestos-like fibers. Mercury, for example, would be emitted from the plant and increase the about of mercury in the water, in the fish, and in the diets of Minnesotans relying on fish in their diets. The risks of mercury pollution, especially for Minnesota children, should be addressed. Minnesota's state grain, Wild Rice, is put at risk and should be better protected in the PolyMet plan. As an important resource in Minnesota, and particularly for Minnesota's native people, the rice beds downstream of the mine would be affected and water there might not meet the state's wild rice sulfate standaRd The plan outlined by PolyMet suggests that water exceeding the sulfate standard will be released in the years after closure. Thank you for considering these comments. Diane Klinefelter 1011 Iowa Ave W. St Paul, Minnesota 55117

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Anderson

45427

To Lisa Fay, Dept. of Natural Resources: From: Diane and Thomas Anderson, 1034 Glen Paul Ct. Shoreview, MN 55126; HYPERLINK "mailto:dbanderson@comcaStnet"dbanderson@comcaStnet and HYPERLINK "mailto:Thomas.anderson9@comcaStnet"Thomas.anderson9@comcaStnet I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan and as a property owner in Cook County, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I have monitored the public meetings and discussions and I am deeply concerned that the state is more interested in short term job growth over the long-term negative effects from the mine on our water quality. Minnesota is known throughout the country as the state with 10,000 lakes. Tourism and a healthy environment for people and wildlife, especially in the BWCA, is vital to the long-term financial interests of our state. PolyMet has never operated a mine, it's not a US company. No mining company, especially PolyMet, could ever provide enough financial resources to clean up ANY site for hundreds of years. Please don't put money ahead of our irreplaceable clean water, wildlife habitat and tourism industry. Don't be shortsighted; this proposed mining will have an everlasting detrimental effect on Minnesota. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and m

Diane Beckett

25429

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Tthe PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project should not go ahead. If approved the mine will pollute Lake Superior, threaten our clean water and wildlands, and endanger public health for generations to come. The Great Lakes have about 25% of North America's fresh water and are the home of much of the Canadian and US population. Any pollution to the Great lakes will negatively affect the health, livelihoods and economies of millions of people. And, as the rate of refresh of the water in the Great Lakes is 1% a year - the pollution will effectively last forever. A decision in favor of PolyMet's proposal would open a floodgate for more sulfide mining in a large area near Lake Superior and surrounding the Boundary Waters Wilderness - considered by some as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Diane Beckett 353 Chapel St Ottawa, ON K1N 7Z5 (613) 231-6274

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Beeny 52187

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Diane Beeny 181 Tudor Oval Westfield, NJ 07090

Diane Bublitz 40081

I came to work for the Governor's Job Training Office in 1984, during the height of the shut down of taconite mines on the "Range" and the dislocation of many families from the "Range" to the Twin Cities and other locations for jobs. I can understand the support and desire for good paying mining jobs. Unfortunately I cannot support Copper/Nickel Sulfide Mining. It has not been done safely anywhere there is water present like it is in Northeast Minnesota. We need safe drinking water for human, animal and plant life. The need to do long term - 200 to 500 year- water treatment is not realistic for us. Please put clean water before the interests of foreign companies. Diane Bublitz 1776 Cypress Road St Cloud, MN 56303

Diane Bundlie 39477

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We have a duty to our planet to protect it. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Diane Bundlie 2536 34th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1734 (612) 508-6402

Diane Dickey 54697

See attachment

Diane Dinndorf Friebe 38997

Hi - I would like to enter a comment about the Polymet proposal and their SDEIS. There is not enough proof that damage will not be done permanently to the watershed here in northern MN and certainly not enough proof that Polymet will escrow enough money to take care of the problems the citizens of MN will face for the next 100, 200, several hundred years. Please do not allow them to build this mine and ruin our watershed. Thank you. Diane Dinndorf Friebe 760 Old North Shore Circle Two Harbors MN 55616

Diane Harper 37778

Mar 1, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, US citizens from everywhere are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). We are spreading the word through Facebook and other worldwide networks. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This mine will also ruin Minnesota's reputation as a great place to find safe and peaceful recreation. Sincerely, Ms Diane Harper 3205 Drew Ave New Bern, NC 28562-8008 (407) 484-8518

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Hilscher

38919

Dear Lisa, I believe we should be listening to Minnesota State Auditor Rebecca Otto regarding the financial risk to taxpayers, not only to ourselves but through many generations. We all want to do the right thing here. Her article from the Star Tribune is copied below. We already are looking at have unknown expenses due to the rapidly changing climate. It is getting commonplace in Minnesota to have presentations on climate effects to living species including actions such as moving trees to assist their migration and other methods. With weather records on a yearly basis now and more turbulent weather causing major storm damage, I think we'd be far better to be prepared to have funding available to address unknown issues such as this, and not take on a long-term risk such as non-ferrous mineral extraction that is too hard to quantify. I hope you will deny approval of the PolyMet mine. Far too much is at stake financially. Sincerely, Tony and Diane Hilscher 910 Oakgreen Ave N. Stillwater, MN 55082 State auditor on mining: Long-term risk too hard to quantify Article by: REBECCA OTTO Updated: November 20, 2013 - 7:22 PM <http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/232745641.html> Thirty-one nonferrous mineral leases were recently approved by the Minnesota Executive Council — that is, by the governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state and attorney general. I voted against them. In my judgment as state auditor, important financial questions related to nonferrous mineral mining have emerged. Minnesota taxpayers are entitled at least to have a full discussion of the issues. The state owns mineral rights under much of Minnesota's land. It leases those rights to private mining companies. The leases give companies the right to explore for nonferrous minerals beneath both public and private lands. The companies must seek additional permits from the state to begin mining, but the reason for both the leases and the exploration is mining. Iron ore (ferrous) mining has existed in Minnesota for more than a century. It is part of our history and identity. Because of iron ore mining, Minnesota has a fairly well-developed body of mining law to protect the environment and the taxpayer. Nonferrous mining, however, is new to Minnesota. It brings with it unfamiliar risks. Nonferrous minerals are found in sulfur-bearing rocks. When sulfide waste rock is exposed to water and air, sulfuric acid is produced. Toxic heavy metals can also be released. When sulfuric acid and heavy metals get into our surface waters, fish and plant life die. Waterfowl and other wildlife populations follow. Minnesota law requires mining companies to provide financial assurances. A financial assurance is a damage deposit provided by the mining company before mining begins to ensure that cleanup and reclamation can be done after the mine closes. Financial assurances, if sufficient, protect taxpayers from having to foot the bill for cleanup costs. Cleanup related to nonferrous mines is costly and difficult to predict. State regulators estimate that the PolyMet Mining site in northern Minnesota, for example, will require water treatment for up to 500 years. How do we calculate such financial risk 500 years into the future. How do we account for changes brought on by technology, the environment or the economy over such a long period of time. How will local governments and the local economy be financially impacted. Will other local economies suffer a negative financial impact. Will it impact other stakeholders such as hunters and anglers and wild rice gatherers. As state auditor, I am charged with looking out for taxpayers' financial interests. Based on the evidence I have seen so far, I am not convinced that we know how to accurately quantify the size of the financial risk of this type of mining. The US Government Accountability Office, an independent nonpartisan agency that reports to Congress, says that financial assurances fo

Diane Hiniker

3655

As a resident of northeastern Minnesota I am sending my comments on the Poly Met copper/nickel mining proposal in Hoyt Lakes. Sulfide mining has never been done without environmental consequences. All the promises in the world to do no harm to the environment are sincere I'm sure, but accidents happen and people are fallible. (Exxon, BP, Shell, Japan's and Chernobyl's nuclear industries, sand mining and fracking companies, etc were all sure they could go about their work without any environmental disasters. They were wrong.) All the money in the world cannot buy back the treasure we have in this region once it's contaminated. There are no metals more precious than our water and we owe it to future generations to protect it at all costs. Many of us up here depend on tourism for our livelihood. People from all over the country come here for the peace and tranquility that are found in it's woods and waters. Are their needs less important than that of large corporations that are only interested in how much money they can make. Should Native Americans be asked to risk continued wild rice harvests. Wild rice requires clean water to grow, a mining accident could destroy that crop. Yes some people want the jobs that mining might bring, yet they choose to live here because of the environment. I don't believe they can have both. I am a senior citizen who won't be around 50 years from now but my hope is that northeastern Minnesota will still be a place to get away from it all and enjoy a break from everyday life. There is an old Cree proverb that should be heeded. "Only when the last tree has died, and the last river poisoned, and the last fish has been caught will we realize that we can't eat money". Diane Hiniker 147 Bloomquist Mtn. Rd Grand Marais, MN. 55604 [HYPERLINK "mailto:backwoodsneilie@msn-com"](mailto:backwoodsneilie@msn-com) 612-581-7844

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Hiniker

38990

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are there

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Hiniker

38991

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Diane Hiniker 147 Bloomquist Mtn. Rd Grand Marais, MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Hiniker

39004

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Diane Hulke

15791

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. You can not turn back the clock to fix the damage. We can find other ways for the local people to make a living. Not a temporary situation which leaves behind nothing but a damaged environment. Sincerely, Mrs Diane Hulke 1830 Ives Ln N Plymouth, MN 55441-4023

Diane J Peterson

54489

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Krueger-Pirnat

6437

Hi, My name is Diane Krueger-Pirnat, CPA. My address is 8231 Stone Lake Rd in Zim, Minnesota 55738- I am a business owner in three Iron Range towns. I am a life long resident of Northeast Minnesota and have had family members all the way back to my Great Grandfather work in the mining companies of northeast Minnesota. I also worked at LTV mining company as a college student in the summer of 1995- I received a college scholarship from LTV mining company which helped me a lot as a nontraditional student. In other words, my family and I have a lot at stake concerning the Polymet project and completely support it. I believe that the environmental review process has been going on too long and that the supplemental draft EIS has solutions to the impacts on the air, water, or land. The land post-closure documentation shows that the land will be reclaimed to protect the natural resources. Polymet will help create jobs that can support a family so that our children do not have to move away as soon as they are out of High School or College. Local businesses need a boost to their bottom line as many have already closed up and have left vacant office buildings or stores in every town on the Iron Range. Enough is enough; let's get the permits out for this mine. I want to see our economy prosper again as it has in the paSt Sincerely, Diane

Diane M Cole

57231

After reading info on what is being proposed – it still makes no sense to put our natural environment at such risk. We should protect all the wetlands, rivers and lakes, the quiet areas from being invaded. These folks are not even from our country and will have even less interest in preserving our land and waters. Diane M. Cole 24553 Evergreen Drive Nevis, MN 56467

Diane Marie Knott

39544

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Diane Marie Knott 93 Kent St Apt 5 Saint Paul, MN 55102-2060

Diane Mason

19926

I would like to comment on the Polymet mine situation. I toured the Polymet mine proposed project with a college group, and while on this tour, the college kids began asking questions. Many were very well thought out questions about water, the quality of the surface water, the ground water, and what was proposed. They were either brushed off, or they were told that the water would be re-used from open holding ponds that were so toxic that anything that got into them (ie. Birds landing in them, or wild animals drinking from them) would die. They were told that these ponds would be “impermeable” even though the track record for this is horrendously bad. They asked what would happen if a leakage occurred in an area with the World’s most pristine ground water. They were told that the water would flow “away.” Our students were hydrogeology students. They know that there is no away. They researched the record of mine drainage, and they know that any metal mines using sulfur produces horrible acid. They also know that some of the areas that this company owns are geologically pristine and should be preserved. Even though it feels like legislators and the powers that be are willing to sacrifice our water and one of the only wild areas left in the Midwest, I think it is unthinkable that it is even being considered based on the water issues at hand. Diane Mason

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Michel

2935

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I* find it difficult to believe that anyone appointed and paid to serve the citizenry could even contemplate an activity such as open-cut sulphide mining in the sensitive Arrowhead Region. Even if contamination abates after the estimated five or so centuries, it is obvious that the flora and fauna we now treasure will not stage a miraculous return. We need the clean waters and all which they support. Particularly at a time when coal seam gas drilling/fracking is despoiling great tracts of land and underground water, surely we should not add sulphide ore mining to the growing selection of ways to destroy the future. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Who will profit and by how much. Polymet would appear to be yet another code word for short-term profit serving mindless greed. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Diane Michel 535 Summit Ave Crookston, MN 56716-1510

52108

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I* find it difficult to believe that anyone appointed and paid to serve the citizenry could even contemplate an activity such as open-cut sulphide mining in the sensitive Arrowhead Region. Even if contamination abates after the estimated five or so centuries, it is obvious that the flora and fauna we now treasure will not stage a miraculous return. We need the clean waters and all which they support. Particularly at a time when coal seam gas drilling/fracking is despoiling great tracts of land and underground water, surely we should not add sulphide ore mining to the growing selection of ways to destroy the future. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Who will profit and by how much. Polymet would appear to be yet another code word for short-term profit serving mindless greed. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Diane Michel 535 Summit Ave Crookston, MN 56716-1510

Diane Mundt

37946

Mar 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Dear Gov. Dayton and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to oppose the plan to allow sulfide ore mining in northeastern Minnesota. It is the wrong project for an area so dependent on clean water throughout that watershed. Contaminating that water will harm all living things in that beautiful part of our state, including humans. Water has become a very valuable resource. Why would we do anything to harm that resource. I am 81 years old. I can't believe the damage that has been done to the environment in my lifetime - a mere blip in time. I wish I could honestly think that writing to you would have an impact on your decision, that the decision will not be made solely on political expediency or who has the most money for lobbying. A decision in favor of the environment on this issue would be an encouraging turning point to those of us concerned about our future. I would like to think that you are thinking of what is best for our state and people in the long run. Regularly in the news there are stories of newly discovered polluted sites, newly discovered ways in which polluting chemicals, etc are damaging our health. Why would we pursue a project that would likely be one of those stories long into the future. If we can make sure our state remains beautiful and healthy people will want to live and work here. That is what will keep us prosperous in the future. Sincerely, Diane Mundt 3709 Grand Way #216 St Louis Park, MN 55416 Sincerely, Mrs Diane Mundt 3709 Grand Way Apt 216 St Louis Park, MN 55416-2937 (952) 646-6467

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Nelsen

41939

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Diane Nelsen Saint Paul, Minnesota

Diane Norland

16251

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Olson

26684

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I GREW UP NEAR LAKE ERIE AND I LOVE THE GREAT LAKES, THEY ARE A NATIONAL TREASURE. EVERYTHING SHOULD BE DONE TO KEEP THEM AS CLEAN AS POSSIBLE. HAVING SULFIDE MINING ACROSS THE ARROWHEAD REGION OF MINNESOTA INCLUDING LAKE SUPERIOR IS A TERRIBLE IDEA. THE OWNERS OF THESE PROPERTIES JUST WANT TO MINE THEM FOR WHAT THEY ARE WORTH THEN MOVE ON LEAVING A TERRIBLE MESS BEHIND NO MATTER WHAT THEY PROMISE. Sincerely, Diane Olson 521 Montana Ave Apt 305 Santa Monica, CA 90403-1370 (310) 395-2043

Diane Overby

38828

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Diane Overby 8059 Kentucky Ave S Bloomington, MN 55438-1247

Diane Peterson

47371

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager Minnesota DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: I am concerned about the inadequacies of the Polymet SDEIS and request that you reject it. I also request that you do not issue permits to Polymet to go ahead with its plans to begin sulfide mining. You would severely undermine the confidence of Minnesota citizens in fair and logical government if you took action which neglected your duty to require strict adherence to statutes, and to prudent protocol, in handling the review process of the Polymet SDEIS. Governor Dayton's administration has failed to follow statutes in federal and state law concerning the handling of Medicaid funds in Minnesota. For professional pride in the mission of the DNR and your responsibility within it, you should avoid following the bad example which the Dayton administration set in the last four years by the Minnesota Department of Human Services regarding that agency's scandalous failure to properly regulate the state's Medicaid programs. The Department of Natural Resources could distinguish itself as an ethical leader—in public esteem far above that other pitiful state agency—by holding firm against shoddy, flimsy documentation submitted by a corporation. The DNR can, and should, uphold the highest standards which protect the state's environment and the state's residents from the harmful consequences of the environmental degradation which is certain to occur from Polymet's current proposal. Polymet's predictions of water pollution rely on unsubstantiated assumptions that no pollution will seep from the 526-acre mine site waste rock pile into the 100 Mile Swamp. Polymet claims that pumps on the edge of the tailings pile will capture 99-37 percent of the polluting seepage. The DNR should require solid evidence that 99-37 percent of Polymet's toxins will be prevented from contaminating our environment. As reported by J. R. Kuipers et al., in Comparison of Predicted and Actual Water Quality at Hardrock Mines (2006), every time sulfide mining has been tried in a water-rich environment, it has resulted in contamination of surface and/or ground water with sulfates and toxic metals. The proposed Polymet mine site is located in a water-rich environment. Require the SDEIS to be redone to provide verifiable substantiation of Polymet claims of protection of surface waters from contamination. I have confidence that the DNR can protect the long-term environmental interests of the majority of Minnesotans. Ms Fay, you are in a position of public trust, a gatekeeper to preserve nature from a short-term corporate exploitation which would inflict death-dealing impacts for centuries. Please exercise your power, uphold your duty. For environmental protection, Diane J. Peterson 4051 Gisella Boulevard White Bear Lake, Minnesota 55110 HYPERLINK "mailto:birch7@comcaStnet"birch7@comcaStnet

Diane Skoog

54514

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Diane Steen-Hinderlie

52209

The following comments are submitted by Diane Steen-Hinderlie, 2829 Yosemite Av., St Louis Park, MN 55416- First, regarding water resources, a federal website shows that there will be connections/flow to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, which will jeopardize this invaluable state and indeed national treasure. There will be mine "acid drainage" that will leave lakes, rivers, and streams without most living creatures. Mining pulls water from areas, so a thousand acres of wetlands at the mine site will be lost. No sulfide mine has ever operated without producing polluted drainage. 2/3 of attempted remedies fail. So, secondly, wildlife is affected. Birds, fish, moose, even lynx, etc, are poisoned. Their habitat is threatened, changed beyond their evolutionary capacity to adapt. Of course there's human life threatened, with increased cancer rates, etc. Third, regarding jobs and finances, PolyMet itself predicts that only 25% of the jobs would be from local hiring. World markets make all quickly changeable - highs and lows re the economics of it all. Plus, the end of operations finds a devolving of responsibility from companies to the taxpayers, private to public. This happened right next door in So. Dakota, where a mine went bankrupt and the state had to request Superfund status. I thank Mining Truth for much of the above. Please don't inflict the PolyMet project on our State. Yours, Diane [HYPERLINK "http://thirdpartyoffers.juno-com/TGL3142/532284cc2b5024cc3723st03duc"](http://thirdpartyoffers.juno-com/TGL3142/532284cc2b5024cc3723st03duc) This fish is Toxic (avoid) Impairs brain function, damages your heart, joints, and skin [HYPERLINK "http://thirdpartyoffers.juno-com/TGL3142/532284cc2b5024cc3723st03duc"](http://thirdpartyoffers.juno-com/TGL3142/532284cc2b5024cc3723st03duc) info.inflammationsolution-com

Diane Tessari

58157

The content of the PolyMet SDEIS causes me extreme concern that the proposed project would add dramatically and catastrophically to pollution and habitat destruction in the already polluted and compromised area in which the project would take place, as well in the entire watershed, including the St. Louis River, its estuary, and the waters of Lake Superior. I believe the project would adversely affect worker health, human health in general, wildlife (including endangered lynx and threatened moose, among many others), and plant life (including wild rice sacred to native peoples – and a sensitive indicator species when it comes to water pollution). The PolyMet SDEIS proposes:• The largest wetlands destruction ever proposed in Minnesota• A land exchange that would result in a significant loss of public land in areas of high biodiversity, mature forest, and flood plains• Mining activity and unlined waste storage only 100 feet above the aquifer, in an area with existing fractures, and more likely to occur with blasting• A plan that underestimates water flow through the area• That treated water would dilute pollution, while the EPA says testing must be done at the initial point of pollution Serious omissions include:• No plan to replace most “indirectly” affected wetlands• No water treatment for the perpetual seepage of polluted water from waste piles• No analysis of alternatives such as underground mining, lining waste piles, returning waste to the pit, etc• No analysis regarding worker health or residential wells• No analysis of risks to public health in an area where one in ten babies is now born with elevated mercury levels Given all this, I ask that:• The EIS be rejected as inadequate• The project be rejected as environmentally harmful• The proposed land exchange be rejected• The Section 404 Permit be denied• A state permit to mine be denied

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dianna Jancik

40183

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dianne Douglas

42487

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Dianne Douglas 2723 E Valencia Dr Phoenix, AZ 85042-7082 (602) 268-7065

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dianne Ensign

16507

Feb 19, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who cares deeply about protecting our environment and who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Dianne Ensign 11600 SW Lancaster Rd Portland, OR 97219-7655

Dianne Knoblen

39475

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dianne Pappas

16207

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dianne Robertson

41745

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Dianne Rowse

58046

It's not worth the risk of 500++ years of environmental contamination. Do not mine so close to the BWCA. Instead, focus on reclaiming copper from used electronics, homes, etc. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnninage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dianne Swanson

16516

I am most certainly NOT IN FAVOR of allowing copper mining in northern MN. We cannot sanction the continued destruction of our wetlands and waterways. The frac sand mining right next to the Mississippi River is also a concern. Please say NO to the copper mines. Dianne Swanson Rochester, MN From: Kenneth Rosemark Sent: Monday, February 17, 2014 9:57 AM To: 'Mark Rieder'; 'gkbkleist@aol-com'; 'Kleist, Kevin J., C.Ph.T.'; 'TODD SLIFKA'; 'Norman Fitch'; 'Chris Benson'; 'John Walker'; 'Chuck Dixon'; 'Vincehila@aol-com'; 'Dustin Rosemark'; 'Michael_dosdall@yahoo-com'; 'jmhockert@charter-net'; 'CSibley@KTTC-com'; AllUsersCOB; AllUsersLBA Subject: FW: Copper Mining Around Ely, Minnesota In March of this year, a decision will be made regarding whether to allow copper mining in and around the Ely, Minnesota Area. If allowed, I believe the silica residue left behind, will destroy the eco system of the pristine area we know as The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I've expressed my opinion in the letter listed below and E-mailed it to [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us. If you believe as I do, please feel free to sign onto this letter and forward it to the above E-mail address. Together, we can make a difference KBR From: Kenneth Rosemark [mailto:kenneth_rosemark@charter-net] Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2014 6:48 PM To: Kenneth Rosemark Subject: Fwd: Copper Mining Around Ely, Minnesota Sent from my iPad Begin forwarded message: From: Kenneth Rosemark <[HYPERLINK "mailto:kenneth_rosemark@charter-net"](mailto:kenneth_rosemark@charter-net)kenneth_rosemark@charter-net> Date: February 5, 2014 at 11:38:37 PM CST To: ["HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> Cc: ["HYPERLINK "mailto:Krosemark@cobrowm-com"](mailto:Krosemark@cobrowm-com)Krosemark@cobrowm-com" <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Krosemark@cobrowm-com"](mailto:Krosemark@cobrowm-com)Krosemark@cobrowm-com> Subject: Copper Mining Around Ely, Minnesota The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a national treasure, just like the Grand Canyon. The BWCAW is the most pristine wilderness area on the planet. The residue left behind by copper mining seeps into the water, kills plant life, fish and wildlife. In a very short period of time, copper mining will ruin 500 Years Of Echo System. There are several mining companies ready to start mining in this area. As soon as one gets permission to begin mining, the other mining companies will be right behind Poly Met Mining Inc. All of these mining companies are not even US COMPANIES. They are for profit organizations and once they are given the green light, they will destroy this Pristine Wilderness Area. I implore you to take a stand, against allowing the mining companies, anywhere near, any waterway, tributary, stream connected to or running into a Boundary Water Area Lake Or Waterway. Several decades ago, one man stood up against a rich and powerful man, who wanted to dam up this area, to create hydro electric power, for the sole purpose of selling it and making even more money. Something's are worth more than money. The peaceful, pristine, soulful wilderness area, called the BWCA is one of them.. On behalf of my children, their children and your great, great, great grandchildren; PLEASE, SAY NO TO THE MINING COMPANIES SAY NO TO BIG MONEY . Carry on the legacy of the man who originally saved the BWCA. You are in a position to make a decision regarding this matter. On behalf of all of us and future generations, make it a good one. Thank you. P.S. Please forward to Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager , too. Kenneth B. Rosemark, Rochester, MN. Sent from my iPad

Dick Bortorff

38062

To the Attention of Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Dear Ms Fay: I would like to comment on the proposed Polymet Mining Project. As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, and a regular visitor to our great North including often to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, I find this idea appalling. Copper and other heavy metal mining is among the most environmentally destructive and far reaching types of mining in the world today. One need look no further than Chile or Australia, or our own Western US to view the massive damages wrought on the landscape by this type of mining. The images of the huge gouges, toxic spills, polluted water and other destruction caused by this type of mining of the earth are all over the web, and easy to see. Do we want this in Minnesota. Our citizens are saying overwhelmingly, "No." and as public servants our government employees have a duty to stop this project. To be contemplating this on the edge of our most pristine and sensitive natural wilderness is highly irresponsible. All of this beauty and splendor could be jeopardized for the sake of a few temporary jobs. And at what coSt The information from Polymet's own studies say that the cleanup of the water alone will take centuries. The earth will however never be the same. Polymet touts a new process that is supposedly safer. Frankly, why should we trust them. The fact remains that no project of this scope and scale can be conducted without massive environmental damage. So please do everything in your power to safeguard our irreplaceable Northern Minnesota paradise and keep Polymet and similar ill-advised schemes from destroying our environment. Kind regards, Richard Bortorff 4128 Sheridan Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410 tel. 612-590-7654

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dick Hock 5972

I have toured the Polymet site and listened to their very extensive plan to protect the environment in their operation and am convinced that they are being responsible to the extent possible with the technology available, which is all that can be expected of any new venture. They are abiding by all imposed governmental standards currently in existence. If we were to allow progress to be governed by all of the "what ifs", we would still be in the horse and buggy days. There will always be unknowns, challenges, and yes, mistakes and accidents. But we learn from them and are better able to move ahead and provide for the needs of society. Many would not move ahead at all for fear of the risks and the unknown and then where would we be. It is time to move ahead on this venture to provide the needed jobs and materials for our ever expanding society. Think you. Dick Houck A Minnesota business owner Dick_houck@yahoo-com Sent from my iPad

Dick Houck 2259

Sirs: For a non-engineering professional to read and understand such an extensive and detailed document and then make intelligent comments on it is rather presumptuous at best. However, I have read most all of the PolyMet material and have toured the proposed sight and asked many questions of the officials of the company, and have come to the conclusion that the company is utilizing the most up to date and modern techniques available to mine the needed minerals while protecting the environment as well. If this country is to continue to move ahead in the world with continued growing employment and business development, it must utilize all possible ways in which to progress. Those with an environmental agenda would disallow all such progress and prevent any and all abilities to utilize the materials that are needed for that progress. This country was long built on utilizing the natural materials available while also utilizing the preventatives available at the time to protect the environment. In listening to the safety measures that the company will take in this venture I am convinced that they are all that are available at this time and will protect the environment as much as is possible at this time. I am also convinced that if more protective measures become known in the future they will also be used as they become available. The earth has been created for man's use and should be made available if and when it can be done in the best ways available at the time. By doing such things in the present, can there only be better ways developed for the future. R. J. Houck 1131 Roselawn Ave Roseville, MN 55113 [HYPERLINK "mailto:Dick_houck@yahoo-com"](mailto:Dick_houck@yahoo-com) Dick_houck@yahoo-com 651-489-1069

38212

I am one of a few who has taken time to investigate the PolyMet mining sight in person and listen to the plans for the effort, and am greatly enthused about the possibility for employment for the region as well as the need for the minerals that it contains. I am also greatly concerned that the environmentalists do not want to see anything happen that in any way infringes upon the environment or the "beauty" of the State. There are guarantees in the production of anything, and as long as reasonable means are taken to protect against accidents, moves must be taken to move ahead to use the natural resources that are available to us, and I believe that is the case here. I believe that PolyMet has outlined a very reasonable approach to this effort and should be allowed to proceed with its plan. It cannot, nor can anyone guarantee what will happen in the future, but it seems to me that all precautions are being taken that can be taken within what is known at this time. It seems to me that all the environmentalists want to do is prevent anything and everything from happening regardless of the need or good for society and the nation. The State and the region need this effort and it should be approved for the benefit of everyone. Thank you. Richard Houck 1131 Roselawn Ave Roseville, MN 55113 Dick_houck@yahoo-com

dick krueger 3471

Please do not allow the Polymet mining project to proceed. It will harm water quality and degrade wetlands for hundreds of years. Richard Krueger 55 Holly Lane N Plymouth, MN 55447 Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dick Webber

18064

My name is Dick Webber. And one of the concerns with me is the environment. And from what I understand, 70 percent of the rock being mined is low in sulfate and can't produce pollution. And the rest of the rock will be placed on a lined area where anything that runs off it can be collected and treated. This rock then will be dumped back into the mine and covered by water without air to mix with the water. And sulfate acid can't be produced. And I'm confident that the DNR, the pollution control agency, the US Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers, and other experts have done their research and will make sure the project does not hurt the environment. The other side of the coins is jobs. And we all know that if we don't have jobs we don't pay our bills and don't send our children to college. And as far as I'm concerned, this is 2014, it's not the 50's or the 60's. Let the agencies do their job and make sure it is done correctly.

18302

My name is Dick Webber. One of my comments is that I was inside talking to the person that was in charge of the overflow and which direction the water is going, and from what I learned, one of my main questions is, is this job going to be monitored weekly? Monthly? That's my biggest concern. Because I fish and hunt in northern Minnesota, and if this job is going to be monitored by the DNR, Corps of Engineers, EPA, or other agencies, then I don't see any reason why the job shouldn't go through. If it can be done safely, correctly, and everybody is on board with it getting done the right way, I really, really don't have any problem with it getting done and moving forward, as long as it is monitored. Because I care about jobs and I also care about the environment. So, I don't know why, with the opposition we have for and against it, why the job shouldn't move forward. It's simple.

Dinda Evans

36517

--Original Message-- From: dindamp4@yahoo-com [mailto:dindamp4@yahoo-com] Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2014 8:14 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is fatally flawed, and needs to go back to the drawing board to be fixed. You should not burden the next fifteen generations with toxic water pollution and cleanup costs from a sulfide mine that hasn't been properly planned. PolyMet proposes a complex mechanical system of pumps, pipelines, and filters that it says will capture and hold back the water pollution from getting into our rivers. PolyMet assumes the proposed expensive and complicated water treatment system will continue to operate effectively for long, long after the mining has stopped. It should be expected that mechanical systems like pumps, filters and pipes will eventually fail. In a 2007 report, an organization called Earthworks analyzed the records of 14 modern copper mines in five states found that 100% of these mines experienced pipeline spills or other accidental releases. 92% had failures of water collection and treatment systems that resulted in releases of contaminated mine seepage that significantly impacted water quality. But Polymet's SDEIS lacks contingency plans for predictable failures in the proposed piping, pumping, and filtration equipment. By assuming that a complicated water treatment system will function indefinitely without fail, the SDEIS has failed to take the hard look required at the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. Please send the SDEIS and PolyMet back to the drawing board with directions to include contingency plans for predictable failures in the water pumping and treatment system, and the power supply to run that system. PolyMet proposes a large open-pit mine in untouched, high-quality wetlands, that are located on public land owned by the US Forest Service. The SDEIS states that building an underground mine would have significant environmental benefits. compared to an open-pit mine. However, the PolyMet SDEIS rejects underground mining, stating that in today's market conditions, underground mining is not considered economically feasible. The minerals will be there if and when the market prices are high enough to mine them right. Not fully considering the underground alternative is a major flaw in the SDEIS. Sincerely, Dinda Evans pob 178695 San Diego, CA 92177-8695

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dinda Evans

39055

---Original Message--- From: dindamcp4@yahoo-com [mailto:dindamcp4@yahoo-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:38 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Dinda Evans pob 178695 San Diego, CA 92177-8695

Dirk and Kathryn Hanson

52588

Protect our water. Hooded Mergansers swim in northeastern Minnesota's pristine marshes, ponds, and rivers, feeding on fish, crayfish, frogs, and insects. PolyMet Corporation is proposing to destroy thousands of acres of pristine habitat to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St Louis River - a major waterway that flows over 180 miles to Lake Superior. PolyMet's proposal calls for 20 years of mining, and they acknowledge that 500 years of toxic runoff will need to be collected and treated. Just like the Hooded Merganser, our children and grandchildren all deserve clean water. Let clean water be our legacy - not toxic pollution from mining. At a minimum - extend review period.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dirk Hanson

21067

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine will pollute wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS says that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, which makes it the largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota under the Clean Water Act. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please: • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance. • Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS. • Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin. • Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. Very truly yours, Dirk Hanson 1491 Pyhola Court Way Ely, MN 55731 2182350886

49828

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine will pollute wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS says that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, which makes it the largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota under the Clean Water Act. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please: • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance. • Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS. • Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin. • Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. Very truly yours, Dirk Hanson 1491 Pyhola Court Way Ely, MN 55731 2182350886

Disa Moraine

39168

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Disa Moraine 4229 Chicago Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3150 (612) 790-9833

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Disch

44954

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. I have concerns about the pollution of waters where wild rice grows. Since wild rice moves around and does not stay in one area, it is crucial to protect the waters in areas beyond where wild rice is presently growing. Who will monitor these waters. I am concern about the present pollution in the former taconite mine area where Poly Met plans to mine. Will there be clean up of the site before Poly Met would be allowed to startup. Who pays for the cleanup. There seemed to be data that says there is already pollution into neighboring streams from the former taconite site at the planned Poly Met site. Are holding ponds for tailings and debris of Poly Met's mining lined underneath to prevent leaching into the groundwater. I saw plans for covering the mine debris and catching the runoff to filter, but I am unsure of what is under the tailings and the holding ponds to prevent leaching of toxins into the groundwater. How often are covers replaced as they deteriorate over time. Is there plans for replacement of covers. Is the present plan to use reverse osmosis to clean the runoff a viable process. Has it been used and shown to prevent toxins and pollutants from entering water from the mining area. If the reverse osmosis process is put in place and fails to keep runoff within water quality standards, are there alternative methods to clean the runoff. Will enough money be collected from Poly Met to pay for the continuing cleanup of pollution of the water in the area and for how long. Who will pay these costs if Poly Met fails to. Will taxpayers pay for poor planning of cleanup costs. How accurate are models that project cleanup processes. Is there an ongoing monitoring that corrects the models to represent the reality of the pollution being created. Is there accurate monitoring of runoff and water in the area to check pollution levels. Who monitors. Self monitoring by some companies has not always been up to standards. Will Poly Met self monitor or is there monitoring by outside reliable sources. How thorough is the regulatory process in Minnesota. Is this type of monitoring water quality in regards to mining already in place in Minnesota and has it been able to prevent water pollution from exceeding standards and reduce pollution that exceeds standards. Will the surrounding residents be exposed to air pollution from the dust created by the mining and extraction process. Can there be more aggressive ways to recycle the many minerals that are thrown into landfills every day in Minnesota, before mining for more minerals. I have huge concerns about creating more pollution from Poly Met's planned mine. The St Louis watershed affects Lake Superior's water quality. We cannot afford to pollute the largest fresh water in the world. I am afraid allowing Poly Met's planned mining operation will open new mines closer to the Boundary Waters area, a very sensitive area needing high water quality. I am not in favor of mining in the Boundary Waters watershed. Minnesota needs clean water to protect our health and our lives and our fishing, birding, and tourism industries. Mary P Disch Mayadidi@hotmail-com 8308 York Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-2747 763-560-6793 Sent from my iPad

Dixon Shelstad

47034

I am writing to comment on the Polymet SDEIS. As a professional forester and educator, I am familiar with the planning processes that natural resource managers complete prior to any major project. These processes help insure that completed projects deliver a net benefit to our state's citizens, while minimizing detrimental effects to the environment. After reviewing the information presented in the Polymet SDEIS, it is apparent to me that a very comprehensive and thorough accounting of all potential environmental impacts has been accomplished. The most contentious issues, those involving effects on the local and regional watersheds, have been addressed in the plan and mitigations appear to be in place to safeguard against potential problems. I have no expertise in mining, or the potential environmental impacts. I expect that the same could be said about the vast majority of individuals submitting comments on the SDEIS, whether they support or oppose the proposed mine. With that in mind, I would only ask that you consider the source of the comments you receive - and that includes mine. Specific, science-based comments, from scientists with backgrounds in closely related fields should be given more weight than those delivered by non-experts. My comments, and those that come from the thousands of non-experts that oppose the mine, should be given relatively little consideration in the process. I would ask that you discount the emotional speculations and exaggerations, and focus on the comments (both pro and con) that have significant scientific basis. In summary, as a non-expert, I support that SDEIS as written. It presents a strong case for balance between mining and environment. I also support any significant changes found to be necessary as a result of this comment period, as long as they follow scientific reason. Thank You for allowing me to comment. Dixon Shelstad 512 E. Pattison St Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

DJ Wickre

39801

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

DJK Alexander

39199

Please see attached letter, in response supplemental draft environmental impact statement. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Deb - Deborah Alexander (651) 659-9964 HYPERLINK "mailto:DJKAlexander@gmail-com"DJKAlexander@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

djordet@q.com

9472

1- Is a performance bond going to be required of the company. 2- How is it going to be determined that the bond will be sufficient to cover the cost of clean up. 3- Can the fund be used to clean up spills or damage as they occur. If so how is the fund going to be refreshed. 4- How is the bond going to be protected from government changing its use designation and reassigning the money for other projects in the state. 5- What is to keep the fund in place for 500 years or until the site is deemed safe. 6- Who is going to administer the fund and be responsible for its use. 7- Is the bond going to be invested to make interest as it sits in place. 8- If a bond is required, how is it going to keep pace with the rising cost of construction costs as the years go on. 9 Who is going to be responsible for monitoring the site. 10- What powers will the monitors have to deal with immediate problems that will arise. 11- What is going to happen to the tailings in the pond after they reach saturation of sulfates. 12- How is the water seeping through the tailings and into the bedrock cracks and pores going to be monitored. 13- As a suggestion, would it be safer for all concerned to build a concrete table on which the tailings could be placed so that the sulfides and sulfates could be better treated and controlled. 14 How are the emissions on the stacks going to be controlled. 15 Who is going to monitor them and be responsible to see that they are being held within the EPA limits. 16- If effects are seen in the environment (effects on the water, plant and animal life) around the mine site, who will be responsible for applying corrective action and how will the effects be monitored measuring the water leaving the site and air off the stacks.

Dodd Cosgrove

19391

Dear Mr Bruner: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Dodd Cosgrove

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dominique Boczek

39754

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please don't take valuable resources away from the future generations. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Dominique Boczek 310 15th Ave SE Apt 516 Minneapolis, MN 55414-2831 (651) 235-4936

Don & Tess Uzelac

15775

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Sent from my iPad. Don and Tess Uzelac 1324 Fraser Drive Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744

Don Arnosti

18328

Thank you. My name is Don Arnosti. I live in St. Paul but I represent Audubon members throughout the state. I work for the National Audubon Society. I'm the policy director here in the state. Audubon members and Audubon is not either in favor of mining or against mining. We are pro-clean water, pro-habitat, pro-clean water for birds and fish organization. And we take a look at this proposal in that light. It's clear that the deal being offered by this proposal is anti-clean water, anti-habitat, anti-fish. On that basis this should be rejected. This is not a good deal for the people of the state, particularly those who are not in the room and who are not yet warned. It is inconceivable that we could consider 20 years' worth of jobs -- that is all of us in the room benefitting from both the materials and the jobs -- and to pass along a legacy of hundreds and hundreds of years of water treatment and the costs associated with that in the hope that we're not polluting our great-grandchildren's waters. We inherited a beautiful Minnesota from our ancestors. And personally speaking I think it's a moral obligation to pass the state along in better condition. This is a bad deal. The particular SDEIS is insufficient and should be rejected because it does not provide information on the water treatment plant or how that will be paid for. Not just when we're alive but for centuries into the future. What is being talked about is perpetual water treatment that would last more than twice the life of our nation. The United States is 238 years old. George Washington was alive 238 years ago. We're talking about more than double that. And there are no details in this SDEIS that would explain how this magic water treatment system is going to be paid for 2, 3, 400 years from now. That alone is sufficient to say this document is incomplete. This is an inappropriate proposal. Beyond that -- just wanted to check the time -- there's a number of other insufficiencies in this document. For example, the proposal to mitigate headwaters (inaudible), specifically the headwaters of the St. Louis River, only concerns the 912 acres that are directly impacted by either excavation or filling. However, in the document is information on more than ten square miles of additional wetlands that are going to be either partially drained or poisoned by toxic materials that flow off the railcars and off the mine site. And the proposal simply calls for monitoring, and if necessary in the future mitigation. That is also insufficient information and should be the grounds to send it back for further analysis. Finally, what I would say is this document refuses to consider alternatives that will reduce

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Arnosti

40760

---Original Message--- From: darnosti@audubon-org [mailto:darnosti@audubon-org] Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 3:08 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: PolyMet proposes a large open-pit mine in untouched, high-quality wetlands, that are located on public land owned by the US Forest Service. The SDEIS states that building an underground mine would have significant environmental benefits, compared to an open-pit mine. However, the PolyMet SDEIS rejects underground mining, stating that in today's market conditions, underground mining is not considered economically feasible. The minerals will be there if and when the market prices are high enough to mine them right. Not fully considering the underground alternative is a major flaw in the SDEIS. The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is fatally flawed, and needs to go back to the drawing board to be fixed. You should not burden the next fifteen generations with toxic water pollution and cleanup costs from a sulfide mine that hasn't been properly planned. PolyMet would operate for 20 years but, according to PolyMet's own data, would pollute water for over 500 years at the tailings basin, and over 200 years at the mine pit. The modeling results provided in the SDEIS show that PolyMet and the DNR simply did not look beyond 500 years. The fact that the SDEIS does not say when the mine pit and tailings basin will stop polluting our water is a major and apparently intentional failure that needs to be corrected by the DNR. Please run the models or require PolyMet to run the models long enough to show when pollution of our water by PolyMet's mine would cease. The PolyMet SDEIS suffers from many major failings. The SDEIS needs to be withdrawn, sent back, and fixed before it is returned for public comment. Sincerely, Don Arnosti 1722 Princeton Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105-1916

42579

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Arnosti

43738

Fantastic, Julian. Thanks for the good work on this. Don Sent from my iPhone On Mar 13, 2014, at 12:29 AM, "Julian Sellers" <HYPERLINK "mailto:juliansellers@msn-com"juliansellers@msn-com> wrote: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: This comment pertains to the effects the proposed NorthMet mine would have on two avian species: northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) and Boreal Owl (*Aegolius funereus*). The habitat requirements of these two species are similar, and the proposed mine would affect them similarly. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the status and outlook for these species in Minnesota. Section 4-2-5-1-2, Species of Greatest Conservation Need, of the SDEIS contains the following: Mature upland and lowland forest is the most common habitat type at the NorthMet Project area (primarily at the Mine Site). Section 4-2-4 provides a more detailed discussion of vegetation cover and habitat types. Northern goshawk, spruce grouse, black-backed woodpecker, and boreal owl were observed in these forests (ENSR 2005). These species represent a group that generally requires large forested blocks and/or minimal human intrusion. Section 4-2-5-1-3, Regional Forester Sensitive Species, misstates the status of northern goshawk and boreal owl in Minnesota. That section states: Four of these RFSS species are state-listed ETSC species (ie, gray wolf, bald eagle, wood turtle, and eastern heather vole) and are discussed above. Seven other species are on the SGCN list and are discussed by habitat type in Table 4-2-5-1- These species include the boreal owl (*Aegolias* [sic] *funereus*), . And: The northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) is not federally or state-listed. In fact, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources added both species to the list of Special Concern species in August, 2013- The Minnesota DNR defines Special Concern species, in part, as follows: A species is considered a species of special concern if, although the species is not endangered or threatened, it is extremely uncommon in Minnesota, or has unique or highly specific habitat requirements and deserves careful monitoring of its status. Both the northern goshawk and the boreal owl meet this definition. In fact, when the DNR proposed this listing, Audubon Minnesota objected, stating that both species should be listed as Threatened rather than Special Concern. Here is Audubon Minnesota's justification for the Threatened status of both species: Northern Goshawk – Audubon Minnesota believes that the Northern Goshawk should be listed as Threatened. Listing this species on the Special Concern list, as proposed by the DNR, does not properly reflect the current status of this bird and will not provide an appropriate degree of protection to ensure its future in the state. As noted on the Species Status Sheet, there has been an average of only 29 territories found in MN annually in the recent past, in spite of intensive surveys by the DNR and the US Forest Service. Additionally, as the SONAR shows, the Minnesota population has lower productivity than found in populations in other parts of the country. While we recognize that the species habitat needs are not fully understood in this part of North America, there is strong evidence suggesting that large patches of mature forests are very important to the Northern Goshawk. This habitat is currently in decline in Minnesota, and recent land management decisions are likely to exacerbate this slide. There are no plans to increase this habitat type in the future. Boreal Owl – Audubon Minnesota believes that the Boreal Owl should be listed as Threatened. The proposal by the DNR to list this species as Special Concern does not adequately address the needs of this species in the State nor ensu

Don Baldus

40003

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Don Baldus 40835 County Road 90 Mazeppa, MN 55956-4199

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Brown

43076

Please accept these comments on the PolyMet SDEIS 1-Minnesota law is clear that clean up/reclamation after mining activity cannot be perpetual. It appears that the proposed post PolyMet mine cleanup would be perpetual under any common/reasonable understanding of that term. That is, the SDEIS does not and apparently cannot indicate when the proposed cleanup with end. Absent an end date, any proposed cleanup must be presumed to be perpetual. Moreover, it appears that the materials used in allegedly protecting the environment, eg., liner of the mine waste storage pit would need to last forever (perpetually) in order to protect the water resource. Similar concerns exist with respect to other processes (reverse osmosis) and materials such as containment pits. What proof is there that these processes and materials will last until cleanup is finished (perpetual). 2- The SDEIS does not seem to adequately address issues concerning the health and safety of human resources such as those who would be employed and/or living in or near the proposed mine and those living in or near the relevant watershed area. What substances will be released into the air, water or otherwise and what effect will that have on human (and non-human organisms). 3- The DSEIS does not appear to address the effects of releasing heavy metals brands other than mercury into the environment. There appears to be no doubt that certain other heavy-metal released into the environment including but not limited to magnesium. 4- There appears to be no real cost-benefit analysis, or cumulative effects analysis, for the total cumulative impact area – in both the Lake Superior and Rainy River Watersheds. Donald Brown 603 Mt Curve St Paul, MN 55116 3432 Breezy Oint Road Tower, MN 55790 612 414 1664

don hilligoss

38208

Mar 6, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are NOT very concerned with protecting our clean water. We Do Not have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is sufficient and should be approved. I would like to mine this area and provide the State with the profit they will get from the land they hAve I implore the decision-makers to approve this proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis river. We have been mining this area for over 100 years. Enough study has been done. Sincerely, Don Hilligoss Sincerely, Mr don hilligoss 3509 E Inner Dr Hibbing, MN 55746-2644

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Hon

40468

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

42488

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Don Hon 3135 Arthur St NE Minneapolis, MN 55418-2210

Don Janes

21690

Don Janes 651-429-0016 On Wednesday, March 5, 2014 5:52 PM, Don Janes wrote: One many things about the SDEIS that concerns me is that underground mining and subsequent underground disposal of tailing was not considered. Even tho it may be more costly, it would help to mitigate sulfide pollution and would save many acres of wetlands from being converted into tailings ponds I believe that the DEIS should be revised to consider this option. I am also concerned about effects of inevitable sulfate pollution of wild rice waters. Wild rice is a part of the culture of native Americans, and should be protected. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Don Janes 5 Doral Dellwood, MN 55110

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Klegstad 42543

See attachment

Don Markwardt 41018

I believe the DNR has done an excellent job in evaluating the Polyment mining proposal and included restrictions and regulations to make it an environmentally safe operations. They have set rules that have to be met or the process would be shut down. Technology has improved so much over the years that this process can be done successfully. The comments on the SDEIS should relate to the information on the SDEIS not on personnel feelings or misinformation. What was done years ago doesn't apply except to learn what needs to be done. We have so many technological improvements that were not available years ago. The country needs this type mining process to protect it self. Donald Markwardt 414 Arlington Road Hoyt Lakes, Mn. 55750

Don Mitchell 37970

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Treatment of tailings wastewater and waste piles for perpetuity at the headwaters of the Lake Superior watershed is illogical and impractical even if it was successful for the 1st time in the history of sulfide mining. The proximity to the Hudson Bay watershed to the north and the potential to devastate the headwaters of the St Louis River make this mining project's risks unacceptable. New basewater groundwater flow studies indicate incorrect science to support the project were included in the PolyMet SDEIS permit. Impacts to residential wells from tailing seepage must be studied in light of the incorrect data for groundwater and surface flow rates. Sulfide mining impacts on the health of plantlife, wildlife and fisheries for subsistence lifestyles and the health of those diverse biological communities must be adequately accessed before permitting is allowed. This project is not about jobs versus the environment. It comes down to an independant unbiased scientific assessment which assures Minnesotans and all citizens on both sides of the border in the Lake Superior watershed that our treasured irreplaceable water will not be polluted long after PolyMet is gone. Sincerely, Don Mitchell Don Mitchell 2950 E. Pioneer Rd Duluth, MN 55804 2185250509

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Mitchell

44476

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I am a lifelong resident of Northern Minnesota accept for my years at the University of Minnesota while working to complete a BS in Fisheries Biology. The information I have seen regarding PolyMet's proposed plan to mine precious metals from this mineral deposit which contain sulfides has not addressed all legitimate science based concerns regarding long term impacts to an aquatic resource which is both unique and irreplaceable. While working for the MN DNR I surveyed many lakes found within the Lake Superior watershed that this mining will impact. This is a special ecosystem I am involved in protecting through involvement in Trout Unlimited, the Lake Superior Steelhead Association, The Lake Superior Coldwater Coalition and as a Landowner that recently added a conservation easement on the French River which is a tributary stream to Lake Superior. This watershed is under stress from many different challenging problems I am committed to protecting this watershed and the species which are found here. I am for economic development but not at the expense of this essential ecosystem. We must be stewards of the land if it is to provide for our spiritual, mental and physical health as well as for the health of the other species found here. History is full of examples of the huge costs required to clean up degraded ecosystems Short term economic gains to often overwhelm long term good decisions. When our water resource is polluted as happened in the cold slurry spill in West Virginia, then we see how irreplaceable clean water is to our health. Risks to our water quality must not be ignored. Until mining in sulfur bearing rock complexes can be assured without degrading the water quality of this watershed the permit should not be issued. Thank you, Don Mitchell 2950 E. Pioneer Rd Duluth MN 55804 Sincerely, Mr Don Mitchell 2950 E Pioneer Rd Duluth, MN 55804-9711 (218) 525-0509

Don Morrison

41507

My mining and environmental experience puts me in full support of Polymet and expansion of our resource developments. We need to PRODUCE responsibly in every way we can. Don Morrison Neon Magic of WY, LLC 1407 W. 4th St Gillette, WY 82716

Don Olson

57334

I am from Aurora. I worked out there for many years, the plants and that. I don't know, we had a good living and everything. All of the kids are healthy. But I was just thinking, you know, we have been mining this country for 100 and some years and it is basically the only industry there is. I was just thinking, you know, half of these towns wouldn't even be here and it is just hard to picture what the country would be like without the mining. You know, the amount of taxes that they put out, you know, even Duluth gets half of our taxes. You know, it would just be a dead country. Logging is pretty much all gone. You know, we just got to get something going up here. As one guy was saying, all of the minerals were put into the ground for a purpose, and if we don't use them, what good are they? So, basically that's it. But, you know, our kids would like to stay up in this country. I don't know. Basically that's it. You know, these guys are always saying all of these things that are going to happen but, you know, how do you know what is going to happen? They don't know what the mining company is going to do or what pollution is going to be there, or anything else. All of their theories are going to be there or whatever. I can't say much more. I lay in bed and think of this, I think all we got to do is get it going. Because, you know, tailings basin, they say it is going to hurt the wildlife. Well, I've counted between 50 and 100 deer on the tailings basin a night. The moose are out there. It is all full of wildlife. And in the fall, there is thousands of geese out there. So where is the pollution coming from? You know, wildlife is smarter than we are. The tailings basin is full of walleyes. You can catch one every time you cast. I don't know. Basically that's it I guess.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Osborn 41814

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Don Osborn Rochester, Minnesota

Don Pietrick 45271

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I strongly advocate that the decision on whether to allow hard rock mining by PolyMet be solely based on the most rigorous possible scientific analysis of potential environmental impact. The DNR should make this determination independent of political influence. Don Pietrick 3824 Susan Lane Minnetonka, MN 55345 612-581-1284

Don Portwood 57884

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Don Rudrud 58145

Let me tell you an experience I have personally seen with my own eyes. There is a mining village in the State of Washington name Holden on Railroad Creek. Holden Village was created by the Howe Sound Mining Company to mine copper and other metals for the war effort in the Second World War. Holden Village housed the miners for a few years till it was suddenly closed in the 1950's leaving huge piles of tailings and sulfide polluted water that I have seen many times in the past 60 years. Holden Village was given to the Lutheran Church and thousands of visitors have visited Holden to observe with their own eyes and to learn of the God given responsibility of care for the earth. Now after Al-can sold the mineral rights to Rio Tinto (based in London). Rio Tinto is spending up to 100 million dollars in cleanup. This very year they must build a concrete container to contain two years ago water at Holden. Saw sulfide polluted water still running out of the mine into Railroad Creek and Lake Chelan. Don't let it be in Minnesota!

Don Schumacher 45264

Please don't allow copper mining in MN. Our state is too precious to be polluted. Thank you, Don Schumacher Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Don Vasatka 29715

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and I don't see any way that the pollution from this mine can be contained for 500 years. Even if it could, we should not put the cost of this on future generations. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Don Vasatka 4754 Beacon Hill Rd Eagan, MN 55122-2708 (651) 454-8310

Don Yerhot 39918

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Don Yerhot 2501 W 70th St Richfield, MN 55423-2003 (623) 866-9204

Donald Barstad 22173

From: Don Barstad [mailto:donjo2@frontiernet-net] Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 11:16 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Polymet Supplemental EIS Ms Fey, After following the Supplemental information, I believe the updated results provide a complete analysis of the project to date. The economic benefit to the area is well certified by many of the comments both in the review and by public comments. The land exchange and wetland are reasonable for the area intended for the project. Future effects on wildlife and plant life are not adverse to the environment of the area. The design of the mining and plant operations are well thought out. Some new processes have covered many previous questions in regards to water and waste. The proposed Reclamation and Financial Assurance add to the feasibility of the return to "mother nature" of an acceptable result. The annual review of the project in this regards gives continuous oversight. As a resident of the Iron Range, I look forward to this project (and future ones) providing an economic and environmental boost to the area. Donald Barstad 5209 South Ave Aurora, MN 55705

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donald Britt 40214

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Donald Britt 1102 - 1st St Princeton, MN 55371-1404

Donald C Myntti 54745

See attachment

Donald Chambers 21581

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Donald Chambers 25958 County Road 62

Donald Howard 26304

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is NOT in the public interest Sincerely, Donald Howard 8317 Water Lily Way Laurel, MD 20724-2995 (301) 362-0969

Donald L Stewart 54494

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donald Myers 48953

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is not right to have a short term benefit for a few at the cost of a long term cost to many, including the children to multiple generations of those getting a short term gain. Why can't we love our children. Donald Myers The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Donald Myers 2388 Jansen Ave White Bear Lake, MN 55110-5540

Donald Nelson 41470

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: There are several reasons I object to the PolyMet mine, but I have recently learned of one that speaks to me in a personal way that I think needs addressing. I was at the Jan. 28th comment session and I heard a lot of people talking about how mining creates good jobs. I've had relatives up in the area working in the mines and the processing. Today I learned that there has been no evaluation of the impact on the on-site workers. Considering the toxicity of the substances, this seems a grave oversight at the start. But more personally, I lost an uncle to one of those "good" jobs because of mesothelioma. And I'll grant that there was not much awareness of the problems from asbestos at the time. Still, there wasn't even an attempt. And now the PolyMet proposal is making the same assumptions - the health of the on-site workers is not a concern. We know a lot more now, and we also know this mining involves substances known to be toxic at many levels. As a minimum, there should be a detailed evaluation of the health effects of the on-site workers and their families (as at least some of that substance is going to come home with them. It always does). Health effects on the general population are also important and should be taken in to account. After all, making the people in the area (or even just the workers) is an effect on the environment. I also object to not having liners for the waste pits. This is a known fractured area and we have more and more evidence that the sulfides cause problems for the plants (such as the wild rice) and animals. So get a fair study of the health impacts on workers and families. And line the waste pits. At a minimum. Sincerely Donald Nelson 812 Queen Av N Minneapolis, MN 55411 612 588 8910

Donald Pederson 57194

See attachment

Donald Plotnik 24008

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest As a career military aviator I flew over and enjoyed many of the earth's beautiful places. Having grown up in northern Minnesota in the Floodwood/Cloquet/Duluth area, I later learned how I was fortunate I was to have enjoyed the lakes and rivers of Boundary Waters. The St Louis River was a special place to enjoy as it made its way to Lake Superior. The Boundary Waters area is unique in its earthly beauty. The thought that this area and its beauty could be desecrated by sulfide or other mining is frightening. I have seen this ugliness left behind by open pit iron mining on the Mesabi Range. No mineral is worth that type of ugliness in or near the Boundary Waters. We must keep special places like Boundary Waters and the St Louis corridor natural and free. Sincerely, Donald Plotnik 211 Bluebird Ln. Central, SC Sincerely, Donald Plotnik 211 Bluebird Ln Central, SC 29630-8405

Donald R Fosnacht 42612

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donald V Wahlberg 57211

I strongly oppose Polymet's sulfide mine plan. It would not be good for Minnesota or the US. Donald V. Wahlberg 1451 Arden Place Arden Hills, MN 55112

Donella Kubiak 57223

I emphatically object to sulfide mining or any other kind of mining in the pristine forest and lake property of northern Minnesota. Our generation should not produce the kind of pollution from mining, for many generations to come, and leave it to the next generation(s) to clean up! No! We should do a better job of re-claiming metals/minerals through recycling. Donella Kubiak 6830 Three Lake Rd Canyon, MN 55717

Donna 38492

We strongly oppose any form of copper mining in northern Minnesota. The long-term run-off pollution threat to our unique water resources is just too great to take a chance. The possibility of hundreds of years to reclaim potential damage is a frightening prospect to pass on to future generations. And all this for several hundred jobs that themselves aren't for certain sustainable in the long term. WE SAY NO. Donna and Bryce Hamilton 4033 Linden Hills Blvd Minneapolis MN 55410

Donna & Neil Berglund 10720

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: NO NO NO to copper mining in our state Mining has a terrible track record and no amount of so-called "science" will convince us this won't turn into a disaster for not only this generation but future generations to come. How can we justify 25-30 years of mining vs. 500+ years of treatment-more like forever No matter how much money we throw at cleaning the area, it will never be what it is now. Never. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Donna and Neil Berglund 61555 252nd avenue mantorville, MN 55955 5076355195

Donna and Allan Butler 16663

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Donna and Allan Butler 8438 Mississippi Blvd NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna and Allan Butler

50042

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Donna and Allan Butler 8438 Mississippi Blvd NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Anderson

17256

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. It is my firm belief that Minnesota should pass on this sales proposal at this time and not be pressured by the empty promises of Tony Hayward who's BP oil spill desecrated the waters of The Gulf of Mexico, then whined about his responsibility. As a close watcher of the tactics used by Northern Dynasty Minerals at the Pebble (copper) Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska, it is apparent that Poly-Met will likely do and say anything to get at Minnesota's copper resources. 80% of people opposed to the Pebble Mine "don't want their unspoiled home to become the kind of dead zone that surrounds the world's other giant copper mines." Please see the heartbreaking results in Nicaragua and Honduras for example. In all honesty, I don't trust the true ownership. I'm thinking it's the Kochs or Global Bankers who are quietly purchasing precious metal industries. I am highly skeptical that PolyMet's emission figures are credible, that their monetary clean-up guarantee is calculable with any certainty, or that they wouldn't "hit and run" after five years, declare bankruptcy and leave taxpayers to clean up the mess. Let's make the deliberate choice to watch and wait five years or so to collect more third-party data. Everyone knows an accident is going to happen while quibbling over what the damage is going to be worth in dollars. We should be embracing our value of clean air and water, and the quality of life it affords every Minnesotan. Sincerely, Ms Donna Anderson 10211 Cedar Lake Rd Hopkins, MN 55305-5403

26249

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We don't need it and the risks are too great. Let Poly-Met experiment elsewhere. Sincerely, Donna Anderson 10211 Cedar Lake Rd Hopkins, MN 55305-5403

28435

Minnesota's passage of the Legacy Act speaks volumes. Keep polluters out of our state and keep Minnesota exceptional. On Tuesday, March 4, 2014 6:32 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Donna Arbaugh

43211

Short term employment and economic benefits have little value when compared with the spectacular ecosystem of northeastern Minnesota. The risk is much too high with too many unanswered questions. We should not risk the devastation that followed the mining near Butte, Montana. Donna Arbaugh Tacoma, WA

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Belvin

42107

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Donna Belvin 4513 Gillis St Austin, TX 78745-1809

Donna Butler

48173

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Donna Butler 8438 Mississippi Blvd NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Ceglar

16118

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Hanna

40276

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Donna Hanna 48 Mulberry Circle Staten Island, NY 10314 US

Donna Henry

15992

I oppose the PolyMet Mine and Land Exchange. And I Ask that you extend the public comment period for the proposed PolyMet Mine. The current 90 day comment period is not enough time. Due to the size, complexity and difficulty in reviewing the SDEIS - 180 days is needed to adequately review the proposal. The draft EIS was already found to be lacking in several areas and received a scathing EPA review. 90 additional days of review is little to ask in light of the potential for long term problems and the dismal record of sulfide mining around the world, regardless of what mine operators promised. The PolyMet project proposes a land exchange of 6,700 acres of federal land within the Superior National Forest. The Forest Service is under no obligation to do a land exchange with PolyMet. According to current federal law, it is illegal to strip mine land acquired under the Weeks Act for watershed protection. Don't put corporate profits before the people, land, water and wildlife of the Arrowhead. This project will be harmful to the Superior National Forest and Lake Superior Watershed. Treatment of contaminated water will be required for more than 500 years. The modeling done by PolyMet stopped at year 200 (at the mine site) and year 500 (at the plant site) because that was the point at which it became clear that water quality would not get worse. However, the modeled water quality at 500 years does not come close to meeting water quality standards. In addition doesn't include: • No back-up plan if Reverse Osmosis doesn't work for water treatment. • Hardrock mining carries the potential for asbestos-like minerals to be released in water effluent or air emissions. The PolyMet environmental review process does not adequately address their effects on human health as this is already an emerging concern in northern Minnesota. • Destruction of Wetlands - The SDEIS predicts that 912 acres of wetlands will be destroyed by filling or excavation and up to 7,413 acres may be "indirectly" impacted, mostly by converting wetlands to dry land. "Mitigation" for the direct impacts will occur primarily outside of the St Louis River/Lake Superior watershed, in an area to the south that is unlikely to support comparable ecosystems and cannot replace the lost functions to the St Louis River system. The proposed mine is harmful to wildlife, threatening home ranges of endangered lynx, wolf, as well as moose which are dramatically declining in the state. As an Audubon member I urge you to halt the project. PolyMet mine could spell life or death for critical habitats and the birds that live there, this mining operation would ooze toxic pollution into the region's waterways for as long as 500 years. More than 300 bird species spend at least part of their year in Minnesota and three Important Bird Areas would be especially vulnerable. These include winter habitats for Great Gray Owls and breeding habitat for dozens of neotropical songbird species. At particular risk are water-dependent bird species, including Belted Kingfisher, Common Loon, Goldeneye, Red-breasted Merganser, Hooded Merganser, Common Tern, American Bittern, and Least Bittern. Donna Marie Henry 538 So. 8th Avenue Galloway, NJ 08205

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Johnson 37952

The value of our clean water far exceeds any mineral value now or in the future. Its not worth the risk. We need to preserve the wilderness for ourselves and future generations. Our taconite mines are already polluting our lakes and streaMs Donna Johnson P O Box 396 Forbes, MN 55738 - Donna Johnson Vermilion Land Office cell: 218-780-9977 office: Tower 218-753-8985 Virginia 218-741-8985 HYPERLINK "mailto:donna@vermilionland-com"donna@vermilionland-com

Donna Kneeland 41861

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Donna Kneeland Big Lake, Minnesota

Donna Magrina 12525

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, (Y)OUR WORLD of NATURAL HABITAT and LIFE is more important than profits. As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National ForeSt More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Donna Magrina 1908 Pomona Ave Ste A Costa Mesa, CA 92627-6233

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Nelson

16160

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Donna Neste

39261

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Donna Neste 2616 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-1125

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Olsen

39222

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Donna Olsen 3132 Oakland Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-1523 (512) 669-6297

Donna Rautiola

42804

See attachment

Donna Seabloom

17098

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Donna Seabloom 1206 Pacific St E St Paul, MN 55106

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Donna Seabloom

50368

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Donna Seabloom 1206 Pacific St E St Paul, MN 55106

Doran Whitledge

42696

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doreen Britz

40094

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Doretta Reisenweber

42668

See attachment

Dori Arnett

54540

Please preserve our sacred environment & this sacred place! Stop mining. Your short-term gain is not worth such costs.

Dorie Gallagher

11

Having lived in the north country all my youth, please note I am deathly opposed to this open mining pit. Copper dust is a killer. Some say it is about jobs. Take a lesson from Libby Montana. No job is sacred when you are dead. Thanks, Dorie Gallagher South Minneapolis Resident

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dorie Gallagher

18276

Dorie Gallagher. D-O-R-I-E R-A-E, Gallagher, G-A-L-L-A-G-H-E-R. I was born in Hibbing in a house on Third Street, where the mine actually took the house and whole town. I know mining. I came from a mining family. I am not in favor of PolyMet. I am not in favor of it because it is not the same as taconite mining. Taconite mining, you could move a rock and it would stay a rock, and it wasn't toxic. 80 to 90 percent of rocks moved in the PolyMet mine will be toxic. This toxicity will last from 200 to 500 years. There are homes in Park City that is on 100-year-old pilings that are still toxic and the ground cannot be dug, children cannot play in the ground, gardens can't be planted, and miscellanea. We cannot afford to have our beautiful northern area be destroyed for the few jobs. I understand they need jobs, but jobs should have been provided, and can be provided, without destroying our northern section of Minnesota.

Dorie Reisenweber

4221

December 31, 2013 To: Lisa Fay MN DNR Subject: Please extend the public comment period on the NorthMet SDEIS Dear Ms Fay and others concerned, I write to urge an extension of the public comment period for the NorthMet SDEIS. On December 24, I heard Commissioner Landwehr express on MPR's Daily Circuit the desire for "as robust an analysis as possible." I understand preparing the SDEIS took over two years of work by agencies and experts. Lay people need time to analyze such a lengthy document dealing with a project which the SDEIS indicates could require five hundred (500) years water treatment. The project's many impacts to water, air and life in northeastern Minnesota demand serious, thoughtful and objective analysis by both the public and by government agencies. As Minnesotans we want the opportunity to study and to ask all of our questions and to raise all of our concerns. Questions need to be raised and to be answered. It will take time to discover and to resolve any problems with the project SDEIS. Afterall, our common goal is to leave a clean, safe environment for future generations. Please consider extending the ninety- day public comment period. Thank you for your attention. Respectfully yours, Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber 111 Garden Street Duluth, MN 55812-1142 218-728-1508
HYPERLINK "mailto:dorierduluth@hotmail-com"dorierduluth@hotmail-com

16076

Attached please find a comment to the NorthMet SDEIS on water shortage. My thanks for your efforts to maintain and protect the water, Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber

16082

Ms Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: Governor Dayton: Please find attached a comment on the NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you for your best efforts to protect the water present and future generations. Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber

16085

As part of the public comments on the NorthMetSDEIS, please find attached a "word document" on Water Quality Issues. Thank you for your best efforts to protect Minnesota's water for present and future generations. Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber

19990

Please find attached public comments on Polymet's NorthMet SDEIS concerning monitoring and contingency funds.

37062

Please find attached comments on PolyMet's NorthMet SDEIS. We all want our water protected, whether we are for or against sulfide mining. This letter shows multiple ways in which sadly, our environmental laws let us down, because they have been watered down. Thank you for listening to these concerns, Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doris Bandel

22965

Mar 4, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I am particularly alarmed by the possibility of sulfide mining in Minnesota. Although the PolyMet mine watershed drains into Lake Superior, the Twin Metals Mine would drain into Voyager National Park. Our family has a cabin on Lake Kabatogama with 4 generations having witnessed its breathtaking beauty. The otter come up to the dock. The location of our dock is only known to family and friends because it is the best dock to catch walleyes. I cannot bear to think of my niece's 2 month old son growing up to never know that beauty because some people did not take good care of the land that God gave to us, telling us to be good stewards of that land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Doris Bandel 1574 Cohansey St Apt 101 Saint Paul, MN 55117-4567 (651) 489-3226

41676

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I do not think this PolyMet mining is looking to the future care of Minnesota's great wildlife. My family has used our cabin on Lake Kabetogama for 4 generations. We cherish the time we spend there. There are wild Lady Slippers on the path - we do not pick them because they must be saved for future generations. I have stood nose to nose with a bear at the screen door - I think he was as fearful as I was. I enjoy seeing the Northern Lights and hearing the Loons across the lake. The best walleye fishing is off our dock - but only close friends and family are allowed to know where it's location. :-) Please do not let PolyMet ruin this for my family for the next 25 generations.. I do not trust PolyMet to be truthful -sorry, but their job is to make money, not to protect the water of Minnesota. That is your job and my job. I'm doing my part by informing you of my thoughts. Now you do yours. I voted for you. I appreciate your time. Sincerely, Doris E H Bandel Note - you can read all of these facts below. But I think my thoughts above are most important. I am a mechanical engineer with a minor in polymers and coatings. So, I understand the science of this immoral business. Creating sulfuric acid to poison Minnesota water should be considered a crime. Have you ever seen skin tissue eaten from sulfuric acid. I have and it is not pretty. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Doris Bandel 1574 Cohansey St Apt 101 Saint Paul, MN 55117-4567

41790

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. My family has a cabin in Voyagers National Park. The last 4 generations of our family have joyously spent time at the cabin. I want the next 4 generations to have the same environment available to them. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Doris Bandel 1574 Cohansey St Apt 101 Saint Paul, MN 55117-4567

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doris Bandel

49457

Mar 4, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I am particularly alarmed by the possibility of sulfide mining in Minnesota. Although the PolyMet mine watershed drains into Lake Superior, the Twin Metals Mine would drain into Voyager National Park. Our family has a cabin on Lake Kabatogama with 4 generations having witnessed its breathtaking beauty. The otter come up to the dock. The location of our dock is only known to family and friends because it is the best dock to catch walleyes. I cannot bear to think of my niece's 2 month old son growing up to never know that beauty because some people did not take good care of the land that God gave to us, telling us to be good stewards of that land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Doris Bandel 1574 Cohansey St Apt 101 Saint Paul, MN 55117-4567 (651) 489-3226

Doris Lawson Gerdes

36778

Dear Ms Fay, Attached are my comments on the Polymet NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you for incorporating them into your analysis of the efficacy of the proposed project. Sincerely, Doris Lawson Gerdes 10566 Highway 1 Isabella, MN 55607

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doris Petrie

15773

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Dorothea Diver

11355

Dear Madam: I am writing to complain that the SDEIS as proposed by the DNR is very inadequate in failing to offer a plan that leaves the site clean and maintenance free. In addition, the water modeling that involves the ongoing protection of the Partridge and Embarrass Rivers has been recently proven very off - by a factor of four in some cases. To issue a go-ahead permit to a mining plan that so endangers - for 100s of years - our most precious resource - clean water - is an abdication or your department's mission to protect and do no harm to our environment. Please get real science and real numbers behind this plan, Thank you, Dorothea Diver, 1321 E. 8th St, Duluth, MN 55805

42746

See attachment

42772

See attachment

42778

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dorothea Diver 42779

See attachment

42780

See attachment

42795

See attachment

42796

See attachment

54547

Dear Sirs, It is so important that we get the standards for the projected Polymet undertaking set at levels that will set the bar for many mining projects which will surely follow. I therefore ask that the 18 areas cited as “Major Differences of Opinion” by the tribal co-operating agencies be addressed and corrected in the final EIS.

Dorothy Brown 42424

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Dorothy Brown 5701 Lake Rose Dr Minnetonka, MN 55345-5500

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dorothy Dolezal

16688

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dorothy Dolezal 3005 west 43rd st minneapolis, MN 55410

50062

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dorothy Dolezal 3005 west 43rd st minneapolis, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dorothy Nordness

40640

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am a native Minnesotan and an outdoors-lover and a birder. Though I have lived in Michigan much of my adult life, I have often visited northeast Minnesota for its beauty, its clean waters, and the life-changing experience of canoeing in the Boundary Waters. I am very concerned that this area be protected from any intrusion that could potentially disrupt this pristine area. I want my grandchildren and their children to all have access to this wonderland of wilderness. The long-term implications of PolyMet mining operation's water protection seem impossible to actually fulfill for the duration needed to assure that the water is not polluted with harmful chemicals. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Dorothy Nordness 114 8th St Ann Arbor, MI 48103-4254 (734) 668-6306

Dorthea Diver

18329

Hello, My name is Dorthea Diver. And I'm going to cede my time to Gerri Williams.

Doug Baker

36437

Dear Ms Fay, On behalf of Doug Baker, please see the attached letter. Required info to accompany letter: Ecolab Doug Baker – Chairman and CEO 370 Wabasha St N. St Paul, MN 55102 Kind regards, Tanya TANYA ANDERSON EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICES / ECC / 19 ECOLAB 370 WABASHA STREET NORTH, St PAUL, MN 55102 T 651 293 2400 F 651 225-3230 E HYPERLINK "mailto:tanya.anderson@ecolab-com"tanya.anderson@ecolab-com CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain proprietary and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doug Buell

23304

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources For the past 20 years or more, I have followed the history and development of the NorthMet deposit from an initial indication in early diamond drilling through the creation of this SDEIS. Living in Hoyt Lakes from the mid 1960's until May of 2011, I worked for Erie Mining / LTV Steel Mining companies as a Mining Engineer from the mid 60s until LTVSMC was closed in early 2001- I have a BS degree in Mine Engineering from the University of Wisconsin. As part of my duties with the taconite mine, I traveled the "Dunka Road" many times, passing through the area of the proposed NorthMet mine at the boundary of the Superior National Forest The only road access is by way of private roads not open to the general public. In addition the site is surrounded by the private roads, railroads and Northshore mine pits and LTV mine operations. The site has been logged for pulpwood in the last 20 years and has no unique features that are not available throughout most of the public accessible areas of the Superior National Forest Some folks point to the stockpiled Gabbro at the Dunka mine pit as an example of the issues that may arise at NorthMet. It should be remembered that that pit and its stockpiles were started in the early 1960's before there were few if any regulations, permits or guidelines from State or Federal authorities concerning mining or pollution. The mining and stockpiles at NorthMet will be built and protected under the strictest rules available and will be intensely monitored to prevent any escape of potential pollutants. The fact that PolyMet will reuse an existing plant and brownfield site in an area of the state that has seen continuous mining and processing for over 100 years is a positive in that a minimum of "new lands" will be disturbed. This mine and processing operation will provide well paying and full time employment, that is at a premium. I do not believe that "tourism" jobs will be adversely affect. For the most part unaffected jobs are minimum wage and part time. Those are jobs for students and second incomes and are not family supporting. In general, this is such a high visibility and intensely followed project that it will highly unlikely that any unwanted consequences will be allowed to begin to happen before remedial action is initiated. Thank you for the opportunity to add my comments to the important discussion. Douglass A. Buell 201 Bluffs Ridge Court Duluth, MN 55811-2602

Doug Christy

57338

My name is Doug Christy from Grand Rapids, Minnesota, and I am for the project. I guess I want to start the statement by saying that if people had seen the "Lake of Construction" advertisement on TV recently, it kind of says it all. It states that, "This is mining country." People live here and work here and they play here. And that, you know, from there people have choices. If that's not the way they want to live, they can move, you know, if they feel this environment isn't for them. Also, I would like to state that we have, you know, the best and the brightest right here in Minnesota on our staff, as far as the DNR, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, the University of Minnesota that have been studying this. And if people don't trust the information we are getting from them, who will they ever trust? From there, I guess I feel that there is inherent dangers to any business or manufacturing, whether it is, you know, your power plants or your paper mills or the oil industry. I mean right down to your farming and your, I guess your cattle. I mean everything has got inherent potential for I guess so-called danger. I guess you can pause there. So, this is no different. And for us to progress forward, you know, sometimes we have to take that risk and we have to do our due diligence and try to get the facts and information on what the risks might be. The progress still has to go forward. People -- people have to work to live up here and this is one way they can do it. We need the jobs. I guess I will just leave it at that.

Doug Connell

18370

My name is Doug Connell. C-O-N-N-E-L-L. I'm from St. Paul. I'm here on behalf of Jobs for Minnesotans. I heard from our chair Nancy a few minutes ago. I just want to make a point that the economic impact of this project is not restricted to the Iron Range. It affects all of Minnesota. It affects the region. The jobs that are created directly and indirectly are going to benefit the whole region. I'm the former of CEO of Bar Engineering Company. We've been very active in assisting PolyMet with scientific and engineering aspects of this work. And that is an example of the ancillary jobs that are created from this kind of project. That has led to my company hiring folks in Hibbing, in Duluth, in the Twin Cities, and the also around the country in the technical expertise needed to support and do these kinds of projects safely. Those impacts really have a dramatic effect. If you have read recently about Duluth's resurgence, part of that resurgence, as the articles have indicated, have been because of the jobs that have been created in fields like engineering as well as other areas. And this is the reason why those jobs are being created. This economic development that this project represents is very clearly tied to the fortunes of Duluth, the fortunes of Northeastern Minnesota, and the state as a whole. I'm very proud of the work that my colleagues have done. I haven't had any personal involvement in the technical aspects of the work. I think it's been done very, very well, very rigorously. And I compliment the agencies for the process that they used to put together this public comment period, public meeting, etcetera. I've attended quite a few public meetings in my day. I have rarely seen one that has been this well run and frankly this cordial. So thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doug Duncan

16172

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Doug Halverson

40524

I support copper – nickel mining in Northern Minnesota. I believe Polymet is doing all the right things to make their operation environmentally safe. I am very confident that there will be no pollution of any streams, rivers or lakes including the Boundary Waters. There won't be a Smelter involved here, so no acid rain. Even though some people feel that copper-nickel mining pollutes lakes and streams, I beg to differ as I grew up in Coniston, Ontario which is in the Sudbury Nickel belt. Even with 3 smelters running in the 1960's and 1970's there were no lakes or streams or rivers that were polluted by mining and smelting sulphide ores. I swam in every lake and river and creek in the Sudbury area. Copper-Nickel mining will be very safe in Minnesota. Thanks you, Doug Halverson 1330 20th Street Cloquet, MN 55720 Email: dhalverson@mchsi-com

Doug Hildenbrand

19940

My name is Doug Hildenbrand and live at 420 NW 8th Street Chisholm, Mn 55719- My wife and I have followed this process closely. I have toured the proposed mine site and have investigated the proposed process. We are fully in support of proceeding with the project as proposed. Congrats to the agencies who have played a vital role in developing controls and measures that address environmental concerns. Let's begin the mining. Sent from Doug's iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doug Lande

57346

My name is Doug Lande. It is spelled L-A-N-D-E. Okay. I am requesting that the executives in charge of approving or disapproving the DEIS will take the "no-action alternative," as stated in the executive summary, on Page 43, and that no land exchange of public property be allowed to create a mining operation for private financial gain. Could you read that back for me; what I just stated? Okay. You can do a new paragraph. I would say a number of inappropriately addressed concerns give reason to distrust claims made in the DEIS. Specifically, there seems to be a problem with the DEIS, listed at Page 5-413, Table 5.2.7-12. The problem that I see is that the DEIS doesn't take into account uncontrolled Co2 emissions, such as that generated by the electric plant used by the mining operation. I don't think this is accounted for in the edition which says that the Co2 emissions are minor and not a major emission source. So, I would like to see all controlled and uncontrolled Co2 emissions related to the mining operation be listed. Also, I don't believe that the DEIS explains who does the monitoring of potential pollution sites, who pays for the monitoring, and where the public can access in an easy manner the monitoring results. Also, I do not believe that, as stated in the DEIS, that reclaimed wetlands should serve for mitigation lands, as they will never again be as productive as they were before they were reclaimed. Also, I don't believe that the 90th percentile discussion of probable pollution levels related to water is appropriate and I believe the modeling to be flawed as described in the dissenting opinion of the tribes. That's it.

Doug Lohman

36359

It's a really bad idea. Please, don't let it happen. Doug Lohman [HYPERLINK "http://www.armadillohomerepair-com"](http://www.armadillohomerepair-com) Armadillo Home Repair [HYPERLINK "http://www.armadillosound-com"](http://www.armadillosound-com) Armadillo Sound and Design [HYPERLINK "http://www.dlcajunband-com"](http://www.dlcajunband-com) DL Cajun Band 612-306-3490 Keep your words soft and tender, someday you may have to eat them Don't tell them where your goat is. If they can't find it, they can't get your goat.

doug myren

46524

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, doug myren 609 Portland, #2 St Paul, MN 55102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

doug myren

46526

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, doug myren 609 Portland, #2 St Paul, MN 55102

Doug Stevens

9700

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Doug Stevens 130 W 43rd St Mpls, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Doug Stevens

18547

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Doug Stevens 130 W 43rd St Mpls, MN 55409

50623

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Doug Stevens 130 W 43rd St Mpls, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Douglas DeNio 42794

See attachment

Douglas Ewart 39530

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Douglas Ewart 3714 17th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-2808 (612) 722-0910

Douglas Gregor 54857

See attachment

Douglas Kuehl 44549

There exists at least one assessment that yet has not been considered and really needs to be considered before mining should be permitted. That being, whether or not there exists sufficient need for the amount of copper and nickel expected to be mined when considering the current and future developments in replacement products, ie will the new technologies that have been developed using carbon nano-fiber for electronics, building materials, etc rapidly replace the need for even small amounts of new sources of copper and nickel, thus resulting in rapidly making the mining operation unprofitable. The MN-DNR should determine if there exists sufficient justification to permit the mine to begin operation, if in just a couple of years the use of carbon nanofibers results in suspension of mining operations. This may be reviewed on the internet in, among other sources, at HYPERLINK "<http://www.mining-com>"www.mining-com by looking at discussions of the research results of Cambridge University, or simply searching for applications of carbon nanofibers on the internet. Thank you. Douglas W. Kuehl 1401 Minneapolis Ave Duluth, MN 55803 218-391-2768 HYPERLINK "<mailto:dwkuehl@gmail-com>"dwkuehl@gmail-com - Douglas W. Kuehl Duluth, MN (218) 391-2768

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Douglas Olson

15824

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and DNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Douglas Olson 20538 Cadwell Ave Brainerd, MN 56401

15898

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and DNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Douglas Olson 20538 Cadwell Ave Brainerd, MN 56401

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Douglas Olson

40388

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney and Mr Westlake: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes alre

Douglas P Fulton

54727

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Douglas Peterson

42503

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Douglas Peterson 9508 Russell Ave S bloomington, MN 55431

Douglas Stephen

39333

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Douglas Stephen 8765 Hunters Way Apple Valley, MN 55124-9433

39340

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Douglas Stephen 8765 Hunters Way Apple Valley, MN 55124-9433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Douglas Wood

45685

From: Douglas Wood 3835 Pine Point Road Sartell, MN 56377 Dear DNR I wish to state my very strong opposition to the proposed PolyMet and Twin Metals mine operation in NE Minnesota. I am aware of the Duluth Complex deposit and of its size and importance, and of the need for such metals in today's economy and technologies. I also know that such a mining operation is inherently extraordinarily risky in terms of potentially catastrophic collateral environment damage. Because of the location of the minerals, all within igneous and metamorphic bedrock billions of years old and laced with fractures, the chances of acid contamination are high indeed. Soothing assurances about corporate responsibility and effective long term treatment and amelioration are in fact not reassuring at all, given the following circumstances: A waste water treatment program that will need to be in place and stringently monitored and overseen for a period of at least 500 years. (For perspective , 500 years ago it had only been 22 years since Columbus' first steps into the New World.) After recent environmental accidents in West Virginia and Japan, among others, the hubris of such an expectation is self-evident. The fact that virtually no corporation can be expected to last 500, or even 50 or 100 years, and thus assurances of long term responsibility are relatively meaningless. The fact that the location of these and other mining proposals is at the head of two great watersheds - St Lawrence Seaway (including of course incredibly valuable and highly sensitive Lake Superior and the other Great Lakes, destined to become only more valuable in the future) and Hudson Bay. The likelihood of a devastating impact to these watersheds - based on the past record of such mining operations globally - is very high indeed, particularly when extended over 500 years, with all the attendant uncertainties and unknowns. Even if, for instance, there were 1% chance of a failure in a given year, that would translate to a 99% chance over 500 years. The fact that the existing track record alone - of other such mines around the world - is convincing of only one probable outcome. And the transcendent fact that such mining operations would be at the very doorstep of Minnesota's natural crown jewel, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and downstream Voyageurs National Park. Generations of Minnesotans and other Americans have devoted their lives to understanding, studying, preserving, defending, and enjoying these global treasures. They are bequeathed to our care. And there is simply no realistic, tangible, practical, predictable, or believable way that this responsibility can be honored while approving and moving ahead with these plans. We are told of potential economic benefits - for a relatively short period of time, a few decades, 30 or 40 years, with some good wages for a few workers. PolyMet estimates that 25% of workers would be hired locally, with about 90 from neighboring communities, 72 commuting from regional hubs like Duluth, and 200 coming from elsewhere. While I in no way denigrate the importance of jobs and living wages to these workers, one must point out in fairness that the current jobs, careers, and economic benefits of tourism alone in the area - the Boundary Waters alone is visited by 140,000 visitors a year on multi- day trips - dwarf these potential benefits in the short term, but more importantly in the long term. The greatest economic benefits from these projects - the really big money - will go to enrich a very few who do not live here, who have no ties or feelings or sense of place or responsibility for this globally significant and internationally treasured area. When we are asked a question that requires a yes or no answer, the human bias is toward yes. Yes is positive, it seems forward looking and optimistic. No, on the other hand seems negative, oppositional, leading only toward a stop sign or a dead end. But it all depends on how the questio

dprichards86

9513

I welcome my opportunity to comment on the PolMet mining proposal. It was extremely easy to find links to sign a petition against this mining not easy to find a forum to vote for the mining and opportunity for more jobs in Northern Minnesota. My opinion is the State of Minnesota should be able to monitor the mining process, they do have the experience to do so. Everyones fear is unrecognized fear, have we not made state parks out of past reclaimed mines. I myself have enjoyed these state parks. Are not mining companies requiered to reclaim the land once finished. I could go on and on about this as I have a background in business opportunity. I also have a long history in Northern Minnesota. I could not find a decent job there It has always appeared to me that the state is more in the way than helpful when it comes to emerging business. The cities and counties understand the importance of business and economic growth. We need jobs in Minnesota, we also need business opportunity. Northern Minnesota does in fact have residents and they would like jobs. Northern Minnesota is not a playground for the rich and underworked people to enjoy the boundry water canoe area. It is also not a wolf sanctuary. There are residents in that all over Northern Minnesota. Most barely able to afford a hunting or fishing license let alone pull a 100,000 dollars of boat and pickup around. My family for a number of generations has served the State of Minnesota in a variety of positions. The state would have many more resources if we would replant the State forests once logged off. In summary, I feel the State of Minnesota is more than qualified to monitor and enforce mining laws with this new opportunity. Lets turn a leaf and welcome new business to Minnesota. Better yet, let's help them in any way we can. Dan Richards [HYPERLINK "mailto:dprichards86@zoho-com"](mailto:dprichards86@zoho-com)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dr Jay Sullivan

40277

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Dr Jay Sullivan 771061st Ave Nw Gig Harbor, WA 98335 US

Dr Paul Lindfors

51756

From: Sierra Club [mailto:information@sierraclub-org] On Behalf Of Paul and Gail Lindfors Sent: Friday, December 20, 2013 7:59 AM To: Dabney, Tim -FS Subject: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft EIS Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The burden of proof should be on PloyMet to prove their actions will not hurt people. It should not be left for the people to prove they might be injured. The injuries of pollution are subtle and require long and careful studies. Such studies have not been done. Consider the case against cigarette smoke being inhaled by innocent bystanders. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Paul and Gail Lindfors 2224 W Dream Dr North Mankato, MN 56003-2306 (507) 388-2876

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dr. Louis LaPierre

40460

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Drake Best

54334

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, After researching the idea of mining in northeastern Minnesota, I disagree with the idea. I think that PolyMet Mining does have a good plan in place, but I feel that the disadvantages overpower the advantages. The copper-sulfate mining process could boost Minnesota's economy, but we can find other ways to boost the economy. The effect on the environment is not good. Although PolyMet is planning to minimize or possibly avoid the effects, they can't stop everything that could happen. Let's take wetlands for example. If the project does take place, 913 acres of wetlands would be permanently lost. I understand that PolyMet plans to recreate some of these wetlands after the mining is done, but they will not be able to replenish the valuable home of organisms and many animals. Mining in this region would also harm the St. Louis River. As many people know, the St. Louis River flows into Lake Superior. There is already a lot of pollutants in the lake, and polluting a river that flows into the lake would only make things worse. Another reason why I disagree with the idea of mining in northeastern Minnesota is, what it would do to the Ojibwe people. The Ojibwe people would lose part of the sacred Mesabe Widjiu. It is not fair to take away even one inch of their sacred land. Many Indian tribes throughout the country have lost most or all of its land. Taking away even more of their land is unethical. The last reason I would like to address on why I believe PolyMet should not mine in the region is, the effect it would have on endangered species. One endangered species in particular would be the Canada Lynx. The Canada Lynx are struggling to sustain a population in Minnesota and mining would only exacerbate the situation. Thank you for reading my letter and considering my opinions. Sincerely, Drake Best

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dressel 54853

See attachment

Drew Johnson 58113

To the Minnesota DNR, thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Polymet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are fortunate to live in a place that requires Environmental Impact Statement for the significant mining projects such as this one. We are also fortunate to live in a place where we can publicly discuss significant mining projects. The proposed Polymet mine would be a significant mining project potentially a precedent setting mining project for many mining projects lined up to follow it. The way we handle this proposed mine will surely be used as a blueprint, perhaps even a legal argument, for many mines that might follow. So we are thankful for this hearing and the 2,200 page study that has been submitted. It is a long document, but unfortunately not thorough. Some significant questions are left unanswered, including: How long will the mine need to be maintained? The study mentions 500 or more years. That sounds an awful lot like forever or we don't know to me. How much will maintenance cost? Maintaining a complex and polluted site forever would cost quite a lot, I assume. Who will pay the maintenance cost? I don't believe Polymet will be around forever so I can only assume that means Minnesotans will pay for it. Mining operations are expected to last 20 years, according to the study. After the 20 year boom what support will there be for communities that will face the mining bust? Who will pay for and provide this support? In this state, we are strong community. We care for each other. We want good jobs and cleaner water. For everyone, including those too young to speak tonight and those not yet born. I'm a parent of three very young Minnesotans and I care deeply about the world they will inherit from us. Given the magnitude of those proposed mine on the people and the land we hold most dear, we must get the Environmental Impact Statement right. To act responsibly and avoid recklessness, we must demand concrete answers to these fundamental questions. For this we pray that you will be thorough and you will be courageous that you will be wise. Thank you.

Drew Peterson 41987

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Drew Peterson Montrose, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Drew VanKrevelen

16621

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Duane Arvola

42515

Duane Arvola 1204 18th St NO Virginia, MN 55792 With the national debt at near 18 trillion, we had better get real. The new type of mining is already proven to work fine, even as the water is concerned. North Dakota is really booming now, we can also do our part in Minnesota to help our nation. She is really getting weak now.

Duane Bieber

42589

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Duane Glew 39561

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Duane Glew 1135 Brown Rd S Wayzata, MN 55391-9119 (952) 476-6426

Duane Godbout 42528

See attachment

Duane J Lunda 57227

I'm no expert on this type of mining, but I have done a lot of reading up on this subject and I believe that this is not the right type of mining in the proposed area. My biggest concern is who is overseeing the project? Is it the same person who was in charge of the BP oil spill as reported in the news? Duane Lunda 5940 Eagle Lake Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Duane Larry Gerlovich 54480

I have listened to television news, radio programs, talked to a few people at various places. I have my own opinions also, It seems like the pollution and runoff are or would cause some problems in surrounding area of Polymet. I think we would be better off with some type of manufacturing jobs that would not pollute the area up there. We do need jobs in this area.

Duane R Schmidt 54831

See attachment

Duane Sickmann 39582

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We must preserve our Minnesota wilderness from these type of activities and stop pollution before it starts. Clean water is what Minnesotans want as they passed the Clean Water Legacy Act "overwhelmingly" - these funds are not to clean up activities such as PolyMet's that never should be allowed to start without full measures to insure our waters are clean well into the future. Thank You Duane Sickmann The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Duane Sickmann 200 Freeport Ave NW Apt 1 Elk River, MN 55330-1567 (763) 259-1844

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Duluth Seaway Port Authority 19913

February 28, 2014 Attached in pdf format is the Resolution of Support for PolyMet that was passed at the Duluth Seaway Port Authority's board meeting on February 27, 2014- The original is being sent to Lisa Fay, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit, via US Mail. Contact information for the Duluth Seaway Port Authority is as follows: Vanta E. Coda II Duluth Seaway Port Authority 1200 Port Terminal Drive Duluth, MN 55802 Regards, Becky McMillan Executive Assistant Duluth Seaway Port Authority Phone: 218-727-8525 HYPERLINK "mailto:bcmcmillan@duluthport-com"bcmcmillan@duluthport-com

54660

See attachment

Duncan Storlie 52563

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404 " Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation " wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect " wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dureti Doto

54222

Dear Lisa Fay, I am a student at Humboldt High School and my name is Dureti Doto. I have recently been informed about the one hundred mile swamp. I learned that the SDEIS incorrectly drew the one hundred mile swamp in the SDEIS maps. I also learned that the mine site is just south of the one hundred mile swamp that drains to the boundary waters. I am writing to you today because first of all people do notice the error on the SDEIS maps, because people really do care about the one hundred mile map and the boundary waters. And because it is not okay for the SDEIS to draw the map incorrectly. It is also not okay for the mines to contaminate the boundary waters. The boundary waters are important because they are clean and there are only a few of those left. We need to leave clean water for our future generations. Please take this into consideration because it is important for many people. Thank you. Dureti Doto 1605 Case Ave St. Paul, MN 55106

Dustin Bower

40623

This comment is from: Dustin Bower 8865 Branson Drive, Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076- I am emailed to express my complete disagreement with the proposed PolyMet mining project, specifically on environmental grounds. If the tachonite seepage is already exceeding water quality standards for the holding ponds, and the PolyMet things the solution is to add even more pollution to the mix and create a few more massive holding ponds, and then use an unproven reverse osmosis system in an attempt to decontaminate the water, I just don't know how the DNR can approve such a plan. Minnesotan's pride ourselves on our clean water and beautiful nature. Please don't allow PolyMet to destroy an area in Minnesota that hasn't even recovered from the last mining operation. Sincerely, Dustin Bower

Dustin Cloyes

40420

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Dustin Cloyes 4485 3rd Street Columbiaville, MI 48421 US

Dustin Rosemark

3631

I understand that the public can comment on the Proposed Poly Met project. I highly object to this project, it throws years of conservation by people like Earnest C. Oberholtzer and others. Poly Met is NOT ready to be given such an enormous responsibility by the public. Should there be any damage to this area it would be long-lasting and potentially crippling to an already fragile eco-system. My heart and soul belongs to this place which I feel is now threatened. Please do something to stop Poly Met. Dustin M. Rosemark 311 24th St NE Rochester, MN 55906 www.dmrosemark-com 507-206-8332 This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the solicitor-client or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dwayne 38429

We need the Polymet Jobs. In 2008 I was laid off from my heavy equipment operating job due to the housing market crash. Polymet seemed to be ready to go so I took all the mine training and bought a building site in Hoyt Lakes planning to finish out my operating career at the mine. When Polymet was put on hold, again, I had to take an out of state job. My family wants to come home. We need Polymet to open. This is life changing for us. The people who do not want change on the iron range are using distorted facts and outright fibs. The 20 years of work they keep bringing up is not true. The permit would be good for 20 years, Then they would apply for another permit. The mine may last closer to 100 years. The 500 years of water monitoring is also misleading. Is this a made up number. And technology keeps advancing. The water may very well be better than it is today. Get the facts right and let the people on the range make a decent living. It is good for the world and the right thing to do. Dwayne Myrvold 2014 Atha Woods Dr Monroe, Georgia 30566

Dwayne Trulsen 30273

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, History repeats itself. How much more health problems and environment destruction do we need or can handle. There needs to be ways to mine without the severe secondary effects to our health and especially the health of our children. Dr Dwayne and Peggy Truhlsen Sincerely, Dwayne Trulsen 25228 Redwing Ave Shafer, MN 55074-9779 (715) 338-6480

Dwight and Ann Ericsson 10753

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I could just forward to you the comments prepared by others, and I do endorse them, but I just want to say that I shudder to think of the long-term consequences of this mining proposal. I first visited the Boundary Waters in 1953- I have, over the years traveled most parts of the Boundary Waters and much of the Quetico. It would be tragic to pollute those beautiful waters, as the PolyMet-proposed mine would almost certainly do. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dwight and Ann Ericsson Dwight and Ann Ericsson 4963 W 539 N Huntington, IN 46750

18395

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I could just forward to you the comments prepared by others, and I do endorse them, but I just want to say that I shudder to think of the long-term consequences of this mining proposal. I first visited the Boundary Waters in 1953- I have, over the years traveled most parts of the Boundary Waters and much of the Quetico. It would be tragic to pollute those beautiful waters, as the PolyMet-proposed mine would almost certainly do. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dwight and Ann Ericsson Dwight and Ann Ericsson 4963 W 539 N Huntington, IN 46750

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dwight and Ann Ericsson

39717

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

50514

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I could just forward to you the comments prepared by others, and I do endorse them, but I just want to say that I shudder to think of the long-term consequences of this mining proposal. I first visited the Boundary Waters in 1953- I have, over the years traveled most parts of the Boundary Waters and much of the Quetico. It would be tragic to pollute those beautiful waters, as the PolyMet-proposed mine would almost certainly do. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dwight and Ann Ericsson Dwight and Ann Ericsson 4963 W 539 N Huntington, IN 46750

dwight fellman

43252

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, dwight fellman 7909 victoria curve St louis park, MN 55426

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dwight Mcconnell

39083

---Original Message--- From: condor6@2z-net [mailto:condor6@2z-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 7:19 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet
Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Dwight Mcconnell 438 Buck View Rd Ely, MN 55731-8176

39085

---Original Message--- From: condor6@2z-net [mailto:condor6@2z-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 7:19 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet
Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Dwight Mcconnell 438 Buck View Rd Ely, MN 55731-8176

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dwight Rabuse 58140

The environmental plan PolyMet has proposed appears detailed and comprehensive and should assure the public that this important project is environmentally responsible and sound.

Dwight Smith 6269

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: No doubt you are receiving numerous messages regarding the PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have read a fair amount of the statement itself and other things written - pro and con - regarding both the statement and the advisability of non-ferrous metals mining in northern Minnesota. I don't pretend to know what the best answers are. I do know the history of such mining operations elsewhere, and it makes me very uneasy to think that authorities might proceed quickly on an issue that has potential long-term consequences. I understand the eagerness of a business like PolyMet to begin operations on what is potentially a very profitable venture, and I likewise understand the desire of many interests in the state and region to bring good jobs and prosperity to an area whose economy has suffered in recent decades. What I can't understand is how any government official, elected or appointed, should feel the need to come to a decision without a thorough consideration of all the consequences of taking this step. What is under consideration is a question that will have an impact on the land and water for literally centuries. Shouldn't this justify taking a few additional months of analysis and research before leaping into action. Additionally, is it really wise to consider something as momentous as this in the months leading up to national and state election. Certainly nobody can be so naive as to think there are no political ramifications to this matter. The real points of this message are simple: This is a major consideration with critical consequences for the entire state, regardless of the final decisions. It should therefore be given the necessary time and effort to fully understand all aspects of this matter. And all of this should be carried out in as objective a manner as possible, as free as possible from political pressures. Those minerals have been in the ground for millennia; they aren't going anywhere. They will be as available for extraction in a year or two as they are today. The Iron Range has endured decades of economic difficulties. While everyone would like to see a revival of that region's economy, some additional time taken to get it "right" isn't going to make that great a difference. If the decisions are rushed, generations of Minnesotans may be paying the consequences of hasty action. Commercial and political expedience are no excuse for compromising our treasured natural legacy. Please consider the full weight of the decision you are making, not just the short-term profit and benefits that will come from it. Respectfully, Dwight Smith
Dwight Smith 2285 Brooke Lane Hastings, MN 55033 651-983-1799

Dyces 21482

*letter below is attached in PDF format Dear Ms Fay (MN DNR), Mr Bruner (USACE), and Mr Dabney (USFS) Subject: the NorthMet SDEIS By now you have heard rivers of testimony as to the danger the PolyMet mine poses to land, water and air. You have also heard the industry bargaining line with the promise of jobs and claims that they are committed to be good stewards of the land and water. I am greatly concerned about the very real contamination of precious and finite resources of land, water and air. What good is the promise of a few jobs when the water becomes contaminated. What happens to the numerous tourist and recreation jobs that rely on clean water and undamaged wilderness. I am not willing to risk sacrificing water resources so that PolyMet can take the minerals and run. We know that PolyMet will not be around for the next 250 – 500 years to make good on their “promise” to protect the water. For reasons mentioned earlier, I need not elaborate on the testimony that you have heard I will however, ask that you remember some of the basic information you learned in high school science class. Sulfide and water is a dangerous mix. When the sulfide mining process sees sulfide and life giving water interacting, sulfuric acid is produced on a very large scale. It doesn't stop there. As the acid dissolves the rock, heavy metals are released. Heavy metals no longer trapped in rock become yet another, real and present danger to humans, fish, birds, plants and other wildlife. There goes the neighborhood. Not just decades of water contamination, but also the release of toxic metals. This surely encourages a stronger “catch and release” practice for those who dare to fish the contaminated waters; however certainly there is a better way to protect our fish and human population Although I live in southwest Minnesota, I know that the damage that comes with this mine would impact all of us in one way or another. We began our life journey surrounded with water. Please recognize how precious water is to all life on this planet. I urge you to reject the NorthMet SDEIS and deny any permits which could harm Minnesota's water quality and supply for present and future generations. Your help to stop NorthMet SDEIS will be greatly appreciated by so many. Sincerely, Darwin Dyce 1764 330th St, Ghent, MN 56239 HYPERLINK "mailto:dyce@mvtvwireless-com"dyce@mvtvwireless-com or Cell: 507-476-2042

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Dyke Williams

10693

From: Dyke V. Williams 3725 Parkway Deephaven, MN 55391 NorthMet and the expanded sulfide mining it forecasts are "too far". Currently we the people have no statutes or precedents for being able to determine that a project goes "too far" beyond the qualities of life we wish to enjoy. Because of the numerous earth and water quality and safety hazards it represents, NorthMet must be stopped now - because the people of Minnesota want it stopped. The need for profit (greed) of foreign company executives to sell our resources for their gain is "way too far" Specific objections and concerns include: - Your cynically offering only three public meetings, only one of which was in the Twin Cities area and that way too far east for many of us. Clearly you are afraid of open discussion here. - That only about 90 jobs will go to local northern Minnesota residents - the rest to out-of-state experts in various arcane skills related to this most dangerous mining plan. - It is clear to most of us that the Arrowhead will be far better off economically if left relatively clean - land untrammled, water unpolluted, air unburdened with particulates, roads unclogged with huge, dangerous and impeding traffic, sound left quiet without the roar of Diesel and shock impact of drills and explosives. Like it is now where a resort or outfitter can advertise "Come north where it's clean" - NOT "come north and enjoy the dirt, mess and sulphuric acid". The Arrowhead and BWCA are the area's best assets, NOT to be spoiled for 20 years of profit but lingering on effectively in perpetuity. It is said that the only entity that has lasted for 500 years (where are those NorthMet long term funding plans.) is the Catholic Church. And that hasn't exactly kept the same form, aims and goals throughout. Why should we believe NorthMet's non-existent plans will. - No planning has been made for unintended consequences, nor for unexpected events. What happens when we get another 14" rainfall in 8 hours (July, 1988 - I was there - we paddled OVER campsites and looked DOWN at firegrates). Or the New Madrid fault becomes active. Or green fanatics try to sabotage machinery, facilities, fail-safes (for which there are already precedents). A Polymet manager told me he had never even considered the possibility of sabotage. Why in heaven's name not . - Our remaining wilderness and wild areas are irreplaceable. As a consultant in experiential education, I and we know that most kids can best learn adult roles and responsibilities through involvement in outdoor adventure/challenge experiences - Outward Bound, Menogyn, Widgiwagan, Warren, Wilderness Canoe Base, Sommers Canoe Base, scout and church trips through outfitters. Dig it up and its gone for good. And impact goes MUCH farther than you might think - I've been on Sturgeon Lake in the Quetico and could hear the dozers and Diesels in the Atikokan mine when it was still open. And the Canadian railroad Diesel engines from the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific today. - That the copper is there NO LONGER means that anyone has the automatic right to dig it up in the face of enormous, serious and scientific objections. It is the responsibility of the DNR and of the State of Minnesota to stop this before it starts. This is not a smallish group of deer hunters saying keep the deer population unnaturally at 1-2 million so we can shoot deer easily (the natural carrying capacity is said to be about 150,000). How do the 34 people killed in deer/car collisions last year feel about the DNR catering to the squeaky hunter wheel. It is time to stop accomodating, listen to the majority and make decisions based on the science available or needed and NOT on the emotions or need for extra department funding. Please, please listen to all of us who are saying 20 years' profits for 500 years pollution is going "too far". You have the chance to be leaders and heros, or to be followers and fools. Please choose well for all of us. Dyke Williams

E Blankers

39599

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs E Blankers PleaseUseEmail Chanhassen, MN 553170001 (952) 361-6670

E C Norman

54875

See attachment

E H Hanson

42741

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

E Lane-Getaz

45643

Dear Ms Fay, I am concerned about the pollution that is left behind for hundreds of years after the mining ceases, especially water pollution. I am also concerned about lingering threats to human health that have not been adequately assessed. The technology required to preserve the safety of our water is not adequate. We should not extend mining rights to an outside corporation that cannot realistically provide stewardship for our water nor our environment. Kathryn Hoffman, staff attorney with the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, said “the process to treat the water is complex, requiring multiple systems to work successfully and a mine in Michigan using a state-of-the-art reverse osmosis plant to do just that has already had more than 40 permit violations for not meeting water quality standards.” While jobs are important, we may be talking about as few as 90 local jobs compared to 500 years of ongoing water treatment. I support jobs in northern Minnesota that are sustainable to all life in the area, and I encourage the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to take a leadership role in promoting sustainable industry. However, Hoffman estimated that while “PolyMet project is expected to create 360 jobs after experts in the mining field are imported the site will create about 90 local hires.” Thank you for taking public comment on this important issue that affects the health of us all, and our environment, for generations to come.. Let us be good stewards of the resources we have Sincerely, Betsy Lane-Getaz, MS, RN 32293 Alta Avenue Northfield, Mn 55057

Earl Rook

45197

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney: I am writing to ask that you reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. (I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency). In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on sound science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish, and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its unjustifiably optimistic predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin, and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not an objective and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely, Earl Rook Stillwater, MN Earl Rook 11550 Irish Avenue North

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Earl Rook 45199

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney: I am writing to ask that you reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. (I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency). In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on sound science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish, and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its unjustifiably optimistic predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin, and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not an objective and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely, Earl Rook Stillwater, MN Earl Rook 11550 Irish Avenue North Stillwater, MN 55082

Earth Concerns 54113

I don't buy it!! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Eben Spencer 39496

I am very concerned about both the short and long term consequences of proposed sulfide mining in NE Minnesota. While I understand the need for meaningful employment in the region, the potential environmental degradation inherent with such mining must be avoided at all costs. I am not completely opposed to such mining, but I urge the Minnesota DNR, MPCA, and the USA EPA to require the strictest of standards and to protect our national heritage – our waters, forests, and wetlands – first and foremost. I do not feel that PolyMet has provided such assurances yet, and strongly feel that permits should not be issued at this point, nor should permits be issued until further studies and guarantees are in place and 100% foolproof. Eben S. Spencer Eben S. Spencer 26303 Cedar Lake Trail Bovey, MN 55709

Ed & Harriet Griffith 42713

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ed Borchardt

10189

I live on lake Vermilion. We do not have a well, we have a lake water system and use the water from lake Vermilion for everything in our house including the drinking water with minimal filtration. I would be able to see the head frame from the Sudan underground mine if the small hill between the lake and the mine were not there. This mine started as an open pit mine as well as numerous test pits. Some will say the rock that was drilled and blasted for this mine and the rock cuts for Hwy. 169 and 135 contain sulfur bearing rock. This rock has had no mitigation and has been leaching into the waters that supply lake Vermilion for over 100 years with no measurable adverse effects. It's time to move the PolyMet project foreword and show the world we can mine safely in Minnesota. Best regards, Ed Borchardt Area Manager _____ Atlas Copco Construction Mining Technique USA LLC 4359 Isle of Pines Drive Tower, MN 55790 USA Cell: +1 (218) 929-2540 E-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:ed.borchardt@us.atlascopco-com"ed.borchardt@us.atlascopco-com Visit Atlas Copco at: www.atlascopco.us Read about our products in action atwww.miningandconstruction-comandwww.deepholedriller-com _____ Committed to sustainable productivity

Ed Verzal

41105

There is no evidence that Polymet will not cause serious damage to the environment. Also, there is no way to ensure that Polymet will be able or willing to pay for restoration of land/water areas destroyed by pollution. Polymet must not be given a permit to mine in Minnesota. Thank you. Ed Verzal 2512 16th Ave E. Hibbing, MN 55746

45275

I live on the Iron Range, and I strongly oppose the PolyMet copper nickel mining project. My husband and I love traveling and staying on the North Shore of Lake Superior, and I do not want to see sulfuric acid waste from this project destroy the wetlands, rivers, streams, and trees in the Superior National Forest and Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Tourism is an important and viable industry in this part of the state and should not be compromised by a risky mining project. Copper nickel mining leaves the land and water polluted wherever it occurs. We as a state cannot afford to clean up this pollution for hundreds of years. Mary Verzal 2512 16th Ave East Hibbing, MN

Eddie Harrison

39585

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Eddie Harrison 2425 County Road C2 W Roseville, MN 55113-1054

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Edi Thorstensson

20051

I am writing to express my opposition to the copper mining that Polymet proposes be carried out in northeastern Minnesota. My concern centers on the potential for irreversible damage to the environment, water pollution, industrialization and limited access to a large natural area, and economic loss for residents of the area due to lost recreational revenue. Foremost among these is water pollution, which is estimated to take hundreds of years-many generations-and billions of dollars to clean up. I share these quotes with you. "If you need a horror story, go online to the Berkley Pit story. The Pit is in Butte Montana and the copper mine company long gone. So the city, state and the EPA have had to build a very expensive water treatment plant to deal with the sulfuric acid lake that is threatening to overflow any year now, poisoning the area water. I have a niece who works for the regional energy company in Montana and South Dakota." One of the greatest dignities of humankind is that each successive generation is invested in the welfare of each new generation. ~ Fred McFeely Rogers Edi Thorstensson 809 S. 7th Street St Peter, MN 56082

Edie

46637

Edie and Chuck Mersereau 4320 Glenwood Ave Golden Valley MN 55422 Summer home on Ring Rock. 12963 West ridge Grew up in Hibbing and have lived with mining destruction. Please no more. Lakes and forests will never be the same.

Edith deGroot

41700

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Edith S. Glass-Englund

19977

I am a native of Duluth and I have seen what mining operations do to our northern wilderness. I believe that if the people of that area are conflicted about the mines presence, that they have a more definitive opinion about the impact of this mine on their livelihoods. Right now in this country, we are on the verge of a Keystone pipeline going through the mid-section of this beautiful country, we have the drought-causing practice of fracking snapping at our heels, we have the coal orientated disasters of West Virginia and North Carolina, the serial poison spills nationwide, the oil train derailments and the entire practice of having the oil industry write it's own regulations so as they can do as they please. We're a on a run away train heading for the docks with no breaks..so you people better be pretty damn sure that this mine isn't going to contribute to the already down turn of this planet because when the ocean comes it will take no prisoners rich or poor..and no one will be left to say that the human species that was given their capacity to think, to create and project reason took this beautiful planet, this wonderful wilderness ecosystem and the pure air that we breath acted instead like a bunch of morons. Sincerely, Edith S. Glass-Englund

Edmund Kelley

14818

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Edward A Alto

54706

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Edward Johnson 41943

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Edward Johnson Eden Prairie, Minnesota

Edward Martell 43111

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am strongly against the PolyMet sulfide mine plan. Sincerely Edward Martell 2149 Goodrich Av St Paul, MN 55105 651-231-1179

Edward Pajunen 41270

An outstanding effort has been put forth by the 3 agencies and the company. It is time to allow the company to move forwaRd The region, the state, the US and the world will all benefit economically and environmentally. Edward L. Pajunen 168 E 6th St #4002 St Paul, MN 55101

Edwin Wintermute 27592

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Unless there is an over-riding need for the sulfides that would be produced, this proposal should be rejected. The need for untrammled natural spaces should take precedence. Sincerely, Edwin Wintermute 182 Dividing Ct Arnold, MD 21012-1026 (410) 544-1155

Edwina Hertzberg 6160

Gentlepeople: We write to ask that the possibility of Polymet Mining Corp. mining in this region be fully and thoroughly studied, that no permit be granted until such studies are complete, and then only if Polymet can assure an escrow account that would pay for cleanup for the 500 years that the region would be affected. Short-term jobs that risk long -term pollution would be a short-sided and foolish decision, risking the beauty of this precious part of the globe. It is impossible for Polymet to assure that no accident can happen, no mistake made that would jeopardize the safety and beauty of this corner of the earth. The risk of pollution of the streams and lakes, small and large, is too great. No amount of money can buy the purity of this environment. Sincerely, Edwina and Robert Hertzberg 7090 E. Hwy. 61 Grand Portage, MN 55605

Edwyna Bergh 42583

See attachment

Eh Ku Soe Tun Baw 42927

Eh Ku Soe

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eileen Anderson

39738

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please keep PolyMet Mining Corp out of Minnesota. Please keep our waters clean and this area pristine. This area has a special place in my heart because of its beauty and its healing qualities. This area deserves to be kept special for Minnesotans and any that want to experience the beauty of this spot on earth. The highest good would be to preserve this area for the generations to come. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Eileen Anderson 5356 Holiday Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345-4420 (952) 934-6260

Eileen Molitor

57166

Hi, I do not agree with the proposed mining in the area suggested. The probability of poison going into the water is way too dangerous to our environment. It is never ok to ruin our water. It is way too important to our health. Eileen Molitor 717 North 44th Ave EDuluth, MN 55804

El Dorado

41800

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, El Dorado Rockford, Minnesota

ela crutchley

41718

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, ela crutchley 25 miller rd christchurch, None 07672

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elaine Brown

9575

I was too upset to listen to the entire public forum in St Paul last evening, so I left. This morning, I watched the entire public hearing online. After listening to what people said, I have formed my opinion. I do not think this mining project should be allowed. I have never believed this project as environmentally sound for this part of Minnesota. On the other hand, I have battled with the idea of job creation. I do understand the people that live on the Iron Range need sustainable employment. The key word being sustainable. I believed what I heard when individuals spoke of a need to boost their economy. However, I do not think mining can ever offer sustainable employment. After all, isn't that what is most upsetting to the former miners living on the range. Most spoke proudly of their heritage, as sons and daughters of miners and a desire to carry that forward to their children. I will be harsh in my judgement, in my opinion, you can not have mining a non renewal natural resource as a sustainable career. The people living there today are the end result of an economy unable to sustain itself. Mining is an economy build on a boom to bust cycle. How many mines will it take to sustain employment for Northeastern Minnesota generations to come. At what eventual cost to the environment. As to my environmental concerns I heard one pro mining gentleman say mining forever changes the land. He went on to say he strongly felt in today's world Polymet could somehow do it better, that is, with less destruction. He is clearly a hopeful gentleman. I do agree that mining is destructive to the environment, but I can not see clearly that Polymet can promise less destruction. I find it highly doubtful when Polymet makes such bold claims it is my understanding, the pro mining gentleman was suggesting there has to be a trade off. I agree. I am just not in favor of the trade off. The risk is just too great. I do not believe the science is there to prove it can be done. A classic example of science gone wrong is what is currently happening in Washington state at the Hanford Nuclear Waste Treatment Site. It is leaking, an unbelievable amount of money has been and continues to be spent, the Governor of Washington is seeking a fix, and a resolution is not forth coming. I do not believe it was the intention of anyone in the Pacific Northwest to contaminate the Columbia River Gorge, but that is what they are left with some seventy years after the construction of the site. It makes me wonder how predictions upwards of 500 years could possibly seem reliable. It would be unwise to create the potential for such misfortune in Minnesota. Polymet is not here to help the people of the Iron Range find sustainable employment, nor is it their goal to build the local economy. They are corporation with world wide corporate interests and investments. Approval or not, they will at some point fold the tent and move on, leaving another generation of Iron Rangers looking for sustainable employment. In my opinion, let them leave now, and we will continue to sustain the wilderness areas of Minnesota for future generations of Minnesotans and our global tourists. Elaine Brown 15761 Rivers Edge Drive Milaca, MN 56353

Elaine C Gaston

57278

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever.

Elaine Kaeter

54800

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elaine Leach

16186

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Elaine Loeffler

11353

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands and waterways. 500 Years of monitoring is not a realistic plan. Jobs for a short time will not balance out the extreme risk current mining operations pose to the area. It would be cheaper to pay those workers for twenty years to stay home and not take on the mining risk. We are not the only generation. Future mining methods will hopefully be created that don't pose so great a risk. The minerals will still be there, and future technology will hopefully be discovered that mitigate some of the extreme environmental risk we currently are considering. A realistic plan would lay out years to mine, years to close down the mine, and years to monitor the plan, with a timeline completed within a human lifetime. That would be a plan that could be considered for permitting responsibly by today's agencies. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits. The known risks are too great. Sincerely Elaine Loeffler 7197 Highway 1 Finland, MN 55603 2182268623

Elaine Mayer

9833

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal environmental impacts. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. Sincerely yours, Elaine Mayer 1432 20th St NW Rochester, MN 55901

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elaine Mayer

18622

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal environmental impacts. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS Sincerely yours, Elaine Mayer 1432 20th St NW Rochester, MN 55901

50698

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal environmental impacts. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS Sincerely yours, Elaine Mayer 1432 20th St NW Rochester, MN 55901

Elaine Skrentner

40099

Dear DNR, If you can show me one mine that has run as perfectly as reports are assuming the new Poly Met will run, then I would consider approving the mine. BUT, I don't think you can do that. Do not risk Minnesota's water for the next 500 years for a 50 years of economic development. Elaine Skrentner 5551 Village Drive Edina, MN 55439

Elaine Swanson

25125

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I write from east-central Wisconsin where we are privileged to live on a 50-acre wildlife sanctuary. For over 30 years, our family has worked to take land out of crop production and restore woodlands, ponds, and native grasses. At the core of our efforts lies the belief that the land deserves our reverence and our respect. I am appalled that any serious consideration by officials in Minnesota should be given to an open pit mine on National Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Elaine Swanson W10732 Triangle Rd Pickett, WI 54964-9601 (920) 589-6477

31590

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I write from east-central Wisconsin where we are privileged to live on a 50-acre wildlife sanctuary. For over 30 years, our family has worked to take land out of crop production and restore woodlands, ponds, and native grasses. At the core of our efforts lies the belief that the land and wildlife deserve our reverence and respect. I see a violation of both when an open pit sulfide mine is proposed on National Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Elaine Swanson W10732 Triangle Rd Pickett, WI 54964-9601 (920) 589-6477

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elaine Thruene

6230

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: NO AMOUNT of "progress" or "economic advancement" or "more jobs" or corporate gain, or more tax revenue is worth the price of polluting our land and water, destroying wetlands, poisoning our children (and adults, and livestock, and pets, and wildlife), killing fish, poisoning rivers and groundwater used for drinking water and irrigation, and negatively affecting our entire food chain and living habitat in this part of our beautiful and otherwise mostly healthy state. We all live downstream. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny ALL permits for proposed activities that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Elaine M. Thruene Elaine Thruene 708 Riverside Ave S Sartell, MN 56377

Elaine Tucker

57876

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Elanne Palcich

42959

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Tamara Cameron US Army Corps of Engineers St Paul District, Regulatory Branch 180 5th Street E, Suite 700 Saint Paul, MN 55101 tamara.e.cameron@usace.army.mil Tim Dabney USDA-Forest Service Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Ave Place Duluth, MN 55606 tdabney@fs.fed.us March 13, 2014 RE: PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) I am submitting these comments as a life-long resident of the Iron Range. The impacts of taconite mining upon the landscape and the watershed are becoming increasingly apparent, and the severity of those impacts are gradually being made known to the public. I believe that we are entering an age that will demand more transparency from our governmental agencies, as individual citizens take it upon themselves to become more informed. My comments are as follows: Problems Concerning the Proposed US Forest Service Land Exchange, Loss of Wetlands The US Forest Service Land Exchange, as part of the PolyMet SDEIS, is lacking in several significant areas. (1) The Land Exchange bypasses the most important obligation of the US Forest Service, which is that of protecting the surface area of land purchased under the Weeks Act. (2) The Forest Service omitted an underground mine option as the only legal alternative; because it was omitted, the plan was never analyzed. As a result, the Forest Service has wasted tax payer money and agency time on the preparation of an open pit proposal that cannot meet the obligations belonging to the Forest Service. (3) The rationale for choosing the proposed parcels to be exchanged fails to demonstrate that this would be an equal exchange. (4) The Forest Service fails to adequately analyze the loss of wetlands and Aquatic Resources of National Importance (ARNI). The loss of wetlands in acreage would be significant and the quality of the wetlands irreplaceable. (5) The Forest Service fails to adequately analyze the loss of wildlife, bird and migratory bird habitat, and the loss of wildlife corridors. Of great concern is the lack of analysis on impacts to threatened or endangered wildlife species or Regional Forester Sensitive Species (RFSS) of plants. In addition, the concept of a land exchange as put forth by the Forest Service presents a precedence that would greatly facilitate the opening of a sulfide mine district in what is now Superior National Forest The Forest Service is thus removing itself from its over-riding obligation to the citizens of this state and nation, in which land was put aside in order to protect the watershed and preserve the natural quality and character of the land for all generations. This land exchange instead amounts to a give-away of public land to a Canadian mining company with global ties, and in which any metals would be directly sold on the global market, most likely to China (based upon an agreement with main investor Glencore-Xstrata). The Forest Service also fails to adequately analyze the economic impact of copper-nickel sulfide mining in northeast Minnesota, by neglecting to analyze the costs of degradation to the environment over a time frame of 500 years or more, and by not considering the loss of current and potential jobs that are based on a clean environment. Nor is there any analysis of actual loss of these metals as a domestic source. The loss of 6,000 acres of Superior National Forest for a large scale mining operation is unacceptable. But to make matters worse, the Forest Service has neglected to adequately analyze cumulative impacts to the Forest, including continued mineral exploration, taconite mine expansion, and potential copper-nickel mining proposals from Teck Cominco and Twin Metals. The Forest Service has failed to fulfil

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elayne Lappi

41957

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Elayne Lappi Virginia, Minnesota

Eleanor & John P Yackel

42807

See attachment

Eleanor Wagner

40434

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, There are so many problems with the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS that it's hard to know where to start. Minnesota has always been a leader in preserving the environment and providing a beautiful state for those who want to enjoy unspoiled nature. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential imp

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eleanor Wagner 54692

See attachment

57875

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project. The jobs gained are not worth the damage.

58077

I am strongly opposed to the NorthMet mining project. Even though it would create some jobs, the damage to our environment more than offsets the benefit of the jobs. I believe if the project goes through, tourism jobs would be lost. We need to preserve our environment and increase jobs not by mining but by developing alternative energy sources. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Elena Willmot 45104

Hello, My name is Elena Willmot, and I'm a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I am asking that you please reject the PolyMet Mining Inc. Project (SDEIS) which plans to exchange 6,650 acres of national forests to create an open-pit sulfide mine in northern Minnesota. The Fact Sheets provided by the Minnesota DNR suggest that "There would be few cumulative effects from the [PolyMet Project] The affected resources included water quantity and quality, air quality, wetlands, and vegetation." While the number of resources affected may seem small, their impacts are overwhelmingly important in the regional and global climate. Air quality, especially, does not have simple local effects but can affect neighboring communities, states, or countries. Not to mention that increases in CO2 emissions on the order of 200,000 metric tons per year is the last thing this planet needs. The mining technology is outdated and no longer suited for this environment if we hope to maintain the beauty of our national parks. Many people in Wisconsin speak about northern Minnesota as their sacred place: the place to which they retreat to find peace, comfort, and pleasure. I, personally, have not yet been to northern Minnesota, but I would hate my first trip to include dirty water, foul air, and no wildlife. I have every intention to visit this summer, and I sure hope this project has long been rejected by then. I urge you to make the right decision and reject this project. Best Regards, Elena Willmot Mailing Address: 432 W Wilson St, #6 Madison, WI 53703

Eleni Johnson 54532

Please think about the cost, payoff & benefit. Worth the cost is the land and the water, the benefit is jobs and the payoff is both you getting to say you've created jobs and you making money. Let's think creatively in 2014., THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO CREATE JOBS. DO THE RIGHT THING.

Eleonora Lesar 42548

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elexus Garcia

54223

Dear ms. lisa fay I'd like to have a minute of your time to let you know my most unadulterated feelings towards that of the mining near the boundary waters. The mere fact that even considering mining near any pure water, untouched by chemicals and etc, is the most degrading consideration to those who care, who just want to protect the land and the water surrounding/in the boundary waters. The mining that may take place, which shouldn't, will definitely affect the BWCA. This should go without saying that this is wrong and unjust to a environment will no say, and with way off fight bad on the big machinery that will try to wiggle it's way in. Also to mention that those who are pushing the mining in the BWCA are Are blatantly putting false images of the swamp that the mining would lead into. The fact is they're falsifying facts by removing from view of citizens the connected creek of lanely to the BWCA .Only allowing you to see the river to lake superior, And people believe this!. There are two connecting waterways through the swamp;lanely creek connected to BWCA and partridge river that connects to lake superior. The thing is that this would be simple to sway people back to the side of protecting the BWCA if they knew that this were effecting the BWCA, but the mining companies are doing great at lying and just being straight up unethical. I really think that this needs to be stopped and nipped in the bud. And i think in order to justify that this won't affect the BWCA is to then place two water wells in the swamp and in Langley creek to test the transportation of dye in the run off. Then we should have a answer of how this will affect the people on the side BWCCA and the BWCA. Help in the fight to protect The boundary waters, please!Sincerely,Elexus garcia Of humboldt high school tenth grade chemistry class.

Eli Bissonett

45195

Thank you for providing the PolyMet SDEIS for public viewing, and thank you for this opportunity to share my comments, questions, and suggestions. Though the NorthMet Project Proposed Action concisely outlines proposed environmental and economic impacts of the proposed PGE mine, please consider the following SDEIS modifications to help better inform the public about the effects of the mine if it is ultimately permitted. 1- Financial Assurance Please provide clearer parameters on what types, and what degree of environmental pollution a "damage deposit" would and would not be used for. Please describe a realistic and enduring legal framework for financial assurance that would render damage deposits bankruptcy-proof. What is the agreed definition of "bankruptcy-proof", among Polymet and all involved agencies. Please include in the SDEIS a requirement that the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock (currently Glencore, and whoever it happens to be in the future) be held legally accountable to share the financial responsibility of cleaning up any pollution from mining operations that exceeds legal levels. 2- Water Quality Please include more qualitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish, flora, and fauna. Correlate a spectrum of mercury exposure to actual physical effects on these organisms Create a similar correlation with regard to lead and aluminum contamination risks mentioned in the Executive Summary. Please do the same with regard to possible manganese and arsenic pollution. Please address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. Please redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity. Please don't let the SDEIS wording underestimate the possible magnitude of ground water base flow unpredictabilities, especially those incurred by seasonal fluctuations of water levels. The 2013 SDEIS appears to be making this underestimation. 3- Public Health Please conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Organizations in communities affected by the St Louis River Watershed, such as the Duluth YMCA, have already publicly requested that this HIA be conducted. Please provide detailed descriptions or modeling of how PolyMet mining operations could strain existing health and social service infrastructure. Thank you for considering my comments. Please provide reasonably detailed responses that specifically address my bulleted concerns. Sincerely, Eli Bissonett

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elias Anoszko

44798

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. This mine is short sighted and would permanently impair the environmental quality of one of the most biologically rich areas of Minnesota. Sulfide mining has never been shown to not pollute and we can expect to be dealing with the pollution from Polymet long after Polymet has gone bankrupt. Who pays for pollution. we the tax payers of MN will be paying for it, not the mining company. The lakes of the BWCAW already have high levels of mercury pollution, making the fish in some lakes unsafe for human consumption. Polymet must not be allowed to add to the mercury load of these already threatened water bodies. Furthermore Polymet there is a good chance that Polymet would leach acid mine drainage into area lakes and streams that have inherently low buffering capacity. This could make much of the affected areas unsuitable for growing wild rice. PolyMet must show it would not increase sulfate concentrations in these areas. However, it fails to do so. The mine plan inaccurately describes wild rice waters, understating the area that supports stands of wild rice. In addition, the mine plan claims to reduce sulfates, but that assumes that expensive water treatment will continue for hundreds of years. Millions of gallons of untreated polluted water will escape every year, and the mine plan predicts an increased chance that water exceeding the sulfate standard will be released at times, years after closure. Sincerely, Mr Elias Anoszko 948 Cromwell Ave Saint Paul, MN 55114-1123

Elif Cingi

40167

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Elif Cingi 7659 W 14th St Minneapolis, MN 55426-2002 (952) 544-1368

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elinor Ogden

16023

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elinor Ogden

51424

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: • Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. • Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. • Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. • Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. • Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: • The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. • The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. • The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are threatened, endangered or of significance to tribes. • The SDEIS fails to study cumulative adverse impacts on moose of the PolyMet project and other activities that destroy habitat and increase global climate change. • The SDEIS fails to provide a cumulative analysis of impact

Elisabeth Bechmann

41834

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Elisabeth Bechmann Neugebäudeplatz St Pölten, None 03100

Alphabetical by sender's first name

elise kyllo

20231

To Whom This May Concern, It is absurd that we would allow PolyMet, an international corporation that has no interest in the long term future health of our environment and it's inhabitants, to embark upon the sulfide mining project in NE Minnesota. From close inspection upon the SDEIS, it seems their study is based upon tests that stretch the truth or conveniently have performed their tests so that outcomes are falsely positive. There has never been a mining project that hasn't polluted. There is also a long list of previous mining projects that have failed to meet environmental standards, leaving the area polluted and sticking the local government and its taxpayers to pay for clean up, or more likely, to live with the pollution because clean up is too expensive and often not even possible. We must consider the long term costs of these open pit mines; the costs of the pollution of an undetermined area for an undetermined time. It seems obvious that the risks far outweigh the potential benefits of this project. Why would we sacrifice even an acre for the short term impact of a few jobs and a bump in the economy when we know the benefits (if there are any) would be temporary and the negative consequences would certainly be passed onto countless future generations. Who will be responsible for the long term management of the water and area polluted by this mine. Of course the company and its investors should be, but we know the company will try to weasel out of any clean up and long term pollution management. They have structured their corporation in a way that "legally" enables them to escape responsibility. The major investor of this project, Glencoe, a Swiss owned company has a long history of illegal activity. Responsible mining and clean up is not in their for profit interest If we could see the future, the choice would be clear. 526 acres of land on the edge of the BWCAWA turned upside down, 167 million tons of waste rock covered by black plastic, supposedly enclosed in a waste treatment system, that requires continuous monitoring and maintenance for centuries to contain the toxins, which is realistically impossible. Hundreds of miles of dusty roads traveled by loud and smelly, polluting trucks, noise, light pollution. These mines are nothing like the Taconite mines of the past If we could see the financial and societal costs of pollution seeping through bedrock, into lakes, wetlands, the atmosphere, fish, birds and finally into our bodies, we would obviously stand up and say no. No, thank you. It is not our duty to mine these minerals and we are not forced to accept the environmental damage. Our arms are being twisted by the power of money, but this is our choice and this is our future. It would be negligent of us to not question and thoroughly study the claims made by the company in the SDEIS report. Considering the impact of this project, it is logical to extend the comment period from 90 days to 180 days or more. I have moved to the north woods to be near the quiet beauty of wilderness areas. The fact that water can be sipped from a BWCA lake, that wild rice can be harvested, is invaluable and this is at stake. People travel from around the world to experience the rare purity and silence of this wilderness. Please reject the Poly-Met SDEIS and deny permits that would allow open pit sulfide mines. Please extend the comment period to allow the public fair time to investigate and comment upon the topic. Please protect our waters, the people that live here and the beauty that makes this one of Minnesota's favorite places to visit. Elise Kyllo PO Bo 71 Grand Marais MN 55604 ekyllo@hotmail-com

42501

Please see the attached document.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

elise kyllo

47691

It is absurd that we would allow PolyMet, an international corporation that has no interest in the long term future health of our environment and its inhabitants, to embark upon the sulfide mining project in NE Minnesota. From close inspection upon the SDEIS, it seems their study is based upon tests that stretch the truth or conveniently have performed their tests so that outcomes are falsely positive. There has never been a mining project that hasn't polluted. There is also a long list of previous mining projects that have failed to meet environmental standards, leaving the area polluted and sticking the local government and its taxpayers to pay for clean up, or more likely, to live with the pollution because clean up is too expensive and often not even possible. We must consider the long term costs of these open pit mines; the costs of the pollution of an undetermined area for an undetermined time. It seems obvious that the risks far outweigh the potential benefits of this project. Why would we sacrifice even an acre for the short term impact of a few jobs and a bump in the economy when we know the benefits (if there are any) would be temporary and the negative consequences would certainly be passed onto countless future generations? Who will be responsible for the long term management of the water and area polluted by this mine? Of course the company and its investors should be, but we know the company will try to weasel out of any clean up and long term pollution management. They have structured their corporation in a way that "legally" enables them to escape responsibility. The major investor of this project, Glencoe, a Swiss owned company has a long history of illegal activity. Responsible mining and cleanup is not in their for profit interest. If we could see the future, the choice would be clear. 526 acres of land on the edge of the BWCAWA turned upside down, 167 million tons of waste rock covered by black plastic, supposedly enclosed in a waste treatment system, that requires continuous monitoring and maintenance for centuries to contain the toxins, which is realistically impossible. Hundreds of miles of dusty roads traveled by loud and smelly, polluting trucks, noise, light pollution. These mines are nothing like the Taconite mines of the past. If we could see the financial and societal costs of pollution seeping through bedrock, into lakes, wetlands, the atmosphere, fish, birds and finally into our bodies, we would obviously stand up and say no. No, thank you! It is not our duty to mine these minerals and we are not forced to accept the environmental damage. Our arms are being twisted by the power of money, but this is our choice and this is our future. It would be negligent of us to not question and thoroughly study the claims made by the company in the SDEIS report. Considering the impact of this project, it is logical to extend the comment period from 90 days to 180 days or more. I have moved to the north woods to be near the quiet beauty of wilderness areas. The fact that water can be sipped from a BWCA lake, that wild rice can be harvested, is invaluable and this is at stake! People travel from around the world to experience the rare purity and silence of this wilderness. Please reject the Poly-Met SDEIS and deny permits that would allow open pit sulfide mines. Please extend the comment period to allow the public fair time to investigate and comment upon the topic. Please protect our waters, the people that live here and the beauty that makes this one of Minnesota's favorite places to visit.

54632

See attachment

Elise Moser

28802

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am against sulfide mining in Minnesota. It would threaten wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I've haven't been to the Boundary Waters yet - I want it to last until I get there, and for generations after me. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Elise Moser 1200 Water St Sauk City, WI 53583-1658

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elisee J. Angoran

45858

3/13/14 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay I am writing to request the immediate termination of PolyMet's project to implement the first open-pit copper-nickel mine in an area comprised of wetlands and water ways that could lead to the possible contamination of the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior. The reasoning behind this request is the many drastic consequences that this project will bring to that particular area, with respect to its ecology and populations. On the one hand, PolyMet claims that this project will provide 500 jobs during peak constructions periods and 360 during operations, generating substantial revenue for the state and it's people. The society we live in requires copper for many various uses, ranging from household uses to renewable energies. On the other hand, we have to take into account the consequences that a project of this magnitude will generate. Indeed, the digging of the mine will generate 533 million tons of waste rock in a 20-year span. Moreover, the mine is located on top of a sulfide-containing matrix. In contact with water and oxygen, sulfide oxides will release heavy metals in the ground and the water bodies around the mine. Decades after the mine has been closed, those heavy metals will remain in the soil and the water. That will be the same water in which many organisms have found their habitat, the same water used to grow our crops, and the same that will eventually be used for human consumption. All the other species living in that area will be put at risk as well. The birds, fish, mammals, all part of the food chain, will be contaminated, and contaminate the organisms that prey upon them. Alternatives to open-pit mining do exist, such as hydrometallurgy. A leach liquor solution is used to extract the precious metal. An extractant is then used to extract the metal out of the solution then purified for use. This process will not generate millions of tons of rock waste, cheaper and more environmentally friendly than the traditional mining processes that cause a lot of pollution. Much research is underway in order to perfect the process, but it is a step in the positive for a more sustainable way of gathering minerals that are predominant in our every day lives. Despite the intention of PolyMet to install a wastewater treatment plant, the pollution that will be caused by the mine will take far too much time and resources to clean up. There are benefits to this mining pit, namely the much needed copper. However, the cascade of drastic consequences the pollution will bring, leading up to health issues in human populations. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to put a stop to this project. Sincerely Elisee Joel Angoran 3905 Buttonwood Drive Columbia MO, 65201 ejat27@mail.missouri-edu

Elissa Hansen

21965

I completely support the SDEIS and cannot wait for this project to break ground. Elissa Hansen, MBA, EDFP Director, Business Development image001 APEX 306 West Superior Street Suite 902 Duluth, MN 55802 Office: (218) 740 - 3667 Cell: (218) 590 - 5133 elissa@apexgetsbusiness-com www.apexgetsbusiness-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eliza Schrader

9617

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Eliza Schrader 139 Saint James Place Brooklyn, NY 11238

42504

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Eliza Schrader 139 Saint James Place Brooklyn, NY 11238

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth A. Phyle 43954

I do not support the proposed mining project. It is not a wise investment for Minnesota's economic or ecological future. The benefits of job creation and mineral access are simply not outweighed by the heavy costs. These are the following costs that I see as most detrimental: Minnesota is lucky enough to have such a large freshwater resource, which will only increase in value as fresh water become more scarce. The estimated 500 years of water clean up that will be necessary if this project is approved, far out ways the short term benefit. If all of the real costs of this project was taken into account it would not be a profitable venture. The foreign companies should not be able to generate these externalities in Minnesota and leave with the bulk of the profit. Please consider this before starting a mining project that will harm Minnesotans for many years to come. This mining proposal is a bad idea. Elizabeth Phyle Resident of Plymouth, MN

Elizabeth Ann Fryberger 57138

Have your say on PolyMet –Minnesota is the land of 10,000 lakes – a watershed state. Water is vital to life and Minnesota must protect this dwindling vital resource. It is unconscionable to pollute Minnesota. Just say NO!Elizabeth Ann Fryberger3399 Riley RdDuluth, MN 55803

Elizabeth Bartlett 43416

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. The people whose health would be most impacted are the miners and their families, probably for generations to come, the local indigenous population, and first and foremost women and children, including fetal health. Even small doses of mercury, methylmercury, lead, arsenic at critical moments of fetal development will cause irreversible damage to internal organs, spinal development, and brain development. We pressure pregnant women to be sure not to drink alcohol, not to use drugs, not to smoke, be sure to eat healthy meals, etc, but what about all the toxins in the air we breathe, the water we drink. Would the owners of Polymet be willing to have the pregnant women among their loved ones be exposed to the toxins that will be released in this mining project. I say, that they themselves must be willing to live here, drink this water, breathe this air. This is a multinational corporation which has no stake in the local population. These are critical issues. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Elizabeth Bartlett 2215 Heather Ave Duluth, MN 55803-1431

Elizabeth Brombach 42112

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Elizabeth Brombach 2214 Goodrich Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1022 (651) 699-8466

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Burr

39357

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Cerny

16731

Feb 18, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. Five hundred years is a very long time. Five hundred years ago Columbus had just "discovered" the New World. How can a mine whose toxic water drainage will require treatment for 500 years even be considered for a permit. What effect will a 6-foot rise in sea level from global warming have on Lake Superior's level, and on the mine area. Will the mine be underwater. What happens to all the toxic runoff if the mine is flooded. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Is all the water from those ten square miles of wetlands that will be "dewatered" going to run into the mine pit. Eleven point four square miles (the dewatered 10 plus the 1-4 of the mine itself) of prime wetlands is a lot of frogs, baby fish, herons and egrets, ducks, etc killed or made homeless. How do you dig a pit mine in a wetland, anyway. Can it be economically feasible, with constant water seepage and expensive water treatment necessary for 500 years. Or does the operator plan to simply quit treating the wastewater when they quit mining and who cares about poisoning every living thing for the rest of the 500 years. Whatever fines they are charged will probably be cheaper than treating the water would be, so they will just pay the fines and let the poison continue to run out of their pit. It's public land after all-it's not like it is theirs to care about. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Elizabeth Cerny 7728 Williams St Downers Grove, IL 60516-4408

28631

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This also threatens the entire economy of the region, which depends heavily on tourism, hunting and fishing and guide services for canoe trips into these waterways. Fishing will certainly end when the fish are no longer safe to eat, if the fish manage to survive in the polluted water. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The mining company admits that the wastewater would need treatment for at least 500 years. Will they be there treating it 500 years into the future. Five hundred years ago, Columbus had just bumped into this unexpected land mass between Spain and India-how can any company possibly say what they will do for the next 500 years; but we know what the acidic, poisonous runoff water will be doing throughout that half-millennium: continuing to pollute everything downstream of the played-out mine. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Doesn't an "open pit" mine automatically mean cutting down and digging up a large area of forest Plus all the surrounding trees that need to be cut for access roads, our truck heavy roads, waste storage, water retention ponds, and whatever else such a desecration of the entire forest environment would entail. The noise pollution of the forest silence alone would scare off every animal for miles around. You can not plunk such an operation down in the middle of a forest and pretend there will be no effect on the surrounding forest, even in the areas where the trees remain standing. Sincerely, Elizabeth Cerny 7728 Williams St Downers Grove, IL 60516-4408 (630) 971-3891

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Dokken

16886

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Dokken 4201 Parklawn #301 Edina, MN 55435

50200

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Dokken 4201 Parklawn #301 Edina, MN 55435

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth E Watson

46596

To Whom it May Concern, My name is Betsy Watson and I am a senior at the College of St Benedict, graduating this May. Although I didn't grow up near Lake Superior or the Boundary Waters, I have made numerous trips to those areas since coming to college and I have determined that they are some of my favorite places to be. As a Minnesotan I have become extremely proud of these waters and feel that they make up a huge part of our state. No sulfide mine has ever operated without polluting nearby waters- and the rivers near the PolyMet mining proposed area flow into Lake Superior and are dangerously close to the BWCA. I can't see how these waters would not be affected and contaminated by the sulfide mining. PolyMet's model even shows that there will be need for water treatment of 500 years in order to fully decontaminate the water. Water is something that we are proud of in Minnesota, and I would hate to see that pride destroyed for 20 years of sulfide mining. I would be extremely upset and disappointed if the Minnesota DNR decided to accept PolyMet's proposal. Sincerely, Betsy Watson College of St Benedict 37 S. College Avenue St Joseph, MN 56374

Elizabeth Edinger

40145

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Dear Governor Dayton and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: , My husband and I have lived on the South shore of Gunflint Lake, Minnesota for twenty years. We have always been thankful. for the priceless gift of clean water not only for the people who live and visit here as tourists, but also for the animals and birds. And I am very grateful to the Audubon Society for helping me to express my concerns about the PolyMet Mining plans. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Although I am not a scientist I am deeply concerned about this problem. Sincerely, Elizabeth Ann Edinger 483 South Gunflint Lake Grand Marais, Minnesota 55604 Sincerely, Mrs Elizabeth Edinger 483 S Gunflint Lk Grand Marais, MN 55604-2062

Elizabeth Edmondson

40908

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Elizabeth Edmondson 290 Hill Crest Cir Woodstock, GA 30188-2256 (404) 276-2216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Edwards

41944

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Elizabeth Edwards Minneapolis, Minnesota

Elizabeth Frost

57164

I am concerned about the environmental impact of sulfide mining in North Minnesota. Please don't be short-sighted and approved mining that will compromise the BWCA. BWCA will bring in jobs to North Minnesota for a thousand years. Elizabeth Frost 2904 43rd Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55406

Elizabeth Heck

42896

Please find the attached comment letter regarding the NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you, Paul and Elizabeth Heck

Elizabeth Hope

40510

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Hope 10134 170th St E. Nerstrand, MN 55053

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Hope

40551

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are there

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Hope

40565

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Elizabeth Hulstrand

54678

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Lempp

40471

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Lempp

48143

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Lempp 36365 Pine Grove Lane Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783

Elizabeth LePlatt

54713

See attachment

Elizabeth Maus

39867

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This mine sends us in the wrong direction for caring for our state and it's beautiful lands, which belong to ALL Minnesotans. I hiked in Superior National Forest last year and I don't want it to be the last time. That mine benefits Minnesota in no way whatsoever. We need to follow Wisconsin's lead and ban this type of mining forever. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Elizabeth Maus 9148 Upton Ave S Bloomington, MN 55431-2150

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Mccambridge

14600

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Merz

9353

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Merz 111 W. Lincoln Ave, #305 #305 Fergus Falls, MN 56537

18749

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Merz 111 W. Lincoln Ave, #305 #305 Fergus Falls, MN 56537

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Merz

18950

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Merz 111 W. Lincoln Ave, #305 #305 Fergus Falls, MN 56537 218-998-3145

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Merz

50823

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Elizabeth Merz 111 W. Lincoln Ave, #305 #305 Fergus Falls, MN 56537

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Murray

42244

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Murray

42245

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Elizabeth Olson

58032

A state that prides itself in its lakes - the PolyMets Toxic Sulfide Mine will DEFINETLY endanger this resource. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Paulson

41711

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Plummer

16222

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Elizabeth Sivertson

6115

Thank you. Elizabeth Sivertson Sent from my iPhone On Jan 14, 2014, at 9:22 AM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" <[HYPERLINK](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Sivertson

42863

Dear agency officials now considering PolyMet's North Met SDEIS, My overall concern about the SDEIS is that it fails to show to how toxins will be kept out of the water systems leading to Lake Superior. The water "treatment" and collection systems under rock waste piles being managed by pumps at the end of 2 mile long rock piles 25 stories high seem inadequate to keep leaching toxins from entering the water ways. With the many possibilities and probabilities that those systems could fail in their goal to prevent water pollution, I believe that PolyMet's plan is inadequate. Planning to pile sulfide bearing tailings on an old LTV pit storage area (originally meant for iron tailings to drain into streams) is irresponsible. What bothers me is the unfounded claims by PolyMet to be able to collect the rain run off for treatment in a wetland rich area, to somehow "contain" the toxins and then treat them sufficiently with pumps and treatment systems that would need to be in place for as much as 200-500 years, their models and graphs showing that the toxins will increase as these tailings piles age- leaching more toxins by many times as much in about 40 years' time and long after companies could be held accountable all of the floods and accidents that could occur, and the fact that the SDEIS is inadequate in addressing such probable accidents or floods. Besides those flaws, there are fractures in the earth below the PolyMet site, and new fractures would no doubt be created by the several times a week mine blasting. I don't believe PolyMet's plan to build a 5 mile long cement wall to bed rock would be sufficient to "hold" toxins from leaching into water systems. I can't imagine how the geological evidence showing such a water rich landscape could possibly kept out of harm's way during such an enormous mining operation. I have trouble believing that 32,000 tons of waste rock produced every day, hauled in trucks, dumped on wetlands- every day for 20 or so years, will not have ample opportunity to leach devastating amounts of sulfide content, mercury, cobalt etc. There are not sufficient safeguards in case of flooding, or accidents or spills addressed in the SDEIS. PolyMet's SDEIS shows more "hopeful" predictions of water flow than are even realistic. Since the water flow data in the models used by PolyMet are now shown to be inaccurate, I have less faith in claims of "safe levels of toxins" to be emitted by PolyMet's mine operation. PolyMet has not shown us a feasible or plausible way to both mine copper/nickel, and keep the water from getting contaminated. Already we have exceeded standards of water quality in mercury and sulfates in the St. Louis River, and I believe it is absolutely irresponsible to open the gate for one more mining operation- to tolerate any more mercury, no matter if it abides by current laws. PolyMet, no matter if it complies with the law, WILL add to the mercury content that already exists in the St Louis River and Lake Superior. In Minnesota the other mining operations have hardly been held accountable to clean up their act, and the former LTV site that PolyMet will use already and still exceeds water quality standards based on the old mining operation. The StLouis River still has high enough mercury content to issue health warnings of fish consumption. The Fond du Lac Tribes have been constantly having to bring lawsuits to keep the iron mining companies in compliance, or to try and get them to clean up their act already and this is at a very high cost to a community that has very little financial infrastructure to keep having to fight these mining corporations in order to force compliance. One in ten children born in this part of the state have higher mercury levels, levels that are known to significantly impair cognitive function. According to the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, each person is entitled by right to the protection, preservations and enhancement of air, water, land, and other na

Elizabeth Swarhout

25002

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest As someone who spends part of the summer near Lake Superior in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, the purity of Lake Superior is of great interest to us. It's one of the few fresh water lakes that still has relatively clear water, relatively non-toxic fish and wildlife that is not seen in other areas of the country and that is threatened by environmental pollution. Please consider the long-term health of the region in preference to a short-term economic gain. Sincerely, Elizabeth Swarhout 6739 Richmond Ave Richmond, CA 94805-2079 (510) 215-1647

Elizabeth Treher

42689

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elizabeth Urban 54518

See attachment

Elizabeth Vance 30256

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I just know, that Lake Superior is one of the most beautiful and natural places left in our province. It is a place where there is still a home for the animals we love. It is a place we can go to and get back to a peaceful, healthy environment. Don't destroy such a beautiful spot. Sincerely, Elizabeth Vance, P.O. Box 275, Flesherton, Ontario. N0C 1E0 Canada Sincerely, Elizabeth Vance P.O. Box 275 Flesherton, ON N0C 1E0 (519) 922-3118

Elizabeth Yoder 37881

Polymet's proposed NorthMet mine project should not be permitted because the risk to the environment is so great. The SDEIS admits this and proposes to deal with the results, but I, along with many others, do not believe either that it can be done or that Polymet has the financial resources to do it. My husband and I bought property here almost 20 years ago and retired here 10 years ago because we thought it was one of the few unspoiled places left in the country. Mining for precious metals in this water-rich environment could destroy it-as it has destroyed many other places on the planet. Elizabeth Yoder 1772 Hwy 120 Ely, MN 55731

Ellen Brown 9539

Please don't risk the environmental health of northern Minnesota and Lake Superior by permitting sulfide mining in the region. Thank you for accepting my comment. Ellen T Brown 874 Fairmount Avenue Saint Paul MN 55105 651-225-5650

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Brown 10133

Jan 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Ellen E Shelhon 57242

I am strongly opposed to the Polymet project because there has never been copper nickel mine operation that has not significantly and permanently damaged our precious environment. We must not leave this legacy for our upcoming generations. Ellen E. Shelhon 101 W. Kent Rd Duluth, MN 55812

Ellen Hawkins 42616

See attachment

54676

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Jones

46066

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. This does not seem to be such a difficult decision. How can it possibly make sense to burden future generations with treating water. How will wildlife survive with polluted water. Who cares if there were jobs in this decade if the area is toxic in the next decade. The benefits of a few hundred jobs are simply just not worth these costs. Sincerely, Ms Ellen Jones 5261 Lochloy Dr Edina, MN 55436-2023 (952) 924-9048

Ellen Kent

42448

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Ellen Kent 107 Hill Valley Dr Winchester, VA 22602-6108

Ellen Lafans

7740

To whom it may concern, We have to tell you that our family will be very disappointed in the MINNESOTA DNR if they allow for the dirty mine up near our beloved Boundary Waters. We have been going to the BWCA for all of our lives and love Ely and that entire area. The sulfur can cause too many problems for too long to allow this to happen and truly, don't expect PolyMet to clean it up .. The contamination that occurs may in several decades. JUST SAY NO MINE. There must be another way to get some jobs up there. You will loose the tourism industry if something happens. Ellen Lafans, RN, MSN Dr Richard Lafans William Lafans Katie Lafans 3967 Worchester Drive Eagan, MN Cell 651-353-2741

Ellen Lease

47780

Dear Gentlepersons: I urge you to reject the Polymet Mining proposal. If it is true that this effort will produce only 90 highly technical jobs that locals will likely not be prepared to fill, it does not significantly decrease levels of unemployment in that county. If the estimates that water quality could be negatively impacted for as long as 500 years is accurate, there is no benefit to Minnesotans for allowing this to proceed. There is, in fact, great detriment. A despoiled ecosystem is never truly recovered. Please do not allow Polymet to establish a mine. Thank you, Ellen Lease

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Mork

43105

Ms Fey, My name is Ellen E. Mork. I live at 1013 Borgert Ave, St Cloud, MN 56303- I am responding to the request for public input on the PolyMet Copper-Nickel Mine. I am opposed to this mine. My background includes a MA in biology with a minor in chemistry. I understand the chemistry involved with sulfide exposure to water. I understand the consequences for water pollution and destruction of habitat for the animals and people of northern Minnesota. Moreover, I understand the consequences polluting that largest fresh-water body of water in America, if not the world – the Great Lakes. We simply cannot afford to fill them with mercury and acid mine drainage for the sake of a few jobs for 20 years max – that is a suicidal trade-off. Now to the specifics: Ø I am against selling off part of the Superior National Forest to a Canadian firm that has no experience in operating such a mine and requires the assistance of a Swiss firm (Glencore Xstrata) which has an abysmal record of environmental breaches. How can the DNR or the state of Minnesota pretend to control such a firm. Ø This mine would destroy over 900 acres of high quality wetlands and indirectly harm up to 8,264 acres. As you know, wetlands provide several positive functions for the health of our water: they help to filter and purify water to aid in local and downstream water quality. How can the DNR do anything but abide by the state laws regarding wetland preservation. Ø It is my understanding that there has been no plan produced for the mitigation of the loss of these wetlands, according to Minnesota law. Ø I have also learned that PolyMet plans to use the existing unlined tailings basin used for iron ore to hold the tailings from the sulfide ores. This is a plan for distribution of the sulfuric acid into the local streams, lakes and underground water supplies. It would be dangerous for those living within the range of these waters, as well as the fauna and flora in the vicinity. At the very least, they must be required to line that basin. Ø Since there are rivers near the mine and plant sites that flow into the St Louis River, it is obvious that these rivers will all be polluted with acid mine drainage. I have read that the St Louis River is already heavily polluted. How can we allow even more to occur. Ø Regardless of the inflated figures provided by PolyMet for new jobs in the region, experts know that the numbers are more like 350-400, many of whom would be “imported” from Canada and other regions where similar mines have been operating. Mining equipment has greatly changed since the iron mines were at their peak, according to those reporting on this aspect of the plan. PolyMet will want experienced workers to run these expensive machines. The number of jobs available to Minnesotans of the Range will be minimal. Ø I read everything written about PolyMet in the news. I understand that this SDEIS still does not contain financial assurances of funding to cover the 200-500 years of required clean-up that will continue to be needed to ensure that Minnesota taxpayers are not left holding the bag. This is one of the most egregious faults of mining firms everywhere. They all remove saleable product while there is ore in the ground and leave it to others to do their clean-up. Without financial assurance, Minnesota has nothing – no ore, no jobs, no income and a lot of outgo. Please reject this SDEIS on this factor alone.. Ø Geologists have reported the existence of underground fractures that could increase in number by the blasting that would occur to break up the sulfide ores. Each fracture would have the possibility of transporting pollution into the ground water. I can see no mitigation from this problem. Ø I have already alluded to the probability of mercury contamination in the waters of the north, already so high that babies born in the NE are exhibiting very hi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Murphy

11657

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Ellen Nore

29076

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest We need to think of the future and not to bow to corporations seeking immediate profit at the long run of great costs to our nation. Pollution from sulfide mining is very harsh and TREATMENT for this pollution would have to last for 500 years. We must NOT SUPPORT sulfide mining near this region, which houses supplies of clean, precious water for future generations. Sincerely, Ellen Nore 502 N Fillmore St Edwardsville, IL 62025-1762 (618) 656-5790

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Peterson

47457

Comment Submitted by: Ellen Peterson 1990 Skillman Ave West Roseville, MN 55113 Attn: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Please see my comment below: The Poly Met NorthMet SDEIS does not fully consider all potential environmental impacts that this mine could have. My understanding of the purpose of environmental review is to investigate all areas in order to make certain the impact a project will have on its surrounding environment. In its current state, the Poly Met NorthMet SDEIS is erroneous, contradictory, and incomplete. My main concerns with the Poly Met NorthMet SDEIS are with the issue of protecting our water. As a citizen of the state of Minnesota who recognizes the significance of our geographic location – our proximity to an incredible source of fresh water, not to mention our Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, it is entirely unacceptable that my government – in this instance the DNR who is responsible for completing the environmental review process as well as for issuing the permits, would even consider taking such a massive risk without knowing for certain the outcomes. Please see, record and take action on the comments below pertaining to the specific issues found within the SDEIS itself: Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard. The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Root

43074

To Whomever It May Concern: I own property and reside in Babbitt, Minnesota. I am concerned that the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and fails to consider or address several important considerations regarding PolyMet's proposed NorthMet mine. I believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: Water Resources: Tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the base flow rate of water in the Partridge River is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Cumulative Effects of the Mine: Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 requires that the mine site must be maintenance-free at closure, but the PolyMet mining plan calls for at least 500 years of active water treatment. The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The SDEIS must be redone to include detailed financial assurances of how Polymet will continue to monitor and maintain its water treatment system over this 500-year span. The SDEIS also fails to assess the impacts of possible slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles. The SDEIS must be redone to include assessments of possible pollution and other impacts resulting from failures at either of these sites. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment at the mine. Please reject the current SDEIS and require further investigation of these unaddressed issues. After weighing the proposed benefits of the mine against the many risks to water resources, wildlife, cultural resources, and community members who live near the mine that are outlined in detail in the SDEIS, I ask that you reject Polymet's proposed project in favor of other projects that carry lower pollution and health risks. Sincerely Yours, Ellen Root 3298 Lenont Road Babbitt, MN 55706

Ellen Segal

40348

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Ellen Segal 1066 San Jacinto Way Palm Springs, CA 92262 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ellen Thomas

38600

I am from a family that has had a summer home in Northern Minnesota since 1950- Over the years, we have spent nearly every summer there, and some winter breaks. We come because of the pristine wilderness and clean water of the BWCAW, and often eat meals and visit tourist sites along Lake Superior's North Shore. Our wonderful experience is one of the reasons that both of our children have looked at Minnesota for college. Our daughter is currently a freshman at Carleton College, and our son has applied to the University of Minnesota. Businesses in the state of Minnesota are getting a very high percentage of our family's money at the present time. Over the years, we have introduced many people to the beautiful North Woods, and often they have returned again on their own for additional vacations. Minnesota wouldn't have much to offer without the pristine wilderness-I can't think of any other reason we would routinely drive hundreds of miles to come to your state. This must be true for hundreds of thousands of tourists. The proposed copper/nickel sulfide mine is putting all of that at risk. It is virtually certain to pollute vast areas of wetlands-wetlands which are disappearing all over the country, and with them important habitat, water filtration, and other ecological services. Furthermore, the history of this industry is one of making big messes, declaring bankruptcy, and then letting the taxpayers take on the clean-up bill. I urge you to reject this proposal. Ellen Thomas 2616 Hillshire Drive Columbia, MO 65203

Elli King

18310

Hello. My name is Elli King. I live with my family in the woods outside of Finland, Minnesota. We have lived there for ten years. The main concern that I want to express today is the rise in sulfate levels (inaudible) PolyMet's draft EIS predicts. My family is practicing subsistence living. We currently harvest or grow 80 percent of our food and are also in the process of two initiatives, wilderness guiding and wilderness education for most financial sustenance and in community service. Our harvest takes (inaudible) all around the county. And I have neighbors and friends from Hoyt Lakes. My understanding is that any significant increase in sulfates in our water will inhibit the growth of wild rice. And that sulfates are a key component in the accumulation of you mercury in fish. Fish and wild rice and ducks who live on rice as they migrate in the fall are food staples of my family as well as that of many others in my community. I have a real founded fear of not being available to us anymore. And they are secondarily also important to our economy. While the EIS does speak to this issue as being controlling sulfate, the EIS is incomplete. At best I feel that further hydrological research and more developed refined filtration systems need to be explored. Also, I have intimate information that the base flow of the Partridge River was miscalculated for this EIS. And I don't think there's been time to investigate that yet, but I would ask of you that you investigate that, please. The acknowledged time span of hundreds of year of water treatment (inaudible). I don't see how anyone can submit to that. And it seems (inaudible) for taxpayer expense. I am also worried about the precedent that this project would set because there is a much larger similar project being explored. So if this is approved on a small level, I'm worried about that transferring over. So in summary, I guess I'm fearing that our community over time will lose major food sources and a good slice of our economic potential. To me those would be unacceptable in fact for any project. Please consider the value of these resources to our community and the risks they will undertake if this project is approved.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elli King

19092

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Eleanor King-Gallagher Elli King P.O. Box 526 Finland, MN 55603 218 220 8997

Ellie Hofman

4347

Dear DNR- I am a 15 year old who lives on Lake Superior. I have a cabin near the BWCAW and each year take at least two camping trips into the BWCAW. I am concerned about the sulfide mining polluting our lakes. As I grow up I hope to be able to enjoy the natural wilderness as I do today. I won't be able to if we start sulfide mining. There have been no sulfide mining attempts that have not polluted water systems This would be a permanent pollution that could harm our entire ecosystem. The pollution is the biggest concern of mine but the cleanup could be left to all the taxpayers. Companies like Polymet have reputations of running out of money on the mining then leaving the cleanup to the taxpayers. So what are we going to get out of the mining. The metal and jobs. To me ruining our water systems and ecosystem is not worth the temporary jobs and metals. Please stop the sulfide mining and let the younger generations enjoy the natural beauty that northern Minnesota has to offer. Thank You Ellie Hoffman

elliott

46507

I'm fully behind the Polymet project. I've attended the meeting in St Paul, listened to all the arguments (both pro and con), and was privileged to tour the entire site. I feel the benefits of this project are enormous. I have friends and relatives that live in the area, and they are all wholeheartedly behind the project. These are people who have been involved in mining in the area for generations, but are also a part of the land and want it to remain clean. They don't feel that there's a risk that they will have their backyards polluted. I have also been an ardent fan and user of the Boundary Waters, camping and canoeing for over 40 years. I see no evidence that this project will change the nature of the surrounding area. I fully support the project. Elliot Nordquist 2424 Flag Ave So. St Louis Park, Mn. 55426

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elliot Ginsburg

15276

Feb 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elly Huston

41416

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As someone who cares a great deal about the natural environment in northern Minnesota, I ask you to please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Elly Huston Minnesota resident Elly Huston 200 Cheyenne Trail Wayzata, MN 55391

Ellyn L Wiens

42719

See attachment

58078

There has never been a non-polluting copper/nickel mine such as Polymet proposes. Let's recycle instead! Stop the mine! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnninage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Elsie Dyke

31855

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please protect the great lakes, and vote against sulfide mining anywhere near the great lakes. We need to save this wonderful resource we have from being contaminated by mining. It is not worth the sacrifice of our lakes so that a large company can earn a lot of money. Thank you. Elsie Dyke Sincerely, Elsie Dyke 1718 Chandler Rd Ann Arbor, MI 48105-1612 (734) 663-9741

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elton Brown

15535

MY COMMENTS ON THE INADEQUACY OF THE POLYMET SDEIS 1) THE ONLY REASON TO PERMIT POLYMET IS FINANCIAL: + The Minnesota Environmental Rights Act states that economic considerations alone cannot justify the destruction of our precious natural resources. Clearly the PolyMet plan will result in environmental destruction and degradation (loss of valuable wetlands, loss of an important wildlife corridor, the huge amount of electrical energy needed, and the seemingly-inevitable long-term leakage of heavy metals and toxic water). Given that these metals (especially copper) are readily found elsewhere in less water-rich parts of the planet, it would seem that the main reason to permit the PolyMet mining plan is, in fact, financial. + But the PolyMet SDEIS is quite vague on specifics about how the operation will benefit the Minnesota economy. Where are the company's assurances of wage levels and benefits. Should there not be a realistic analysis of how many jobs will be offered to Iron Rangers (rather than commuters who are apt to spend most of their income elsewhere). Further, is there any way to hold PolyMet (and its parent corporation) legally obliged to fulfill its promised local hires and wage levels. If the reason to permit this project is local jobs, should not the SDEIS offer us a detailed description of the types and number of jobs that will be available for local hires. 2) INCREASE THE PRODUCTION TAX: + As Aaron Brown ("MinnesotaBrown") wrote, "We enter into a negotiation, not a pep rally. The mining company will protect its interests; the community must do the same. Communities that fail to do this are exploited." Of course PolyMet and its parent corporation are mainly interested in maximizing their profits. If we permit this industry for the benefit not of the corporation but of the people of Minnesota, should we not raise the meager percent of taxes they will return to the state. An investigative journalism article in the Ely Timberjay (Jan. 17, 2014) reveals that local tax revenues generated by area taconite mines have been falling behind inflation, even as taconite prices have soared. It makes no sense to sell off these world-class non-renewable resources so cheaply. After all, these mineral deposits are not going anywhere until we decide to sell them, and as time goes on the value will only increase and, hopefully, the techniques for safe extraction will improve - and be proven foolproof elsewhere firSt 3) FINANCIAL ASSURANCE: + And then there is the matter of financial assurance for future treatment and mitigation of contaminants that could escape into our surface and ground waterways for generations. Will PolyMet be willing to set aside enough money to completely pay for the monitoring of containment barriers, the quick repair of leaks caused, say, by some unexpected flood or earthquake of the century, the maintenance (and eventual replacement) of reverse osmosis installations, etc + Should not the public be told now how this huge sum of money will be paid and held safely in escrow for future maintenance and clean-up. Why is the SDEIS so vague on this critical and thorny issue. Any short-term financial benefits to Minnesotans will be more than negated in the long run if clean-up costs fall yet again on taxpayers. + I also wonder if there is a way to hold the parent corporation legally responsible for future clean-up costs once the PolyMet subsidiary declares bankruptcy or simply dissolves when the North Met project is no longer profitable. 4) NEGATIVE IMPACT ON LOCAL ECONOMY: + The PolyMet PDEIS is inadequate in its failure to include an analysis of the costs of this mining proposal to the local economy. Is there a realistic estimate of lost income from tourism, fishing and hunting licenses, etc, should a large hunk of the Superior National Forest be lost to heavy industry. Local realtors tell me that property values, and buyers, in the vicinity are already decreasing. + Also, what protections and compensations are in p

Elwood & Bonnie Swanson

42777

See attachment

Ely Smith

54832

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Elyse Dornhecker

4285

To whom it may concern, As someone who knows many at Polymet and many in the communities they will be impacting, I continue to be impressed by the level of care and concern they take in doing what's right for the community and the state as a whole. The economic development they will bring, while paving the way as the benchmark for clean, environmentally friendly mining, shows that collaboration is key to moving our state forward as an economic, industrial, and conservationist leader in the US. I grew up on the Canadian Border of Minnesota in a small town called Baudette. Through my time in that community and my last 15 years in the urban parts of this state, I have a unique perspective. I have seen what happens when small towns lose their primary sources of employment. I have seen the small town values that bind people together and create excellent school systems, communities, and cultural centers, but I have also driven through northern MN to see abandoned homes, dilapidated farms, and far too many people living without the necessary heating and provisions to raise their families appropriately. I have lived through and seen the sad decline of my hometown and many others on the iron range. I have also experienced the perception of what "northern MN" is and those opinions held by the majority of our population that dwell in the city. Everyone is entitled to their own opinions and comes from different backgrounds, but Polymet has shown that they are committed to meeting and have met every environmental standard that has been set forth by the state of MN and the many professionals and academics who are charged with caring for and regulating the mining industry and so many more. I hope you will remember this when you make your final decisions around the permitting of this project. The futures of many Minnesotans are at stake. Elyse Dornhecker, CFP®, ChFC, CLU Area Vice President Registered Representative Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc. | T h i n k i n g A h e a d 3600 American Blvd. W, Suite 500 | Bloomington, MN 55431 Office: 952-356-3592 | Mobile: 218-590-8513 | Fax: 866-701-1125 HYPERLINK "http://www.gallagherbenefits-com/minneapolis"www.gallagherbenefits-com/minneapolis | HYPERLINK "mailto:Justin_Demars@ajg-com"Elyse_Dornhecker@ajg-com This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential material and/or material protected by law. Any retransmission or use of this information may be a violation of that law. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

18357

Hi, everyone. My name is Elyse Dornhecker. I need to spell that. D-O-R-N-H-E-C-K-E-R. I grew up in Northern Minnesota. I know we have already talked about that. It is actually on the Canadian border. I was raised near the river and had a lot of recreation activity (phonetic) and we can talk about eating fish and whatnot and, you know, the impact on the communities. I also had one of my closest friends who went to the U of M and she studied and she has got her Ph.D. in large mammal ecology (phonetic). And I say that because I spent the last four years of my life, since I've practically known her, listening about the moose population and how that has been negatively impacted and what is going on there. But I say that because I put my faith in the fact that (inaudible) knows a heck of a lot more about that stuff than I do. And the regulatory agency that put this together and have been working closely with PolyMet in the last year, and they have studied this more than I have, and they have told us that they think they can safely operate within the environmental laws of the State of Minnesota, and they can do so while raising tens of millions of dollars of tax revenue that will come back to us and educate us and allow us to do everything needed in the State of Minnesota. So, I am getting up here today to express my support. It says St. Paul, that my name's from, but I went to school in Duluth and I'm from the northern part of the state, not far from there. And I put my faith in the fact that the regulatory agencies, no other (inaudible) has more people involved and who are far more knowledgeable than I am, and have put together the SDEIS, and will prove that PolyMet can operate within the parameters and they are going to do so by bringing mining back to the range.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Altrichter

44469

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Emily Altrichter Emily Altrichter 4815 Todd Dr Apt. 62 Ames, IA 50014

44473

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Emily Altrichter Emily Altrichter 4815 Todd Dr Apt. 62 Ames, IA 50014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Barter

44108

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, The plans of PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota seem completely unsound. They plan to mine for a short period of time, but in so doing cause nearly irreparable damage to a critical environment. Clean water, healthy wildlife, and a non-toxic environment are very important to me. The PolyMet mine would jeopardize all of them. I understand that the creation of jobs is very important right now, but the environmental and monetary cost of this project is not worth it. The massive funds that would be necessary to clean up the environment in the wake of this mining could even be used to much greater effect on public works projects to employ Minnesotans in more productive ways. I urge you, as decision-makers on this issue, to reject PolyMet's sulfide ore mining proposal. Please don't choose a short-term financial gain over the long-term health of our environment. I'm counting on you, as my elected officials, to make the right choice for Minnesota's future. Sincerely, Miss Emily Barter 3208 Lyndale Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3633 (617) 899-7307

Emily Brown

36464

My Response to the PolyMet SDEIS Regarding wetland destruction PolyMet's open pit form of copper/sulfide mining involves destroying hundreds of acres of wetlands in the Partridge River headwaters. Most of these wooded wetlands are of high quality and are key to providing mitigation for flooding, food for fish downstream, and maintaining water quality downstream. Also, these wetlands are an important habitat for waterfowl, moose and other wildlife. The US EPA notes that these wetlands may qualify as "aquatic resources of a national importance". That designation would require a higher level of protection than is currently planned. Thousands more acres would be indirectly harmed by air and water pollution and by the redirecting of water that is needed to support wetlands. PolyMet does not plan to include compensation for these thousands of acres that would be indirectly harmed. Their "wait and see" approach means agencies may or may not mitigate later. Since PolyMet's mine plan did not consider any alternatives to reduce wetland destruction and water pollution, it is doubtful that any such solutions would be found. Taking Climate Change Seriously The widespread contamination of water in West Virginia, the current catastrophic drought in California, and even the ongoing shortage of water for agriculture in southern Minnesota are red flags to a changing climate where water is an increasingly valuable resource that must be protected above all. All reputable climate scientists tell us that extreme weather, long periods of drought, and events such as Duluth's dramatic flooding two years ago are the new normal. Therefore, I submit that new public policy should place an ever higher value on clean water, which is our greatest natural resource here in northern Minnesota. Any plan such as PolyMet's needs to take a more serious approach to accommodate extreme weather and inform the public on how they will prevent torrential rainfall from bursting dams and overflowing waste storage basins. Stop Reliance on Dirty Energy As a society, we must stop the growing reality of climate change. The increase in CO2 parts per million pertains to the larger amounts of electrical energy that this kind of mining requires. At this point that energy source would be mostly coal. In addition, the fuel used by the huge trucks and heavy equipment proposed would add even more CO2 to the air we breathe. PolyMet's project should be postponed until we have energy sources that are not dependent on coal and gas. There is already an issue of haze in the BWCAW. The problem of clean energy needs to be solved before PolyMet adds to the current level of pollution. The SDEIS needs to address this aspect of the project's environmental impact. Conclusion In summary, an environmental impact statement that is responsible to future generations of Minnesotans needs to take into account the big picture of climate change and the long-term effects of adding an intensive industrial operation to our already-endangered waters, forests, and air. Sincerely, Emily M. Brown 1603 Hanson Road Ely, MN 55731

Emily Dayton Slowinski

54566

I am very concerned about the effects of the proposed PolyMet mine on our environment. No matter how you slice it there will be destruction of acres & acres of wilderness to begin with and extensive lasting negative effects for years afterward. We (and all of nature) depend on pure water for our health and lives. Tall trees and wetlands are not just decoration. My husband and I (now 91 and 84) have visited the BWCA at least 20 times in the past and our canoe trips have fed our souls as well as our bodies. As for jobs, we have enough smart people to figure out how to provide employment that is constructive rather than destructive.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Fleissner

40025

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Emily Fleissner 3515 Chambersburg Ave Duluth, MN 55811-3046

Emily Gardner

14972

Feb 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

emily gherity

15251

I find it beyond belief that Minnesota is contemplating such a disastrous mining scheme when all of our waters and natural resources are under siege from zebra mussels in Mille Lac and Superior to Asian carp moving up river to moose die-off due to global warming. There is no scientific question that this type of mining is always extremely damaging to the environment. When the costs of maintenance and recovery have to be figured over centuries, this should be a signal that we are talking about the tooth fairy. This mine would be planted on top of the Superior watershed, a body of water already damaged by earlier economic exploitation. 350 jobs would not justify this failure of stewardship nor would 35,000 jobs. At any rate, the alleged jobs are temporary and, as always when the job argument is used, it is a fig leaf for the millions, conceivably billions of dollars which will flow into the pockets of foreign investors and perhaps a few adroit members of the iron range mafia. I know this thing will go forward and I know there will be a catastrophe and that taxpayers will pay for it while the decision makers act surprised. We are placing a curse on our own children and need to call it for what it is. Emily Gherity 3328 10th Ave S Mpls MN 55407

Emily Hegland

42071

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Emily Hegland Mounds View, Minnesota

Emily M Brown

54671

See attachment

Emily M. Kindelspire

43132

To whom it may concern: Please think about the long term consequences of allowing mining. Too many decisions are made with only the short term benefits in mind- economic gains, increased employment etc What about the children who will be born in 25 years. 50 years. 75 years. 200 years. What will be left for them. What do we want to leave for them to ensure their success and survival. Peace, Emily Kindelspire VISION Student Co-Director Adventure Seeker Story Collector kind1157@stthomas-edu<mailto:kind1157@stthomas-edu> "Humans are vulnerable and rely on the kindness of the earth and the sun. We exist together in a sacred field of meaning"- Joy Harjo

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Mashuga

7762

Jan 18, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in MN and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the BWCAW. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I love the Boundary Waters and the wildness and purity it represents, and I'd hate to see that ruined that so we can make more iPHONES and cheap electronics. Some things are just more important than other things in life, and safe clean lasting water is much more important than making more DVD players and cell phones. Which people don't really "need", but are convinced they want and should have because of advertising. I do not approve of this mining at all, and I think it should not happen here in MN (or anywhere for that matter). Metals like: copper and nickel, etc are notoriously good materials for recycling and they maintain their integrity very well, even after being recycled many times. That option (recycling) should be the one we all start turning to, to get these metals Polymet (and manufacturers) want. Instead of constantly digging up virgin materials, when we already have the materials needed (to make a lot of things) wasting away in landfills. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Emily Mashuga 754 Havenview Ct Saint Paul, MN 55120-1800 (651) 269-0080

51502

Jan 18, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in MN and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the BWCAW. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I love the Boundary Waters and the wildness and purity it represents, and I'd hate to see that ruined that so we can make more iPHONES and cheap electronics. Some things are just more important than other things in life, and safe clean lasting water is much more important than making more DVD players and cell phones. Which people don't really "need", but are convinced they want and should have because of advertising. I do not approve of this mining at all, and I think it should not happen here in MN (or anywhere for that matter). Metals like: copper and nickel, etc are notoriously good materials for recycling and they maintain their integrity very well, even after being recycled many times. That option (recycling) should be the one we all start turning to, to get these metals Polymet (and manufacturers) want. Instead of constantly digging up virgin materials, when we already have the materials needed (to make a lot of things) wasting away in landfills. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Emily Mashuga 754 Havenview Ct Saint Paul, MN 55120-1800 (651) 269-0080

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Meyer

15994

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Emily Ness

41935

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Emily Ness Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Onello

47643

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. I am a practicing Family Physician and medical educator. I believe that the impact on human beings must be clearly outlined before proceeding further. Sincerely, Dr Emily Onello 2817 E Superior St Duluth, MN 55812-2353 (218) 724-1269

Emily or Ken Steil

10712

There do not seem to be enough facts presented along with a listing of the issues such as on the bottom of page 5-6 and into 5-7 where there is discussion of how to treat groundwater as needed on an extended basis. It seems to say all that will be determined by the needs at that point. But page 5-6 also says a certain mechanical treatment process will only be used the first forty years, what happens after that is not made clear except to say treatment would shift to some non-mechanical form to be determined at that time with no definitive statement that mechanical treatment will not be needed longer. Page 5-7 then goes on to say there will then be a 200 to 500 year period that some sort of treatment will need to continue. That is too big a window and too long a time period to lay out at this point. It suggests that what will happen is not known and will be determined and addressed as the years roll along. The mining company is not mentioned as having any responsibility for this though it is likely the company will not exist at that point. I don't think this project should proceed given this huge uncertainty. It suggests the technology is not in existence yet. It is likely the project will proceed in the future as mining techniques catch up. The way to proceed at this point would seem to be to dump category one tailings into the west pit as is being done with east pit. This would answer what I see as the big hole in this proposed project. Thank you for your consideration of this. Ken Steil 301 East Anoka St Duluth, MN 55803 218-728-2551 ste190@aol-com February 2, 2014

Emily Ostercamp

14944

Emily Ostercamp 6213 267th Ct. Wyoming MN 55092

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Schneider

42018

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Emily Schneider Eagan, Minnesota _____ There are now 2374 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to National Audubon Society by clicking here: [HYPERLINK "http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition"](http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition)<http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89b> [http://email.changemail-org/wf/open.upn=aGGv9wQ398j6-2FWVT4grdXbWUo0w-2FupjjjD-2Beylkg5XeInLuCEKc3fZdho8GXxxiplFn6SybU80HWYOLHct2MhHcRv7ksg-2F-2Bt-2BBQdFBpjIwoFDs2Rei6JPpgObA0SW5ZqHBhlRx3kGGHiAjiMeGucWYbiE4itGWHMRNRgKxQZcvAG-2FSz46ZQx5TcZSc7Ih7PGfZD7a1LUJKqbETc0qklUj3w5CU1jxNkOKLPGm-2FoDa1QVZIBT4yCR4zpD-2BTbpuH5k1r8ZQI936PFZaEzx0kS-2FgvYMc17-2Butuio6N-2Fv56vk1kSeYrXGz1RaeHeQIOGTF](http://api.mixpanel-com/track.data=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1andimg=1)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Smith

42180

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are there

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily Swanson

16170

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Emily Wartman

42693

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emily West

41754

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Emily Whittaker

42995

Dear Ms Fay, Attached is a letter from Freshwater Future and other fellow organizations working to protect the Great Lakes. The letter is requesting that the MDNR deem the current version of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement as inadequate. It is imperative to have a sound EIS in order to make proper decisions regarding our resources. If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Emily Whittaker Policy Specialist Freshwater Future (231)-373-3670 [HYPERLINK "mailto:emily@freshwaterfuture-org"](mailto:emily@freshwaterfuture-org)emily@freshwaterfuture-org [HYPERLINK "https://www.facebook.com/pages/Freshwater-Future/10150104189620648"](https://www.facebook.com/pages/Freshwater-Future/10150104189620648)Like Us on Facebook

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emma Marshall

54195

I am a high school senior from Minnesota and I am concerned for the condition of the boundary waters after the mining project. These waters are the purest waters that we have and they are the perfect destination for camping and canoeing. People from all over the US come to enjoy the boundary waters. There are so many things that are going to negatively affect the boundary waters and animals near this area. 99% waste is ridiculous and it is not worth mining for the 1%. You will directly be killing many animals, fish, and polluting the beautiful waters. I am not an environmentalist at all but this is dear to my heart because of all of this nature that will be ruined.

Emma Radke

15906

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Emma Radke 1712 Pleasant St Lauderdale, MN 55113

Emmalee Breth

42003

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Emmalee Breth Elk River, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Emmett Doyle 43814

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness, in addition to damaging the wilderness itself through sulfide pollution. Moreover, because the mechanization of mining has reduced the number of jobs that the industry creates as well as lead to a workforce that tends to be more non-local and thus less stimulating to the economy, and because the environmental impacts of this mine could harm the tourism and recreation industries that are northern MN's inevitable future, this mine is economically the wrong choice for Minnesotan workers. Finally, the mine is roundly opposed by the indigenous community for its potential impacts on manoomin and the wider north woods ecosystem, and the wishes of the indigenous community should bear a degree of special consideration given the historical context of our state. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Emmett Doyle 4315 45th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-4062

Emmett Ramstad 10763

Hello, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed PolyMet Northmet copper-nickel mining plan. I am not at all convinced that the short term goal of mining is at all worth the inevitable pollution it will cause. Nor am I convinced that PolyMet will be able to reverse the damage to water and land to it's original healthy state. I vacation every year on Lake Superior, the largest body of water in the world. I cherish it and am proud to live in a state that boasts this gorgeous treasure of a lake. I am afraid the pollution will inevitably enter the near by Embarrass River and Partridge River which flows into the St Louis River that then flows into Lake Superior. Not good. A resident in Bisbee, AZ. became ill from his garden produce, due to the toxins leaching into the soil from that copper mine. Please think of what is good for the earth and its people and stop this dangerous plan. Thank you for reading this. Sincerely, Emmett Ramstad 2420 31st Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55406

Emmy White 20147

I simply can not understand how the DNR could stand by a consider copper mining in our watershed area. To contaminate the waters for our generations to come is unthinkable. Please stop this from happening. Emmy White

Emrys Stramer 18192

So I have been participating in the harvest of wild rice for about seven years with a group of friends. Wild rice has become a staple food in my diet. It's not only nutrients that I gain during this seasonal harvest, but an incredible time of community-building among my friends. It's an empowering practice to know that we can all feed ourselves and each other in ways that don't exploit the natural environment or people -- yeah, numerous intangible and tangible benefits from doing this. So concerns: Arsenic causes cancer in human beings. The PolyMet project would increase arsenic in Colby Lake by 38.5 percent. That is the drinking water for Hoyt Lakes. Arsenic also accumulates in fish and wild rice. Low-income people who fish and rice for food have the most cumulative risk, and this does proportionately negatively affects poor people and poisons our food supply. The SDEIS must be redone to make a cumulative assessment of arsenic and cancer risks for people in Hoyt Lakes, including people who rely on fish and rice for food. I think that my friends and my community endeavors to provide food in this way for ourselves and enjoy this bounty that is out there that needs to be respected and honored. Like special movement of people of my generation and in lots of, like, to make sustainable food systems that are just food systems. So yeah, I see that as an environmental justice issue. The proposed mine is located within the 1854 Treaty on Ceded Territory, and three sovereign nations retain, never gave away, their hunting, fishing, gathering rights. Under federal case law, these rights are for the welfare and well-being of tribes, and federal caselaw provides that the ceded land must remain productive for the exercise of those rights. So 48,000 of the 64,000 acres of wild rice in Minnesota are within tribal-ceded land, 1,800 just in the Hoyt Lakes area. Destroying damaging, poisoning the plants and other, you know, other important resources in the 1854 Territory is -- you know, this is part of the cumulative effects that aren't entirely addressed by the Impact Statement. Continued genocidal policies and actions towards the indigenous people, towards these lands is unacceptable. So I would ask, in addition to the rare and endangered species, the EIS must analyze fully the impact of the PolyMet proposal on any animal or plant species relevant to any tribal property. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Environmental Law & Policy Center 42967

Ms Fay – attached please find NorthMet SDEIS comments on behalf of the Environmental Law and Policy Center. Please confirm that they have been received ahead of the comment deadline. Thanks, Allen _____ Allen Gleckner Staff Attorney Environmental Law and Policy Center St Paul, Minnesota 651-789-1407 HYPERLINK "<http://www.elpc-org/>"elpc-org

eric baldus 42219

To Agree with everyone who is concerned, I am writing to express my feelings about what a terrible idea this is to allow copper nickel mining in one of the most pristine locations in Minnesota/the USA. This is an extremely dirty process and a very disruptive method of mining. The tailings that are produced are full of toxic elements. The number of jobs created is negligible, certainly we have high levels of unemployment in the area and I appreciate the desire to create jobs. But to be saddled with the environmental damage barely seems worth it. It is extremely short sighted to think that the jobs created would be worth the risk. In light of the recent spill in Kentucky by Freedom industries, please do not allow this mining operation to happen. Freedom industries declares bankruptcy after the spill and now the state and the federal government are responsible for the clean up. To believe that the state will be able to escrow enough money for 200+ years of water cleanup is ridiculous. And what if there is a release, what happens to the jobs that are created by fishing/recreation in the area. The area is now ruined forever, do not think that it will rebound, once a natural area is damaged it does not return to the pristine condition that it was once in. Look at the push for mountain top mining in the south. The effort to create jobs only creates wealth for a few at the cost of future generations. We expect more from the people who are supposed to protect our environment for future generations. It is not work the risk for a few jobs. Please do not allow this mine to proceed. Thank you and please protect what we are leaving for the generations to come, please do not let this become our legacy. Eric Baldus, CNLP Owner/Designer HYPERLINK "<http://www.TerraVistaMN-com>"www.TerraVistaMN-com Cellular: 612-227-0107 Office : 612-788-7500 Fax : 612-781-3260 3009 Central Ave NE Minneapolis MN 55418

Eric Bergstrom 39386

DNR: PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from the dirtiest coal power plants in Minnesota. PolyMet's electricity supplier, Minnesota Power, got 85% of their power from coal in 2013- PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. Finally, Minnesota law requires that a closed mine site be "maintenance free," but PolyMet's mine plan calls for hundreds of years of monitoring and expensive water treatment. Worse, these models don't even show that the pollution stops after 500 years. They just stopped modeling at 500 years. This is not acceptable and we should be provided with information that is accurate. I ask that the DNR reject the Polymet mine plan by requiring use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution and we be provided with accurate information to proposed treatment and 500 years is not acceptable. Thank you- Eric Bergstrom 1362 Sargent Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Eric Erkkila 46278

Please enter these comments into the record for this project. As a native of Northern Minnesota I have lived with and seen the economic booms and busts. A project of this type will stabilize the economy. Adding this operation to the area will provide the following to the economy: - Much needed construction jobs to build the new mine and rehabilitate the existing processing plant. - Increased sales activity for suppliers of construction commodities and services. - Increased sales for mining vendors for supplies during the mine operation. This will provide 2 jobs for every job at the mine. - Provide additional revenue for the state and local economies. - Long term employment for both miners and suppliers. - The national economy needs these raw materials to provide for the necessities and luxuries of life. On the environmental side of the issue: - The re- use of an existing processing facility and tailings basin. - Stringent controls in place for protection of the environment. - Raw materials to feed the "green economy" of windmills and hybrid automobiles. Thank you for your consideration. Eric C. Erkkila 2909 Parkwood Lane Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Haefner

7175

Polymet, along with all the government agencies that provided input, have shown in the SDEIS that the proposed mining operations will not negatively impact the State of Minnesota. Mining has been, is currently, and will always be a vital part of the State of Minnesota. Through government regulations we can make mining a safe industry, and this SDEIS is proving that it can happen. I am an avid outdoorsman and have been to Northern Minnesota and the Boundary Waters multiple times, so I understand the concern and the beauty of the area. What this SDEIS proves is that mining and nature can co-exist if done right. Eric Haefner, P.E. 47068 Shanaska Creek Road Kasota, MN 56050 Eric Haefner, P.E. Bolton and Menk, Inc. P: (507) 625-4171 ext. 2655 M: (507) 380-4180 email: HYPERLINK "mailto:ericha@bolton-menk-com"ericha@bolton-menk-com This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud-com>

eric hendrickson

39182

I write to urge you to deny the permit for the PolyMet copper-nickel mine proposal. The signs read “We support Mining; Mining supports us.” The second half of the catch phrase certainly applies to me and my family. Dad worked for US Steel and helped develop the taconite industry starting in 1951- Mom still gets a pension from his employment. The family lake cabin they were able to build in 1959 is within the drainage area that PolyMet would impact. My sister and I worked in the mines and I worked four summers on the ore boats which put me through college. I was an enthusiastic rider on the Taconite Train to a Vikings game that promoted passage of the taconite amendment in 1964- If mining was so beneficial to us, why then don't I support Polymet's application. The answer is that the issue is much more complex than a quid pro quo of “We support Mining”. Comparing ferrous mining with sulfide mining is an apples and oranges proposition. On the Range we played on the ore dumps as kids, housing developments and trees have sprung up on them, ATV parks use them, all with no ill effects. While iron mining has caused some environmental damage, most notably Reserve Mining's dumping of tailings into Lake Superior, it has been remediable and not long term. The track record of sulfide mining is disturbingly different. I was born in Flin Flon, Manitoba where Dad worked for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, a copper nickel operation. Despite a 600 foot smokestack, when the wind blew in a certain direction, Mom would rush out to cover her garden with sheets so they wouldn't die from the fumes from the smelter. Ross Lake in the center of town quickly became and remains to this day a dead body of water. We are told that new technology will obviate this kind of problem. As I understand the data, this confidence in “new technology” is misplaced. As we perform our due diligence in vetting the assurances of the companies, we will be well served to err on the side of caution. I taught high school social studies for 30 years and think about the historical context of this issue. My students found it hard to believe that 400 years ago wars were fought and empires won and lost over spices. Four hundred years from now, students may well wonder the same thing about oil and minerals. A foreign company whose stock share price hovers around a dollar is a fool's bet for long term accountability. It is not the company but citizens who will be dealing with PolyMet's toxic legacy. We need look no further than the American West to see what a precious resource our water is. We need to take the long view; be statesmen, not politicians. Chief Seattle said “We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors; we borrow it from our children”. Let's not be the man in the Bible who sells his birthright for a bowl of pottage. Three hundred fifty jobs for 20 years is not worth the risk. Eric R. Hendrickson 1813 Juliet Avenue St Paul, MN 55105

Eric J Simso

58151

Has there been a jobs trade-off analysis, mining/construction vs recreation/construction. As a Minneapolis resident and lake County taxpayer and summer resident, the relative jobs and revenue contribution of no-residents doesn't seem to be accounted for.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Kemp

44836

To: Ms Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources From: Eric Kemp, concerned citizen Dear Ms Fay- I am writing to you out of concern that the Environmental Impact Study pertaining to the proposed PolyMet Mine is lacking, insufficient or possibly misleading. I don't believe it deals with ground water contamination to the extent that is necessary to protect this precious resource. Of the many instances where this mine, if it were allowed to go forward, will pose a threat to the environment and the waters of Northern Minnesota, there is no threat so great as that effecting ground water. Ground water may be our most precious resource. In materials produced by PolyMet, they state that they can capture and prevent 90% of surface water from seeping into the ground. This statement should read that they think they can capture up to 90% of surface water because this mine proposal is really a scientific experiment. In any scientific experiment there is an inherent margin of error. Undoubtedly PolyMet and there Lawyers have an interest in releasing the most positive data regarding there plans to the public. Even if the mine were able to capture 90% of it's waste water from entering the ground water supply, the remaining 10% entering ground water represents hundreds of millions of gallons of contaminated water entering the aquifer. I hope the MDNR sees this as the problem that it is. We have seen in this country and even in this State contamination of our surface water. In the cases of the Great Lakes, the Mississippi River and the Cuyahoga River, just as examples, legislation and time have helped to make these water bodies more healthy. We have NEVER witnessed the same regarding contamination of ground water aquifers. Once an aquifer is contaminated it will remain so, so far as our science has shown us to date. As bad as it would be for the proposed mine to contaminate surface and run-off waters surrounding the PolyMet mine site, it would truly be a tragedy to let hundreds of millions of gallons of water with toxic fibers and heavy metals contaminate our most precious resource, our ground water. Thank you. Sincerely, Eric Kemp Duluth

Eric Larson

9900

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: It is critical that you responsibly reject the inaccurate PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS and acknowledge that PolyMet's open-pit sulfide mine plan would have enduring negative environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In absolute fact, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still represent unacceptable risk to the incredible current and future asset of clean water that the world will value incredibly highly until well past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. To take any risk with this, much less a high risk, demands your action to reject it. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that the groundwater base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my assessment. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on acceptable use of known science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be rejected and be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. You must act to protect the environment from the money and political pressure that should not influence a thorough scientific assessment and conclusion. Your actions will have more long term impact that virtually any decision facing the state. Sincerely yours, Eric Larson Resident on Burntside Lake in Ely Eric Larson 2835 Schaeffer Road Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Larson

18664

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: It is critical that you responsibly reject the inaccurate PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS and acknowledge that PolyMet's open-pit sulfide mine plan would have enduring negative environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In absolute fact, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still represent unacceptable risk to the incredible current and future asset of clean water that the world will value incredibly highly until well past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. To take any risk with this, much less a high risk, demands your action to reject it. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that the groundwater base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my assessment. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on acceptable use of known science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be rejected and be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. You must act to protect the environment from the money and political pressure that should not influence a thorough scientific assessment and conclusion. Your actions will have more long term impact that virtually any decision facing the state. Sincerely yours, Eric Larson Resident on Burntside Lake in Ely Eric Larson 2835 Schaeffer Road Ely, MN 55731

50740

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: It is critical that you responsibly reject the inaccurate PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS and acknowledge that PolyMet's open-pit sulfide mine plan would have enduring negative environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In absolute fact, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still represent unacceptable risk to the incredible current and future asset of clean water that the world will value incredibly highly until well past the lives of your great great great grandchildren. To take any risk with this, much less a high risk, demands your action to reject it. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that the groundwater base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my assessment. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on acceptable use of known science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be rejected and be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. You must act to protect the environment from the money and political pressure that should not influence a thorough scientific assessment and conclusion. Your actions will have more long term impact that virtually any decision facing the state. Sincerely yours, Eric Larson Resident on Burntside Lake in Ely Eric Larson 2835 Schaeffer Road Ely, MN 55731

Eric Marleau

20048

Good afternoon, I just wanted to make a few comments on the proposed copper nickel mining around the BWCA. Number one, I am for starting mining operations in this area. In the late '60s and early '70s I worked for Longyear Drilling Company on the Core Drilling rigs in the areas that the Mining Companies are now planning on working. I also retired as a Heavy Equipment and Shovel Operator for the US Steel Mintac Mine, and know how mining is done. Regulated correctly, there is no reason not to mine this resource. This issue has been gone through over and over again sense I worked on the Core Drilling Rigs long ago. All results have been the same, that done correctly, the environmental impact is negligible. I grew up in Ely, and have had a life long love of the woods. If in anyway I thought that this mining would hurt the woods that I have used my entire life, I would be against it. However, with the first hand knowledge that I have on this issue, I believe the Copper Nickel Mining is long overdue. Regards, Eric Marleau

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Morrison

4211

Dec 22, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The SDEIS for the Polymet project on the Babbitt site is incomplete and omits important information. There is insufficient consideration of watershed information. The proposed mine site is uphill from a body of water (One Hundred Mile Swamp) that straddles the Laurentian divide and feeds both the St Louis River and Rainy Lake (via the Dunka River) watersheds. Mention of both the One Hundred Mile Swamp and the Dunka River as it relates to hydrology of the mine site is completely absent from the SDEIS and may be intended to obscure the impact of the proposed mining on the BWCAW wilderness area. The waste water treatment discussion is inadequate. Reverse osmosis its likely to be completely impractical because of short membrane lifetimes and other maintenance issues and the non mechanical treatment methods proposed for the 200 to 500 year treatment are not only unproven, they do not exist today. There are other omissions and questionable conclusions in the SDEIS and it is unreasonable to allow the project to move forward before the SDEIS is corrected. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Eric Morrison 1202 Cherokee Ave West Saint Paul, MN 55118-2004 (651) 334-8399

18177

I'm speaking on behalf Jim Rock who concedes his time to Eric Morrison who speaks for a lot of us who are not getting paid to be here. Good evening. My name is Eric Morrison. And I have Ph.D. in chemistry from Penn State. I would like to address the Clean Water Act Section 404, which allows the US Army Corps of Engineers to authorize discharge into and destruction of wetland by allowing land exchange. The wetland that PolyMet is seeking a permanent discharge into is called the 100-mile Swamp. Shortly before its release the following land was added to the wetland section of the Environmental Impact Statement. And I quote, "However, no delineated boundary exists for the 100-mile Swamp," end quote. This statement is in fact completely incorrect. Delineated boundaries for the 100-mile Swamp do exist and they are available at the US Government National Atlas at www.NationalAtlas.gov/streamer. The US Government National Atlas shows that the 100-mile Swamp is drained by Langley Creek, which is a tributary to the Dunka River, which is in turn a tributary to the Kwishiwi River which runs straight to the Boundary Waters. It is an inconvenient fact that the authors of the Environmental Impact Statement simply do not want recognized that mining waste will flow to the Boundary Waters by way of the 100-mile Swamp and the Dunka River. Worse than just having the statement about the delineation of the 100-mile Swamp, they redo the maps of the 100-mile Swamp solely as to omit the part of the swamp that drains to the Dunka River. (Inaudible) this appears on page 472 of the SDEIS and at least five other maps. On the basis of the redrawn map attention has been diverted from the Boundary Waters. No baseline water testing was done in Langley Creek or in the Dunka River or any other part of the Boundary Waters Watershed. And nor would any testing be done if mining were allowed. This leaves the Dunka River and the BWCA completely and utterly unprotected. The Boundary Waters are a national treasure. And what I request is a federal-level environmental impact evaluation. I'm concerned that local and even state officials would (inaudible) of the BWCA for the proverbial nickel on the promise of a kickback or trickle-back penny. This is shortsighted and it violates the public trust of American citizens and future generations. At a minimum I'm requesting Governor Dayton compel a bonded public review period of 180 days for this SDEIS; and compel a subsequent SDEIS, which has the correct geographical features in it and requires water testing for the Dunka River and the Boundary Waters.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Morrison

44576

Eric Morrison 1202 Cherokee Ave West Saint Paul, MN 55118 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement requires information on financial assurance. Less than three pages devoted to finances required for centuries of treatment projects to protect the environment is absurd. The amount and type of financial instruments which are required for mine and plant site closure and ongoing water treatment are as essential to the environmental impact statement as technical details and need to be subject to public review. For the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to negotiate financial assurance with PolyMet without public or legislative oversight is a severe violation of the public trust. PolyMet exists only for the exploitation of minerals in the NorthMet site and it is a serious concern that PolyMet lacks the assets required to provide a level of financial assurance commensurate with the scope of the proposed project. Glencore, which owns 40% of PolyMet, has the financial resources but Glencore's involvement is cause for alarm. Glencore is a ruthless trading company founded by FBI Ten Most Wanted fugitive Marc Rich, is currently lead by Rich protégé Ivan Glasenburg and ousted British Petroleum CEO Tony Hayward, and has a very poor track record of environmental, ethical, human rights, and labor violations which includes bribery. It is completely unethical to negotiate with PolyMet as a substantially owned subsidiary of Glencore behind closed doors. The need to carefully manage financial assurance for mining is greatly exacerbated for the NorthMet project by PolyMet's finances, ownership, and the extreme risk to the environment from sulfide ore mining. An addendum to the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is required that includes substantial details of the reclamation bond including the dollar amount, the nature of the trust, and the financial instruments for funding it.

Sincerely, Eric Morrison

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Morrison

46074

Eric Morrison 1202 Cherokee Ave West St Paul, MN 55118 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay The safety of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area from mine drainage that will be created by PolyMet's proposed NorthMet mine has not been established. The NorthMet Mining Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement of November 2013 makes no adequate statement about whether water discharged from the mine site can possibly enter the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and provides no satisfactory evidence relevant to this critical issue. Without a definitive statement and data about mine waste and the BWCA, the NorthMet Project SDEIS is inadequate. Determining the relationship of the proposed NorthMet mine and the BWCA requires information about the extent to which the mine site is geologically and hydrologically connected to the Rainy Lake watershed. The proposed mine site is just south of and uphill from a wetland area named the One Hundred Mile Swamp which drains to both the Saint Louis River watershed and the Rainy Lake (BWCA) watershed. Because the mine site drains to the One Hundred Mile Swamp and the One Hundred Mile Swamp is geographically connected to the BWCA, the mine cannot possibly be isolated geographically from the BWCA. Hydrologically, the SDEIS includes no hydraulic conductivity testing for the One Hundred Mile Swamp which would indicate the extent to which the mine is hydrologically isolated from the BWCA. In US Government maps, the One Hundred Mile Swamp is a 10-4 mile long depression straddling the Laurentian Divide that drains to both the Partridge River which is a tributary to the St Louis River and Langley Creek which is a tributary to the Rainy Lake (BWCA) watershed [1]. Groundwater contours for the swamp are easterly descending towards Langley Creek [2] which promotes movement of mine waste to the BWCA watershed while the closer proximity of the mine to the Partridge River drainage site would minimize flow to the BWCA. The balance of the competing effects has not been measured and the division of waste water between the two watersheds is unknown. Estimating the proportion of mine waste that flows to the two watersheds requires lateral hydraulic conductivity testing in the One Hundred Mile Swamp. Over the time scale that mine site drainage will leach pollutants and furthermore considering likely excursions in weather and water levels, flow to the BWCA is almost certainly not zero. Not only does the environmental impact study fail to properly consider hydrology around the mine site, it includes incorrect information. A misleading statement was inserted into the Wetlands Section (4-3-3) of the SDEIS late in the drafting process [3] regarding the unavailability of geographical information for the One Hundred Mile Swamp. The statement "however, no delineated boundary exists for the One Hundred Mile Swamp" on page 4-429 is false. Delineated boundaries for the One Hundred Mile Swamp do exist and are available at HYPERLINK "<http://www.nationalatlas.gov/streamer>"www.nationalatlas.gov/streamer [2]. Accompanying the misleading statement in Wetlands Section of the SDEIS are maps that represent the One Hundred Mile Swamp in a way that is contradictory to the US National Atlas. The portion of the One Hundred Mile Swamp that drains to the BWCA watershed is missing in SDEIS maps. Contradictory maps in the SDEIS support the implication that seepage of mine waste water to the BWCA watershed will not occur. In SDEIS maps, the One Hundred Mile Swamp is depicted as a 5-5 mile long body of water that exists only on the St Louis River watershed side of the Laurentian divide as compared to the 10-4 mile long wetland in the National Atlas that exists as a depression straddling the divide and drains to both the St Louis River and Rainy Lake Watersheds.

51620

Dec 22, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The SDEIS for the Polymet project on the Babbitt site is incomplete and omits important information. There is insufficient consideration of watershed information. The proposed mine site is uphill from a body of water (One Hundred Mile Swamp) that straddles the Laurentian divide and feeds both the St Louis River and Rainy Lake (via the Dunka River) watersheds. Mention of both the One Hundred Mile Swamp and the Dunka River as it relates to hydrology of the mine site is completely absent from the SDEIS and may be intended to obscure the impact of the proposed mining on the BWCAW wilderness area. The waste water treatment discussion is inadequate. Reverse osmosis its likely to be completely impractical because of short membrane lifetimes and other maintenance issues and the non mechanical treatment methods proposed for the 200 to 500 year treatment are not only unproven, they do not exist today. There are other omissions and questionable conclusions in the SDEIS and it is unreasonable to allow the project to move forward before the SDEIS is corrected. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Eric Morrison 1202 Cherokee Ave West Saint Paul, MN 55118-2004 (651) 334-8399

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Norberg 54778

See attachment

Eric Norgaarden 39892

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Eric Norgaarden 634 Randy Ave Shoreview, MN 55126-7013 (651) 482-9987

Eric Olson 18256

My name is Eric Olson from Minneapolis, Minnesota. My comment is on the SDEIS in regards to indirect emissions from land use, from Section 5-404, or 5/404 and 5/406. In that section they list off indirect emissions, air emissions, and the results from the project, indirect emissions from the project, in which they list off terrestrial carbon loss, which would be considered carbon loss from trees and different living things on the land, which would be turned into mine; however, they do not include carbon sequestration loss or rates of carbon emissions that would occur from changing the land use from the peat -- what do you call it? Peat swamp to the mining area. The agencies should look into emission factors for calculating out the amount of carbon dioxide or carbon dioxide equivalent losses during the transition of this land use to the mining land use. And in doing that, using some -- given emission factors of 750 pounds of carbon dioxide, 750 tons of carbon dioxide sequestered per acre, that is a significant source of emissions that could be emitted into the atmosphere. That's it. Thank you.

Eric Paul Jacobsen 41971

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Eric Paul Jacobsen 247 Winona St W West Saint Paul, MN 55118-5707 (651) 228-1282

Eric Ruhland 42110

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. As a medical and environmental professional I am embarrassed that the State would allow this company to jeopardize our water supply, our most precious natural resource. This mistake we will look upon in the coming decades as a short sided decision that put our children, environment, and economy in a worse place. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Eric Ruhland 635 Summit Ave # 1 Saint Paul, MN 55105-3434 (651) 238-6815

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Snyder

17123

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Eric Snyder 215 Oak Grove St, #1802 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Snyder

51036

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Eric Snyder 215 Oak Grove St, #1802 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Eric Viken

44982

Dear MN DNR Representative: I am writing to let you know that I'm deeply concerned about the possibility of a copper-nickel mine being opened in Minnesota and then causing irreparable harm and cost to generations of Minnesotans to come and our precious natural environment. The mining should only be allowed if it can be shown that the water and air quality off the land used to mine is not impacted long after the corporation that mined the land ceases to exist. A method for mining must be first found to prevent the dangerous contaminants from leaking out and dispersing off of the mine site and not to rely on continuous filtering and maintenance of water flowing off site. We are essentially taking a piece of land and converting it to a contaminated waste dump that won't be useable for other purposes for many generations as well as hurt the surrounding lands downstream and downwind if the pollution can't be contained long term. The mining should only be allowed if an endowment fund of enough funds is able to be setup before mining commences to ensure that the site cleaning and containment system can be maintained for perpetuity until the site is longer a source of pollution (ie, 500+ years). The lost tax revenue and utility of the land after the mine ceases to operate needs to be considered because it will become a liability once the mine is used up and is no longer useable and long term will be a drag on the local economies. I think the external costs that will be born by future generations will far outweigh the short term benefits in jobs that are made during the life of the mine. There are plenty of similar mines that have been environmental problems and none that have been shown to be good examples of environmental stewardship. Minnesota's water rich environment will be even more challenging to maintain the mine long after it has closed than other states with less challenging conditions that have failed. If this mine were to move forward, which I think is a very bad idea, we need to make sure we are covered for the long term costs of maintaining the pollution control systems, lost value of the mine land and neighboring lands, and long term costs to the local economies which need to more than offset the short term benefits the mine will be bring to the local economy. Regards, Eric S. Viken [HYPERLINK "mailto:eric.viken@gmail-com"](mailto:eric.viken@gmail.com) iPhone: (218) 727-9061 Workdays: (218) 727-3115x5012 or Page at x0 459 Kenilworth Avenue in Beautiful Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Eric Willms

7061

In light of today's exposure of the DNR's ignorance of accurate water flow analysis, I have difficulty trusting the other data compiled in the SDEIS. The DNR should go back to the drawing board to analyze water flow in a model that includes predictions for climate change as well. Another major concern I have is the lack of consideration for the type of construction materials to be used for piping sulfate-containing water 7 miles between mine and plant. Nobody from the DNR at the recent Aurora public informational session could tell me anything about pipe construction. What happens when the temperature drops to -50 F. Finally, how can anyone predict the financial responsibility required to continue monitoring and treating pollution for 200 and 500 years. Mining corporations will not likely exist that long, banks holding reserve trusts to fund it may go belly-up, and taxpayers may not care. I thought that when I moved to Minnesota, the DNR would be more conscientious and comprehensive in protecting our environment than Missouri, where I am from. It appears that you are more interested in corporate profit than environmental protection. I fear that NorthMet pollution will be in news headlines in the future, following in line with West Virginia, North Dakota, and Gulf of Mexico disasters. Eric Willms 1901 Southern Drive Virginia, MN 55792

Erica Ann Allen

57146

The benefit to the Polymet Company does not outweigh the damage the company's practices cause to the public. Erica Ann Allen 421 W 3rd St, Apt 307 Duluth, MN 55806

Erica Johnson

10136

Good evening and thank you for taking my comments on the PolyMet Mining, Inc. proposal and environmental impact report. I am opposed to the PolyMet Mining, Inc. project and feel that it is a bad investment for Minnesota and urge the DNR to forgo the permitting process. Minnesota is unique among ecosystems, not only within Minnesota but within the globe for its maintenance of close-to-pristine wilderness and raw natural resources. Unique due to the sensitive balance of our bogs, forests, Great Lake, international watershed, and the hundreds of thousands of living species that depend on those interconnected systems to survive. PolyMet Mining, Inc. claims that their production facility will be safe, but there is NO GUARENTEE of that truth. To allow them to mine in Minnesota is playing Russian Roulette with a loaded pistol. Allowing them to mine puts the taxpayer a risk for millions, if not billions, of dollars in cleanup funds for decade after decade. We see Federal Superfund sites that STILL are not clean all across the State. The PolyMet mine would become the largest superfund site in the Nation with no clear understanding of how their mine would impact our delicate watersheds and ecosystems. Allowing the mine to move forward would be irresponsible, selfish and a risky gamble for the DNR. Is the DNR that desperate for cash that it would sell the very soul of Minnesota for a few years of cash flow. Is the risk of poisoning our very water worth it. With climate change in play; more severe weather pattern swings (droughts, extreme heat, fires, extreme cold, etc) now is not the time to allow a risky venture further to anchor itself in the State on a set of loosely conceived 'what-if's'. Yes, what IF we have sustained water replenishment to flush out the mining chemicals from the watershed. What if we enter several years of drought. What then. What if the weather causes something to happen at the mine which will cause the leaching of chemicals into the very aquifer. How will that watershed be cleaned 100% back to its former safe standards. Mining is by its nature an intrusive, messy business. Of course our environment will be altered by its presence. That is the nature of mining. That fact alone should be enough for the DNR to say NO to such a project: A Disaster Waiting to Happen. Just say No to the PolyMet Mine. Thank you, Erica Johnson 1332 N. 4th Street Mankato, MN 56001 (507)-720-7768 Sent from Windows Mail

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erica Sniegowski

16261

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erica TenBroek

4157

Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS plan. For all the reasons stated by those who oppose the Copper and Nickel mine in St Louis County, we should say a resounding "no" to this plan. Not only is 200-500 years of environmental distress enough to make a decision, but the fact that we will put increasing stress on an already shrinking area of natural habitat. It is certainly true that we all use products that require minerals obtained from mining. Nevertheless, the location of this mine and the potentially large environmental impact should make this an obvious choice. It is sad that the population has grown to levels where we are losing so much of the undeveloped land (all over the world) that actually protects our health in so many ways. As the world continues to grow, and demand for materials grows, we will continue to push the natural world into smaller and smaller spaces. In the end this will undoubtedly harm our way of life. In my opinion, it has already started to do just that. We need a complex and widespread web of life to keep the world healthy and bountiful. Better to draw some hard lines now and work on developing alternatives while we are still able to protect the small number of remaining spaces. Please consider that Minnesota's prime jewels are within the natural world. We are so lucky. There aren't many states that have such beautiful and bio-diverse areas that have remained "healthy". I have watched through the years as the once awe-strikingly beautiful and biologically healthy Canada (eg, British Columbia) has allowed the mining industry to flourish. Areas under pressure from mining that were once so astounding in natural beauty now look much different. Dirtier on the surface, and probably much worse if one were to look deeper. You have the power to prevent this from happening here in Minnesota. I know that this is a complex issue. But there comes a time to just say no. We can look harder for alternatives, and I think if we put our minds to it, we'll find better answers. Warm regards, Erica TenBroek Minnesota resident "Our intelligence, however prodigious we like to think it, is trivial compared to the accumulated wisdom of the hundred million species that make up Earth's biosphere. Since each microbe, animal, and plant possesses some minute portion of the know-how that makes the whole earth work, the loss of any species erases some portion of organic intelligence, and leaves the land more stupid." -Sara Stein

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erica TenBroek

12062

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources From: MN resident -Biologist with 11 years corporate research experience Topic: Comments PolyMet Open Pit Copper Mine Proposal EIS 1) Minnesota Environmental Loss The estimated loss and predicted damage to native ecosystems will be huge in the area planned for the mine and mining operations as well as the predicted serious indirect effects to the watershed. As stated by several environmental groups and law firms, PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. This alone should raise red flags. PolyMet, if allowed, will dig up nearly 1,000 acres of high value peat bogs, and damage a large part of the 100 Mile Swamp, a critical habitat for many plants and animals. This wetland has been designated an Area of High Biodiversity Significance in the Minnesota Biological Survey. Although said to be less, over 6,000 acres of wetlands could be damaged or destroyed by PolyMet changing the flow of some of these waters. Wetlands will dry up, animals and plants will die. The damage is almost always more than we can predict, and the suffering to individual animals has been glossed over or completely ignored. So much is unseen and subtle that we cannot calculate the true cost until the damage is done. We can't get back the organisms from these key habitats once they become extinct. It goes without saying that such areas of high biodiversity are the most critical to preserve as the world continues to develop. In my opinion, it's time that we stand firmly behind what we say is important. As a poor analogy, the car won't run at all once even half the spark plugs are gone. 2) Copper and Nickel and Modern Living It has been argued that Copper and Nickel are particularly fundamental to modern living. These are materials used in power lines, stainless steel, rechargeable batteries, etc It has been said that these minerals are necessary for many green technologies. And this is true - but I also think naïve. It is my understanding that copper and/or nickel are NOT the limiting materials in many critical electronics that have been thrown around as examples. People may be unaware that the same "green" products are dependent upon more limited supplies of scarce rare earth metals. These rare earth metals are mined in other parts of the world (eg China) and we will run out of these long before copper and nickel supplies are gone. An MIT site on strategic use of resources quotes that an average wind turbine can use up to 500 kg of neodymium and dysprosium per kilowatt generated (Department of Energy, 2011). Rare earth metal needs are similarly associated with green energy for cars. Certainly green energy and other forms of energy rely on conducting materials, but it is oxymoronic if a "green" technology ultimately creates more ecological damage and/or pollution than it prevents. Something seems wrong with our cost/benefit analysis. Do we really need more copper or will providing more copper merely increase use. If the international demand for copper is high as a result of population growth worldwide, is it our duty to make sure that supply is met. At what coSt How much of the copper/nickel market is one that is created by availability. How much of this is out of true need. I can tell you this – I wouldn't have bought stainless steel appliances if I knew the environmental coSt There is no debate that copper is currently used in many products, but does it need to be. 3) Other environmental costs omitted from consideration As pointed out by the MN Center for Environmental Advocacy, "PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to clima

54651

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erich Wunderlich

16150

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

ericksongary

44906

I hope this project does not proceed. The risk of permanent damage to the environment is not worth the price of shipping Minnesota copper to China. The resulting jobs are a blink of an eye compared to centuries of poisoned waters. How many businesses last 500 years. When Hennepin Paper went broke the taxpayers paid for the cleanup in Little Falls and the odds on 500 years of follow up is unrealistic. Please don't allow this debacle to proceed. Sincerely, Gary Erickson 1132 Lindbergh Drive South Little Falls, Mn 56345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erik 40074

To: Minnesota DNR As a Minnesotan, I am deeply concerned about this project and it's potential to damage what I love about this state - it's lakes, waterways, and the aquatic life in seemingly pristine wilderness areas like the BWCA. I am unwilling to risk the health of those areas on the basis of reports that assume flawless operation of an industry that cannot demonstrate such perfection at any other location and where the only stated benefit is 350 jobs. Clearly, the profits from this mine will be enormous, if the Canadian company asking to mine in our state has expressed willingness to pay cleanup costs for centuries. Clearly, the risks of this project are real and significant given the public debate. Minnesota is known as the land of 10,000 lakes - how many should we be willing to sacrifice for 350 jobs. What recourse do we have if it becomes evident that the operation of the mine is not in accordance with predictions associated with minimal environmental impact. It seems that there would be far less risky ways for the state to encourage just about any other industry to create 350 jobs, if that is the main benefit cited for the state. I find it hard to believe that a mining company would not behave as any other company and try to find ways to maximize its profit and minimize its costs. What guarantee do we have that this company or its investors will honor any promise to pay for future cleanup. If the assumption is that little cleanup will be needed, how is the amount of money set aside by the company determined. What happens if the amount of pollution is demonstrated to be greater than predicted - will additional money be required from the company in the present to pay for the greater than predicted cleanup. Will it be written into the permit that projected levels of pollution must be realized or the permit will be revoked. How will the levels of pollution be monitored, both on site to assure that contaminants are not escaping and elsewhere to be ensure that nearby water and aquatic life is not affected. Will the company pay for all monitoring and testing performed by state and national environmental agencies. PolyMet owns the mineral rights, but I have read that the US Forest service considers surface mining to be illegal in this area. I do not agree that swapping land is a reasonable solution to this issue. I have read that other copper mines are more safely operated as underground mines. Why isn't underground mining part of the proposal. Isn't open pit mining inherently more risky to the environment. I have read that it is a given that the company will need to treat water at the site by reverse osmosis. I have also read that it is considered difficult to assume that all water used on site will make it to and through the treatment facility, due to cracks in bedrock, etc If it is admitted that the process creates water that should not be reintroduced into the environment "as-is", how will the DNR monitor and assure state residents that absolutely no untreated water is escaping into the environment without treatment. If untreated water is found to be entering the environment, will the permit be revoked and mining operations ceased. Nothing about this project sits well with me, and I strongly request that the DNR deny PolyMet a permit to mine in the state. It is impossible to believe that the mining industry will provide it's first case of leaving a site without long term environmental devastation for which the public will eventually have to foot the bill. There are many other projects that could provide 350 jobs, and I don't feel that the DNR should even evaluate this project on the basis of the jobs it may create. The project should only be evaluated on the basis of its potential damage to our state and the costs of that damage. Please do not issue a permit for this mine as proposed. Thank you, Erik Helgen, AIA 760 Nebraska Ave W. St Paul, MN 55117

Erik and Larissa Mottl 44189

Please choose the "No Action Alternative." Finding out that Polymet doesn't actually own the land it would like to mine and that public lands would be sacrificed for this proposal is disturbing. Mining and gas extraction have a long history of environmental disturbance beyond what they or other experts initially expected. We cannot out engineer mother nature and we cannot control the weather. If there are no plans for Polymet to treat the contaminated water there should be NO mine at this time. Recently we have seen what happens with lax government inspection and decisions made by companies to save money- rivers contaminated and towns without drinkable water. This mine would provide short term employment opportunities for a few residents. It is simply not worth the risk to ruin another park of Minnesota's natural heritage for short term extraction and financial gains to an industrial intereSt Please choose the "No Action Alternative." Sincerely, Erik C. Mottl 23113 Hilo Ave N Forest Lake, MN 55025

Erik Erie 42525

See attachment

Erik F Storlie 54702

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erik Fors 4638

My name is Erik Fors from North Oaks mn. Let's give our workers a chance to be great. We need to keep people in our state. Give workers a chance. Please approve the mines in Northern Minnesota Kindest Regards Erik Fors Sent from my iPad

Erik Hinderlie 28150

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have a cabin downstream from the proposed mining site, and am terrified at the havoc it would do to the marvelous jewel that is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and what it could do to Lake Superior if leaks and drainage got out of control. I also do not trust Polymet's parent company, Glencore, with its abhorrent human rights and environmental violations abroad. I am sure as decision makers you have seen Glencore's terrible history, though handsome profits because environmental destruction, topsoil depletion and freshwater contamination is never calculated in GDP or economic indexes. But you will feel its terrible power if sulfide mining contaminates the North Woods, in polluted lakes, rivers and streams, massive deforestation and habitat fragmenting, reduced employment in tourism, outfitting, recreational hunting and angling and second home properties-it will be chaos for short-term economic goodness for one company, not the area. Please consider where you live, what a beautiful, bountiful and life-giving wilderness. The ample opportunities for outdoor enjoyment, provided by the North Woods-the peace, tranquility, pollution free environs. Think about our children, what world they would inherit with a massive open pit mine, with pollution controls that MUST LAST for at least 500 years after Polymet extracts everything-indeed, long past the likely life of that company. The EIS had to be re-jiggered already because Glencore is known for shortcuts and silencing critics and a key error was found in how it pollutes. Let us not give away one of Minnesota's most critical assets-a billion dollar tourism, recreational and private property industry to one quick burst of mining metals. There are many other appropriate places to do sulfide mining. The North Woods wilderness, Great Lakes basin is definitely not one of them. Thank you, Erik Hinderlie Sincerely, Erik Hinderlie 7 Commonwealth Ave Fl 2 Gloucester, MA 01930-3441 (763) 222-6668

Erik Olson 42555

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erik Packard

16292

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

erik pederson

41904

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, erik pederson Glenwood, MN, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erik R 58139

After reading the Polymet SDEIS there are many crucial unanswered questions. One of which are the details surrounding the “West Equalization Basin”. It is clear from the report that this basin will receive the “reject concentrate” from the plant that takes pollution from the tailings. What isn’t clear in the SDEIS is exactly how polluted this basin will be. The only document that offers any indication as to these figures is the 2012 Mine Site Waste Water Treatment Facility Design Plan and this plan is neither listed nor referenced in the SDEIS. In that plan it says this basin could have 8,700 milligrams per liter of sulfate and nickel concentrations that are 10,999 times what the Minnesota water quality standards would allow. Not only does the SDEIS fail to describe the predicted levels of pollution in this basin, it offers little in the way of contingency plans for what would happen in the results of a catastrophic weather event. The extent of their existing contingency plan is that any overflow from this basin would simply flow into the mine pits, which are in no way designed to deal with the high levels of concentrated pollution present in the basin. In the end it comes down to this, the project as laid out in the SDEIS poses far too many risks and brings little in the way of benefits to the state and to the regions. We have seen over and over how these projects can go bad and then we the tax payers will be left to clean up the mess. If we are to learn anything from recent history, it is that these corporations are ethically corrupt and not bound by the legal framework as individuals. They purposefully structure themselves legally so as to minimize or outright avoid any liability in the event that anything goes wrong. There is no reason to believe that Polymet or its investors would be any different. Therefore, there are no conditions or restrictions you could put on this project that these companies couldn’t find a way to weasel out of and that is why I ask you to reject this SDEIS. Thank you. I yield the rest of my time.

Erik Riesenberg 18229

My name is Erik Riesenberg, E-R-I-K, R-I-E-S-E-N-B-E-R-G. After reading the PolyMet SDEIS, there are many crucial unanswered questions, one of which are the details surrounding the West Equalization Basin. It is clear from the report that this basin will receive the reject concentrate from the plant that takes pollution from the tailings. What isn’t clear in the SDEIS is exactly how polluted this basin will be. The only document that offers any indication as to these figures is the 2012 Mine Site Wastewater Treatment Design Plan, and this plan is neither listed nor referenced in the SDEIS. In that plan, it says that the basin could have 8,700 milligrams per liter of sulfate and nickel concentrations that are 10,000 times what the Minnesota Water Quality Standards would allow. Not only does the SDEIS fail to describe the predicted levels of pollution in this basin, it offers little in the way of contingency plans for what would happen in the results of a catastrophic weather event. The extent of their existing contingency plan is that any overflow from this basin would simply flow into the mine pits which are in no way designed to deal with the high levels of concentrated pollution present in the basin. In the end, it comes down to this. The project as laid out in the SDEIS poses far too many risks and brings little in the way of benefits to the state and to the region. We have seen over and over how these projects can go bad and then we the taxpayers are left to clean up the mess. If we are to learn anything from recent history, it is that these corporations are corrupt and not bound by the legal framework that individuals are bound by. They purposefully structure themselves legally so as to minimize or outright avoid any liability in the event that anything goes wrong. There is no reason to believe that PolyMet or its investors would be any different. Therefore, there are no conditions or restrictions you could place on this project that these companies couldn’t find a way out of, and that is why I ask you to reject the SDEIS. Thank you.

Erik Roth 43482

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Erik Roth 225 W. 15th St #412 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Erik Simonson 42678

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erik Simonson 43130

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Northmet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. My legislative district is bordered by Lake Superior, the St Louis River Estuary, and the St Louis River. Naturally my constituents are concerned with the water quality of the river. I have reviewed the summary document and understand the proposed mercury discharge is to be within current state law, at least with respect to net effect. My particular concern is with the future quality of the river and the estuary with respect to excessive mercury content. Currently, there remains a fish consumption advisory in effect for game fish taken from the river and estuary. MPCA is in the midst of a multi-year effort to determine, through science, why these mercury levels remain unusually high, especially given the reduction in airborne emissions over the past years. While it is unknown what the end result of this study will reveal, it should at the very least be considered as you review this proposal for compliance. I understand you must consider current law, but it is entirely possible that the mercury standard may change in the near future. I ask you to consider the possibility that the proposal may have to be adjusted to a lesser discharge of mercury, and can the proposal be adjusted to meet that in the future. Thank you for your time and consideration. Representative Erik Simonson Room 429 State Office Building 100 Rev. Dr Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155 651-296-4246 Follow me via e-mail updates at: <http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/members/join.asp.id=15417>

Erik Solberg 42466

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Erik Solberg 6433 2nd Ave S Richfield, MN 55423-1622

Erik Trader 42564

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erika Carls

45153

The land up here is beautiful, since it is not largely deforested and converted into farm land. So we are lucky here in Northern Minnesota. Nobody wants to see the land hurt, especially the people that choose to live in the area around the PolyMet mine, where I live. And lots of thought has gone into decreasing the environmental impact of the PolyMet project on the local environment. However, I am concerned about some of the risks we may face from the PolyMet mine. What is the existing water quality in our area due to prior mining activity. The water tastes like it already has a lot in it. I would like to know what amount of water pollution from the PolyMet mine would cause our already poor quality water to change to unhealthy and to unpotable water. Is the current water quality in the area linked to problems such as cancer or other health issues. And how would cancer rates and other health problems be affected by the mine. What health problems could be caused by the chemicals used in the mining process. Would pregnant mothers be more strongly impacted by water quality problems. Would the increased rate of mercury pollution in the Embarrass river effect any people or other organisms. How would the levels change in the case of a small leak, or in the case of a large leak. How much leaching is predicted from this mine. How much leaching is predicted from the average mine. What is the probability of having a mining accident like the one in Virginia which cause the water to be completely undrinkable. How would the health of the workers in the mine be impacted by the air pollutants they will be exposed to while they are working, including mercury pollution. How would such air pollution effect the people in the towns near the mining operation. If the speed with which copper is extracted is slowed down, could workers keep their jobs for a longer period of time, and could this reduce the pollution rates and possibly the impact of pollution. How many jobs will be provided as a result of the need to monitor the environmental impacts on the project area. What emergency equipment is needed for clean up in the case of an accidental large scale leaking or other pollution event. Will this equipment be stored in an area that is easy to access in an emergency. Will personnel be trained on how to operate such equipment. Is there a guarantee that the quality of water will be monitored on an hourly basis. If not, how frequently will the water quality be monitored. Does the job security of a few hundred people for 20 years outweigh the safety of several thousand people over hundreds of years. How much will water treatment cost in the worst case scenario. What are the legal mechanisms mining companies may use to dump responsibility onto Minnesota tax payers. Since the treatment of the water will need to continue for up to 500 years, how will we guarantee that there is enough money to keep treating the water. How do we know that the company responsible for the mine will be a viable, responsible company in 500 years. Will a substantial enough portion of the profits be set aside for clean up efforts, especially in the case of a major mining pollution accident. Will this money be kept in a place where it can not be removed for other purposes in the case that the company goes bankrupt. How is climate change likely to impact the PolyMet mine. Will the predicted increased intensity of storms cause any difficulties in keeping the mining area safe. I am especially concerned about increased flooding events. Are there plans in place for natural disasters such as earthquakes, or for the possibility of tornadoes up here. (Tornadoes may sound like a strange thing to inquire about. However, the climate in this area is predicted to become like the climate of the Twin Cities well before 500 years are finished.) I have questions about the i

Erika Sitz

43330

Sent from my iPhone Begin forwarded message: From: Erika Sitz <[HYPERLINK "mailto:esitz@goldengate-net"esitz@goldengate-net](mailto:esitz@goldengate-net)> Date: March 12, 2014 at 6:24:40 PM CDT To: Erika Sitz <[HYPERLINK "mailto:esitz@goldengate-net"esitz@goldengate-net](mailto:esitz@goldengate-net)> Cc: Paul Sitz <[HYPERLINK "mailto:paul.sitz@siemens-com"paul.sitz@siemens-com](mailto:paul.sitz@siemens-com)> Subject: Polymet comments Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please excuse brevity and some shorthand comments. I am in transitional care following major surgery and not very strong yet. 1- Data There are innaccurate and incomplete data in water modeling, eg Partridge River. 2- Water Pollution Does process plan capture all polluted water. What about accidents, extreme weather events, or if things just don't go as planned. Treatment plan length needs more documentation. 3- Wetlands Destruction Destroys 1000 acres of prime peat lands, including 100 Mile Swamp. Destroys another 6000 acres of wetlands by changing water flow. Replacement elsewhere is not adequate. 4- Energy Minnesota Power's dirtiest coal plants, carbon dioxide and mercury. The boreal forest is extremely vulnerable to climate change. 5- Financial Glencore's long history of environmental pollution, NOT TRUSTWORTHY. More detailed discussion of financial assurance needed to protect taxpayers. Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Beeson

42037

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Erin Beeson Spring Lake Park, Minnesota

Erin DeWitt

57142

We have a responsibility to ensure safe and accessible drinking water for now and into the future. Mining – the PolyMet project would be environmentally irresponsible – jeopardizing the quality of water not only for our region, but the whole state as this region is a major watershed! We cannot and must not ignore that fact. The damage this project would cause is irreversible; we have witnessed this in other projects. Land that becomes unfarmable and water impure. Please, it is our responsibility to our fellow humanity, our grandchildren, the animals and the earth. Thank you for hearing me. Erin DeWitt 1512 Jefferson St Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Goetz

14816

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Goetz

17165

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Erin Goetz Gladstone Duluth, MN 55804

51038

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Erin Goetz Gladstone Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Herold

41953

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Erin Herold Saint Paul, Minnesota

Erin Jordahl Redlin

47449

March 11, 2014 Lisa Fay Minnesota DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Tim Dabney US Forest Service Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Dear Ms Fay, Mr Dabney, and Mr Bruner, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS). In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan, as well as the proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands, would have unacceptable environmental impacts. I'm writing on behalf of my three year old and her little sister or brother who is expected in June, as well as other future generations of Minnesotans - because they can't speak up now to voice their concerns about a project that will affect the future of the water they drink, the outdoor places in which they recreate, the wildlife they admire, and the taxes and clean up costs they pay. I live in St Anthony Village now, but I was born in northern Minnesota - a part of the state that holds a special place in my heart. I can't imagine why our state would embark on a project that poses such extreme risks to such a special place. And one that puts the future of our kids and their kids and their kids and their kids in jeopardy. I know that you aren't dealing with financial assurance in the SDEIS, but I think we need answers now about who will pay for the inevitable pollution that occurs, when the companies behind this project no longer exist. Future generations of Minnesotans will be on the hook for those costs - generations that didn't have any input into this decision. With such a poor record of operation in every other place it has been done, why do we think the pollution won't happen here. And why do we believe that the PolyMet corporation and its investors will be around to clean up the pollution. I've lived in South Dakota, a state with a history of mines that created acid mine drainage and passed the clean up costs on to the taxpayers. My husband is from Montana, another state with a history of polluting mines that the taxpayers have to clean up. I don't want Minnesota to join that group of states. Please think about the future of Minnesota and our precious water resources. Take another look at this proposal. Address the flaws in the SDEIS. Make sure that future generations of Minnesotans aren't saddled with hundreds of years of pollution and the costs to clean that up. Thank you for your consideration. Erin Jordahl Redlin 2901 30th Avenue NE St Anthony Village, MN 55418 [HYPERLINK "mailto:ejr0904@gmail-com"](mailto:ejr0904@gmail-com)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Manning

47894

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands and wildlife habitat in the watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. I am a wildlife educator and along with many other aspects of this project that make me incredibly nervous, the lack of acknowledgement of the wildlife impacts the SDEIS is unacceptable. It does state that Minnesota moose population has declined %35 in 1 year. This is an astonishing number. Moose are a vital part of the ecology of this area. The PolyMet project would harm moose further due to loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation. It will be in a key area of moose habitat types. Moose are also a large draw for tourists to the northern Minnesota woods. Lack of tourists, which this mine would have a huge impact on in many ways, will harm our economy greatly. Many of our local businesses rely on the tourist economy. Another animal that will be greatly affected is the Canada lynx. It is federally listed under the Endangered Species Act and the SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine, vehicle and train traffic will reduce lynx habitat by two square miles and kill individual lynx. Having 200 or fewer lynx in Minnesota currently, we should be doing everything we can to protect these amazing northern Minnesota animals. The SDEIS should analyze alternatives to reduce loss of lynx habitat. These two plus many more wildlife will be negatively affected by the PolyMet mines. I was very disappointed in the SDEIS focuses on wildlife, there needs to be more studies done and alternatives proposed before this process should go forwaRd We have lost so much habitat already, why take away prime, beautiful wild lands for such a risky, short term endeavor. It is not worth the risk. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands, fresh water and wild life habitat resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. If we don't do it now, what does that mean for the future of northern Minnesota. Very truly yours,
Erin Manning Northern Minnesota resident Erin Manning 6587 Park Hill Rd Finland, MN 55603

48341

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands and wildlife habitat in the watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. I am a wildlife educator and along with many other aspects of this project that make me incredibly nervous, the lack of acknowledgement of the wildlife impacts the SDEIS is unacceptable. It does state that Minnesota moose population has declined %35 in 1 year. This is an astonishing number. Moose are a vital part of the ecology of this area. The PolyMet project would harm moose further due to loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation. It will be in a key area of moose habitat types. Moose are also a large draw for tourists to the northern Minnesota woods. Lack of tourists, which this mine would have a huge impact on in many ways, will harm our economy greatly. Many of our local businesses rely on the tourist economy. Another animal that will be greatly affected is the Canada lynx. It is federally listed under the Endangered Species Act and the SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine, vehicle and train traffic will reduce lynx habitat by two square miles and kill individual lynx. Having 200 or fewer lynx in Minnesota currently, we should be doing everything we can to protect these amazing northern Minnesota animals. The SDEIS should analyze alternatives to reduce loss of lynx habitat. These two plus many more wildlife will be negatively affected by the PolyMet mines. I was very disappointed in the SDEIS focuses on wildlife, there needs to be more studies done and alternatives proposed before this process should go forwaRd We have lost so much habitat already, why take away prime, beautiful wild lands for such a risky, short term endeavor. It is not worth the risk. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands, fresh water and wild life habitat resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. If we don't do it now, what does that mean for the future of northern Minnesota. Very truly yours,
Erin Manning Northern Minnesota resident Erin Manning 6587 Park Hill Rd Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Erin Manning 52368

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands and wildlife habitat in the watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. I am a wildlife educator and along with many other aspects of this project that make me incredibly nervous, the lack of acknowledgement of the wildlife impacts the SDEIS is unacceptable. It does state that Minnesota moose population has declined %35 in 1 year. This is an astonishing number. Moose are a vital part of the ecology of this area. The PolyMet project would harm moose further due to loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation. It will be in a key area of moose habitat types. Moose are also a large draw for tourists to the northern Minnesota woods. Lack of tourists, which this mine would have a huge impact on in many ways, will harm our economy greatly. Many of our local businesses rely on the tourist economy. Another animal that will be greatly affected is the Canada lynx. It is federally listed under the Endangered Species Act and the SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine, vehicle and train traffic will reduce lynx habitat by two square miles and kill individual lynx. Having 200 or fewer lynx in Minnesota currently, we should be doing everything we can to protect these amazing northern Minnesota animals. The SDEIS should analyze alternatives to reduce loss of lynx habitat. These two plus many more wildlife will be negatively affected by the PolyMet mines. I was very disappointed in the SDEIS focuses on wildlife, there needs to be more studies done and alternatives proposed before this process should go forwaRd We have lost so much habitat already, why take away prime, beautiful wild lands for such a risky, short term endeavor. It is not worth the risk. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands, fresh water and wild life habitat resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. If we don't do it now, what does that mean for the future of northern Minnesota. Very truly yours,
Erin Manning Northern Minnesota resident Erin Manning 6587 Park Hill Rd Finland, MN 55603

Erin Ramberg 45597

Dear Sirs, Two of Minnesota's greatest resources are water and the outdoors. Of these the North shore of Lake Superior is the best example of both. Adding a hazardous practice mine to strip a few mineral for a 20 year duration seem senseless when considering the potential to damage the quickly diminishing clean fresh water we prize and the outdoors I've personally used and loved for 40 years of my 46 years of life. Let the protection of the outdoors and clean water to enjoy for the next 1,000 years guide this decision over the short term benefits it will yield in minerals. Regards, Erin Ramberg

Ernest and Beth Cutting 54476

See attachment

Ernesto Luna 58014

I very much want every effort to be made to protect our natural resources and choose not to put them at risk. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

58015

Our natural resources are too beautiful to risk. Please protect them. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

erossow@gustavus.edu

41685

To the DNR, Please do not allow the PolyMet mining to happen. I do not believe that this project will benefit the community or the environment in a positive way that would continue over time. Yes, there are pros and cons to this however, in the end the negative effects are much more prominent than the positive ones. This project may create jobs and provide resources that are valuable to other industries. Although once the job is completed the only people that will be gaining income will be the companies that continue to get money off the land. The jobs will only last 20 about years then after that people will be back to where they were. Not to mention the environmental impact you will be making, even though the site is not on the boundary waters, you can not control mother nature. You are not God. There is no way for the company to put the environment back to the way it was. Also, from the negative impacts there will be health problems (because there always are when you mess with the environment). I would suggest that you inform the public and educate them on the projects that happen in our community, that is your job to inform the public and keep the environment and the community safe. Thank you for your time to read this

Erynn Jenzen

40906

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Espoir DelMain

16488

I urge you to not support sulfide mining in Minnesota. It will destroy the many watersheds that encompass our state and though it may help the economy it will not help anything else. There is more to life than money, once needs happiness and purpose, all of which I have found in nature and wilderness. I know I am not alone, please help support the many others like me in going against sulfide mining. Thank you Espoir DelMain 1052 Orchard Ave St Paul, MN 55103

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Esther Hope

47977

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am a toxicologist in a private company. My job is to assure that my company's products are safe for people and for the environment. I am proud of my work and use every available tool to assess the impact of my products now and in the future-this is appropriate management. I do not see PolyMet using the care and attention to detail that I would expect and that the people (and wildlife) of Minnesota deserve. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on drinking water sources. The SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years, but does not provide robust plans to remediate this pollution. PolyMet's sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals. The SDEIS does not give any reasonable assurance that this environmental damage can be addressed. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." Their most recent study is still inadequate. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Esther Hope Esther Hope 1006 Cromwell Ave Saint Paul, MN 55114

esther ouray

20070

--Original Message-- From: runningwoman5457@yahoo-com [mailto:runningwoman5457@yahoo-com] Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 8:32 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is fatally flawed, and needs to go back to the drawing board to be fixed. You should not burden the next fifteen generations with toxic water pollution and cleanup costs from a sulfide mine that hasn't been properly planned. PolyMet would operate for 20 years but, according to PolyMet's own data, would pollute water for over 500 years at the tailings basin, and over 200 years at the mine pit. The modeling results provided in the SDEIS show that PolyMet and the DNR simply did not look beyond 500 years. The fact that the SDEIS does not say when the mine pit and tailings basin will stop polluting our water is a major and apparently intentional failure that needs to be corrected by the DNR. Please run the models . or require PolyMet to run the models . long enough to show when pollution of our water by PolyMet's mine would cease. PolyMet proposes a complex mechanical system of pumps, pipelines, and filters that it says will capture and hold back the water pollution from getting into our rivers. PolyMet assumes the proposed expensive and complicated water treatment system will continue to operate effectively for long, long after the mining has stopped. It should be expected that mechanical systems like pumps, filters and pipes will eventually fail. In a 2007 report, an organization called Earthworks analyzed the records of 14 modern copper mines in five states found that 100% of these mines experienced pipeline spills or other accidental releases. 92% had failures of water collection and treatment systems that resulted in releases of contaminated mine seepage that significantly impacted water quality. But Polymet's SDEIS lacks contingency plans for predictable failures in the proposed piping, pumping, and filtration equipment. By assuming that a complicated water treatment system will function indefinitely without fail, the SDEIS has failed to take the hard look required at the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. Please send the SDEIS and PolyMet back to the drawing board with directions to include contingency plans for predictable failures in the water pumping and treatment system, and the power supply to run that system. In addition, the SDEIS proposes to dump tailings from the mining process on top of the former LTV Steel's tailings basin, which was built in the 1950s on top of three streams, was designed to leak. In fact, the existing tailings basin is already leaking millions of gallons of untreated water, yet the chemical composition of that large volume of leaking water has not been tested and characterized. The failure to test and account for known leaks of untreated tailings basin water from the existing LTV Steel tailings basin is another major problem with the SDEIS. Moreover, the tailings basin and the dam holding it back from flowing downstream are recognized to be unstable. If the tailings basin dam were to fail, vast quantities of contaminated tailings, sulfates, and heavy metals would be released into the headwaters of the St Louis River. In other mines, such tailings basin failures have sent a flood of millions of cubic yards of toxic debris as much as hundreds of miles downstream. The failure of the SDEIS to fully consider the potential for . and the consequences of . a tailings dam failure is a deadly flaw in the SDEIS. PolyMet proposes a large open-pit mine in untouched, high-quality wetlands, that are located on public land owned by the US Forest Service. The SDEIS states that building an underground mine would have .significant environmental benefits. compared to an open-pit mine. However, the PolyMet SDEIS rejects underground mining, stating that in today's market conditions, underground mining is not

Alphabetical by sender's first name

esther ouray 41832

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms esther ouray 3351 Columbus Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-2032 (612) 229-1641

ethan hogen 41959

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, ethan hogen minneapolis, Minnesota

Ethelyn Kaim 42631

See attachment

44513

My comment has to do with hiring Union labor, from the beginning of the project, through to the end, when the mine's resources are exhausted. I know many miners in this area are pro-union workers, I hope this project will respect the worker's right to organize and be part of a union.

44528

The profits from the industry must be kept in banks in the US They must not be allowed to hide their profits and not pay their fair share of taxes. Those who do not pay their fair share of taxes are unpatriotic. This corporation must not be allowed to bank their profits overseas.

44531

They must have a 'super fund' of their own to clean up the pollution that will be present. I have seen mines plead bankruptcy and the tax payer left to pay to clean up the pollution. The fund must be in place before they are allowed to begin. The last comment may be the most important: The profits from the industry must be kept in banks in the US They must not be allowed to hide their profits and not pay their fair share of taxes. Those who do not pay their fair share of taxes are unpatriotic.

Etta Bartholdi 57183

Please don't destroy the boundary waters. I love them very much and I feel mining for coal will [ILLEGIBLE] destroy the natural beauty and eco health of the BWCA. Thanks.Etta Bertholdi2100 26th Ave SouthMinneapolis, MN 55406

Eunice Lindberg Milbrath 54505

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Evan Faltesek 54477

See attachment

Evan Nikunen 42656

See attachment

Eve Glidden 43216

I oppose the poly met plan. I beleive that the information in the seis is un true and incomplete for many reasons. one is that the information regarding the potential impacts on wild life including fauna and flora is lacking more observent details including the pathways for moose, the breeding grounds for links, the extince of sun-dews (A rare medicine plant) in the proposed mine location. I believe that saying clean up needs to happen for more than the amount of time the mine will be run is dangrous grounds and there is no proof that poly met, glencore or any other investors would stick around for long enough to clean up any thing. There is also the issue of the tribal rights to the land. the fact that it is in the national forest should be enough to stop this plan before it starts. we need to live for generat5ions to come not just the next 20 years. there are no jobs on a dead planet. another thing lacking in the seis it the real details about what would happen if we took out that much of our current carbon sink. this plan and seis is flawed please take the time to stop this tragedy before it starts. thanks Eve Marie Glidden 4326 5th ave south Minneapolis mn 55409 612b 333 1805 The holy land is everywhere~ Black Elk

Evelyn Staus 16116

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Evelyn Stillwell

39814

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining may have a short-term economic benefit for Minnesota but at what cost. There is clearly an environmental price to pay in the short-term but there is also there very real potential that this could turn into a massive environmental problem in the long term as a consequent of toxic metal release and Acid Mine Drainage. This possibility should not be understated - it would negate any initial financial benefit that Minnesota would experience and could leave the environment damaged for hundreds of years. It is a gamble that is simply not worth taking. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Evelyn Stillwell 1099 Chatsworth St N Saint Paul, MN 55103-1005 (651) 603-0734

Evi Winter

40285

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Evi Winter Heynestrassse 42 Nürnberg, ot 90443 DE

Eville Gorham

42824

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

eyesoftheworld .

44175

Dear Sir or Madam, My name is Erik and I am from Glenwood. I have worked a couple of springs in the Glenwood hatchery and have dear friends at the Glenwood office. I have been to 49 states and seen much wilderness in many of them. I have also been abroad a few times but I have found the BWCA to be one of the most beautiful and unique places I have been in my travels. I believe with copper sulfide mining in the BWCA watershed, there will be grave environmental impacts to the fragile ecosystem, flora and fauna. I do not support allowing a multinational corporation(s) to spoil the great area. The jobs are in no way worth destroying this treasure of nature. Mining is boom and bust and once they extract the resources of the area and possibly destroy the local environment, our children, grandchildren and beyond will inherit the legacy. I think its a terrible idea to allow this. I really hope future generations can enjoy and benefit from this vital, unique and beautiful wilderness. Thank you for your utmost consideration. "The movement of a canoe is like a reed in the wind. Silence is part of it, and the sounds of lapping water, bird songs, and wind in the trees. It is part of the medium through which it floats, the sky, the water, the shores ." Sigurd F. Olson Respectfully, Erik Pederson

F Jeff Verito

1826

You are inundating me with too much information. What I require are large scale maps of the land exchange parcels, with contours, contour interval, and water features. I'd also like to know the vegetation composition and age of the trees on each parcel. Please make clear which are currently Federal versus private. Thank you. Frank Jeff Verito, 350 east Ridge Street, Marquette, MI 49855

3564

PLEASE SEND THE REQUESTED INFORMATION. THIRD REQUEST FJVerito On Monday, December 16, 2013 4:09 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

4592

Dear Head of the Minnesota DNR: These are my opinions. Receipt reply requested. The MDNR failed to respond to my twice-requested information regarding the land exchange portion of the proposal. Based upon this failure, I can only assume that the land to be sacrificed is worth more than the land that will be exchanged for public use. Why else are you trying to hide the information that is obviously needed to compare the parcels. Furthermore, mining prospectors are impacting too many areas. The impact they cause is evident across many more acres (from a visual quality perspective) than the actual damage covers. Access roads and pits are needed, encouraging sedimentation and the introduction of non-native plants. I have no more faith or trust in the Minnesota DNR than I have in the Michigan DEQ. Their managements, in my opinion, are comprised of conspirators who belong in jail cells. Curses to the MDNR for not sending me the requested information. Frank Jeff Verito 350 East Ridge Street Marquette, MI 49855

7490

January 21, 2014 Mr Jiminez: The information you've provided is extremely unhelpful, in fact, you're wasting my time. I need to quickly be able to reference maps of what's to be exchanged and what's to be obtained with contours, water features, composition of the parcels (type and age of vegetation) and contour intervals. I've dealt with Ottawa and Hiawatha NFs for twenty years, and have camped Superior NF, and all the above has made me extremely distrustful. Your failure to provide obviously-needed maps only heightens this distruSt I cannot imagine why you'd refuse to provide this information unless you're trying to hide something. For the third time-PLEASE PROVIDE THE REQUESTED INFORMATION AND ONLY THE REQUESTED INFORMATION. THANK YOU. FJVerito 350-1/2 East Ridge Street Marquette, mi 49855

Alphabetical by sender's first name

F Jeff Verito

47596

The attached maps look like they were drawn by seventh graders. No description of the parcels (type of vegetation, age, water features, etc..) was provided as requested, and the contour interval was not provided. The contour interval is the change in elevation between the contour lines. In other words, do the contour lines represent a two-foot change or a fifty-foot change in elevation. No way can a citizen compare what we're obtaining to what we're relinquishing without the federal parcels as well. TO WHOM DO YOU REPORT Mr JIMENEZ. IT'S APPARENT THAT YOU NEED TO TAKE A GEOGRAPHY COURSE, AND A PUBLIC RELATIONS COURSE SO YOU CAN VISUALIZE WHY SOMEONE WHO'S PREPARING COMMENTS WOULD NEED THIS INFORMATION. It's obvious that we're having a difficult time communicating, and that you're not prepared to be handling this NorthMet item whatsoever. Please add this comment to the comments file for this project. I am dead-set against it until the obviously-needed information is provided. Start over and do it right. FJVerito On Friday, January 24, 2014 5:15 PM, "Jimenez, Michael -FS" <mjimenez@fs.fed.us> wrote: Dear Mr Verito, I conferred with our realty specialist regarding your request for maps and information. We identified the attached maps. They are not currently in our project records for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, however they may address your request for contour mapping on the non-federal parcels included in the proposed land exchange. Corresponding mapping for the federal parcel was not included in the files and apparently not done as it was for the non-federal parcels. If you feel that the SDEIS is missing information on the proposed land exchange that could make the environmental analysis more complete or understandable. Please include your thoughts on this potential information with any comments you may be submitting on the SDEIS. Michael Jiménez Superior National Forest (218) 626-4383 From: Schleif, Elizabeth -FS Sent: Friday, January 24, 2014 12:46 PM To: Jimenez, Michael -FS Subject: RE: Citizen Information Request on Land Exchange Parcels Michael, Some resource information maps were compiled for appraisal instructions. They are not part of the SDEIS, but it sounds like the information this individual is seeking. The files are quite large so I will put them in a common folder for your access. -Liz Elizabeth Schleif Realty Specialist Superior National Forest (218) 626-4373 HYPERLINK "mailto:eschleif@fs.fed.us"eschleif@fs.fed.us From: Jimenez, Michael -FS Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2014 4:09 PM To: Schleif, Elizabeth -FS Subject: FW: Citizen Information Request on Land Exchange Parcels Liz, Please read the my preceding email correspondence with Mr Verito. He is requesting maps that to my knowledge has not been developed and is not available as requested. Do you know of any materials that may be useful to him, beyond what I identified for him in the SDEIS in my original response. Michael Jiménez Superior National Forest (218) 626-4383 From: F Jeff Verito [mailto:sailboardjeff@yahoo-com] Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 4:57 PM To: Jimenez, Michael -FS Subject: Re: Citizen Information Request on Land Exchange Parcels Mr Jimenez: The information you've provided is extremely unhelpful, in fact, you're wasting my time. I need to quickly be able to reference maps of what's to be exchanged and what's to be obtained with contours, water features, composition of the parcels (type and age of vegetation) and contour intervals. I've dealt with Ottawa and Hiawatha NFs for twenty years, and have camped Superior NF, and all the above has made me extremely distrustful. Your failure to provide obviously-needed maps only heightens this distrust I cannot imagine why you'd refuse to provide this information unless you're trying to hide something. For the third time-PLEASE PROVIDE THE REQUESTED INFORMATION AND ONLY THE REQUESTED INFORMATION. THANK YOU. FJVerito On Tues

57373

HELP*****please send requested information On Saturday, December 14, 2013 4:19 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

F Mary Melander

54565

I do not believe sulfite mining is as harmless as the mining companies & politicians say it is. I am deeply against sulfite mining for environmental reasons!

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Faraz Harsini 40334

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Faraz Harsini 3126 4th St Lubbock, TX 79430 US

Fay Bullivant 52283

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota Duluth. The natural beauty of the Great Lakes is what drew me to going to school here. I love Minnesota because it is a state that values and protects these natural spaces. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Fay Bullivant 7518 130th Ave Milaca, MN 56353-4437 (763) 898-0268

Fay Simer 58150

How will mine clean-up be guaranteed and paid for after the mine closes? I am concerned this is not adequately addressed by the SDEIS process.

Fern Arpi 54471

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Fern Peterson 3669

To Whom It May Concern: The proposed PolyMet project in the watershed of Lake Superior will destroy or permanently degrade thousands of acres of high-quality wetlands and cause permanent water pollution with sulfuric acid and toxic metals. Treatment would be required for at least 500 years, but more likely thousands of years. Sulfide ore mining is hard-rock mining, and every hard-rock mine in the United States pollutes the land and water. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) says that hard-rock mining is the most toxic industry in the United States. Polymet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in its response to these concerns. In February 2010, the EPA gave PolyMet's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the lowest possible score. After almost four years, PolyMet is back with a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Despite the length of time taken to prepare the SDEIS, it fails to describe the staggering environmental, economic, and social costs of the project. We are strongly opposed to the State of Minnesota allowing PolyMet to begin production of any sort of mining near our pristine BWCA and feel it would be short-sighted and immoral to trade a few hundred relatively short term mining jobs for the future of our health and the health of our planet. New technologies should be supported/discovered to reduce the need for copper and other minerals for our cell phones, computers, ipads, cars and other devices which are driving this "need" for sulfide mining. Sincerely, Todd and Fern Peterson 5209 Chantrey Road Edina, MN 55436 and 68 Menogyn Trail Grand Marais, MN 55604

Ferolyn Angell 42048

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ferolyn Angell Morris, Minnesota

Fione 54180

I have never been to the boundary waters but I have only ever heard wonderful things about the experiences people have while they are there. During the speech some very valid points were brought up about how mining should not be allowed in the boundary waters area such as how it will pollute the area which is known well for camping and lots of wild life. Also it is a pure watershed which is a great resource to have, especially so close to home. I do believe mining should not be allowed in this nature sanctuary.

FL no name 42658

See attachment

Flannery Delaney 15756

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Florence Hedeem

41769

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Please reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. If in place, the precautionary principle would preclude this ill-conceived project that will compromise the natural resources we've come to take for granted, for generations to come. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at a

Florence Marks

46077

From what I've read about this proposed mining, the protection of the environment has not been adequately met. The project will provide some employment but the land will be raped in the process. The long term effects of the mining appear to be devastating. Until some satisfactory method of preventing contaminants from entering the water system, this is a no go from my perspective. Florence Elliott Marks 3424 Silver Lake Rd NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

Florence Sandok

52239

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Florence Sandok 1516 13th Ave n.e. Rochester, MN 55906

Alphabetical by sender's first name

flynn karen 39536

I think this is a bad idea. I think it is very possible pollution will occur that may be impossible to clean up. Furthermore, if the company declares bankruptcy at some point, there will be insufficient funds to clean up any mess. I recall the state of Minnesota giving a lot of money to Northwest airlines to assist the airline in keeping jobs in Minnesota - now Northwest is gone. I don't think we can count on a business to have environmental safety as its primary concern. This is just too dangerous. Thank you for reading this. Sincerely, Karen Flynn 16 East 10th Street Duluth MN 55805

Fond du Lac Band 42920

Lisa: please see attached comments from the Fond du Lac Band on the NorthMet SDEIS. These should be considered our final comments, although I will follow up with an official hard copy on Fond du Lac letterhead. Nancy Schuldt Water Projects Coordinator Fond du Lac Environmental Program 1720 Big Lake Road Cloquet, MN 55720 218-878-7110 ph 218-878-7168 fax

Forrest Johnson 42626

See attachment

Forrest Petersen 42938

Aloha, Please find attached work doc. with my comments for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Polymet Mining, Inc. NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Thank you for you time. Sincerely, Forrest Petersen

Fort JK 47327

Mar 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to adequately address the negative impact of the proposed copper sulfide mine. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. It would pollute and ruin the wild and beautiful St Louis River and watershed from it's northernmost regions all the way to Lake Superior, which is another body of water that would be so negatively impacted as well as all the groundwater in its wake, groundwater that we citizens rely on to be safe and healthy to drink. For Duluth, or any cities/towns who get their drinking water from Lake Superior, it would be a negative impact as well. But, we must also mention the terrible, direct devastating effect the pollution from the mine would cause concerning wildlife and birds who use the St Louis River and Lake Superior to drink from and obtain food from. I include the Embarrass River and any other body(ies) of water that would be harmed by the mine as well, such as the lake that is over the presumed deposit. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Therefore, in the best interests of public health and safety along with wildlife/bird and environmental health and safety, I urge you not to approve any of the environmental impact statements that favor Polymet's action to build/operate this mine they are proposing. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Fort JK 10332 Bachelor Square Rd Meadowlands, MN 55765-8103

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Fort JK

48574

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to adequately address the negative impact of the proposed copper sulfide mine. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. It would pollute and ruin the wild and beautiful St Louis River and watershed from it's northernmost regions all the way to Lake Superior, which is another body of water that would be so negatively impacted as well as all the groundwater in its wake, groundwater that we citizens rely on to be safe and healthy to drink. For Duluth, or any cities/towns who get their drinking water from Lake Superior, it would be a negative impact as well. But, we must also mention the terrible, direct devastating effect the pollution from the mine would cause concerning wildlife and birds who use the St Louis River and Lake Superior to drink from and obtain food from. I include the Embarrass River and any other body(ies) of water that would be harmed by the mine as well, such as the lake that is over the presumed deposit. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Therefore, in the best interests of public health and safety along with wildlife/bird and environmental health and safety, I urge you not to approve any of the environmental impact statements that favor Polymet's action to build/operate this mine they are proposing. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Fort JK 10332 Bachelor Square Rd Meadowlands, MN 55765-8103

Fran Brinkman

13360

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As a Wisconsin neighbor who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Fran Brinkman 8226 Slater Ave Mount Pleasant, WI 53406-3708

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Fran Cobb

16204

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

fran whitman

9750

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, fran whitman 13856 ford drive L'ANSE, MI 49946

18572

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, fran whitman 13856 ford drive L'ANSE, MI 49946

Alphabetical by sender's first name

fran whitman

50648

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, fran whitman 13856 ford drive L'ANSE, MI 49946

Francie Turner

39792

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Francie Turner 211 South St Morris, MN 56267-1522

Frank Antilla

54138

No I DO NOT support mining in wilderness woods. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Frank Blume

38361

This is a very environmentally friendly mine proposal. We need good paying jobs. We need the platinum group metals. Let's do it. Frank Blume 211 Park Avenue Colchester, CT 06415

38365

This is a very environmentally friendly mine proposal. We need good paying jobs. We need the platinum group metals. Let's do it. Frank

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Frederickson

18100

Hello. My name is Frank Frederickson. I was born and raised in International Falls and I currently reside and live and work in Grand Rapids, Minnesota, where my wife and I are raising our family of four children. My whole life I have enjoyed the beauty of the region and the opportunities it provides to hunt, fish and camp. And as a high school and college student, I was very blessed to have a summer job piloting a tour boat in Voyageurs National Park for the whole three months of the year that our tourist season was. Today I am blessed, again, to have a year-round job in northern Minnesota that is a direct result of the paper and mining industry in our region. This job enabled me and my wife to relocate back into northern Minnesota, after spending ten years in the Twin Cities, so that we could raise our family in northern Minnesota and show them the same environment that we grew up to appreciate and enjoy. With this background, I wanted to state my appreciation for the efforts of the permitting agencies and of PolyMet to work together in a diligent environmental review process that identifies necessary protections for our shared environment, while enabling the economic extraction of materials and minerals that we all use in our daily lives; in our phones, homes and cars. More specifically, I want to comment on the proposed Land Exchange in the SDEIS. As a native of International Falls, I grew up in a community that was established by a paper company and remains largely supported by the mill today. And I also enjoyed having Voyageurs National Park at my doorstep. This national park was not formed without its own controversy in the sixties and seventies. And the establishment of the park meant for an expansion of federal land protection in northern Minnesota and a reduction in private woodland for mixed-use recreation, hunting and pulpwood production. But the national park ultimately was able to co-exist with the paper industry, and it was partially enabled by a Land Exchange between the state, county, federal and paper mill. This Land Exchange my grandfather was a part of, as woodlands manager for the mill, in making that happen. I reviewed the Land Exchange proposed in the SDEIS between the U.S. Forest Service and PolyMet and believe this is a smart move for our region. As detailed in the SDEIS, the Land Exchange proposes a transfer of the surface rights of 6,650 acres of federal land that is landlocked by neighboring private ownership and basically inaccessible for public use to PolyMet for the mine operation in exchange for up to 6,722 acres located within the management area of the U.S. Forest Service. The lands of the U.S. Forest Service will gain a higher recreational value, while the lands for PolyMet unite the ownership of the subsurface mineral rights with the surface rights. I believe this is a win-win for our region and that it enables enhanced recreational opportunities for the public, while enabling the extraction of minerals in an environmentally sound manner. This is a good deal for Minnesotans and our country. I fully support it and thank you for your thorough review.

Frank Gardner

57979

Minnesota cannot be expected to treat polluted water for 500 years. PolyMet cannot be trusted to clean up this mess. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Hansen

17017

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Frank Hansen 17376 US Highway 169 South Grand Rapids, MN 55744

50292

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Frank Hansen 17376 US Highway 169 South Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Jossi

11268

Hi, I live at 1810 Hartford Ave, St Paul, MN, 55116- The following are general comments about the draft. 1) The Audubon Society and others have suggested Polymet look at underground mining instead of open pit. I don't see that as an option in the EIS. Why not. It would cost Polymet more to mine copper nickel but the environmental damage would be far less. 2) We have one of the largest concentrations of fresh water in the world, both in our interior lakes and with Lake Superior. This seems far valuable to the country than copper nickel, especially in time when droughts have impacted different parts of the country for at least the last two decades due to global warming. This legacy is worth preserving and this mine, and others proposed, would like end it. 3) Like many Minnesotans I find it hard to imagine the monitoring of water for 500 years. Copper nickel mining has an atrocious international record so I would certainly plan on necessity for long-term monitoring. The chance for pollution due to heavy rainfall, poor planning, breached liners and unforeseen weather events seems likely. Where is the mitigation plan for worse-case scenarios. Again, the reputation of copper nickel miners hasn't been stellar. 4) What are the details of the proposed water treatment systems I can't find them. 5) Who will pay for five centuries of monitoring. If Polymet goes under, what is the liability to the taxpayer. 6) How much will Polymet put up annually to pay for cleanup in case of a disaster. 7) Are you going to correct the inaccurate water flow model. 8) Will there be more work on the impact to wetlands. Seems under-represented. 9) The land exchange basically a fraud. The mining rights are not clear at all in the swap - so those lands could be mined someday too. 10) There is significant habitat loss not well documented in the report. 11) Finally, Polymet is a small company, frankly not all that well capitalized to take on such an enormous undertaking. It is not Kennecott. I fear any kind of even minor disaster will likely put it out of business, or it may decide to put itself out of business. Of course, the taxpayer will be left with the environmental and financial damage of such a result. The strategy of going out of business is common in the copper nickel mining community. Minnesota needs a liability plan and money in the bank to guard against the inevitable. Thanks for your time. Frank Jossi
www.jossi.biz www.featherly-jossi-com (w) 651-690-9211 (c) 651-206-2558

Frank Korpi

54645

See attachment

Frank Moe

788

Dear Ms Fay, First, thank you for sending me the full bound copy of the Polymet EIS. As you know it is a lot to try and digest but I'm giving it my best effort. There are so many comments I'd like to make but there is one point, that is so glaringly obvious, that it alone should prevent Polymet from ever getting a favorable opinion from any involved regulating agency. Does anyone really believe that Polymet will operate the largest reverse osmosis system ever used for this purpose for at least 500 years. Seriously. That's more than twice as long as our country has been in existence. Five hundred years ago Europe was just coming out of the Dark Ages. Columbus had just made his trip to America. If we are all honest about this, there is zero chance that Polymet, or even it's primary investor Glencore, will be in existence in 500 years, much less any remediation system that they propose. Please, let's just be honest here. Either we admit that this is pure fantasy that this proposed massive reverse osmosis system will still be in existence in how ever many hundred years it takes for the Polymet mine pollution to somehow no longer be a threat, or we admit that we want the mine to happen regardless of the massive amounts of pollution that will result from it. This draft of the Polymet EIS is still "inadequate" being based upon the assumption that the pollution from the mine can and will be processed for 500 years. We all know this is not going to happen. So please let's again reject the Polymet EIS and protect the Saint Louis River Watershed and Lake Superior. Thank you. Frank Moe PO Box 863 Grand Marais, MN 55606

Frank Ongaro

54506

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Peterson

39543

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Frank Peterson 424 W Main St Waconia, MN 55387-1028

Frank Trapanese

9593

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I live in Red Wing and a few years ago committed the majority of my life savings to purchase a lake lot in St Louis county. Thus, I am both a concerned citizen and a stake holder. It is the duty and ethical responsibility of the EPA, DNR, the Corp and other governmental agencies to protect ordinary citizens and the environment. I ask that you fulfill this duty by not letting PolyMet get by with a poor quality assessment based on unrealistic data. The effect of PolyMet's likely pollution would devastate the now vital fishing and tourism industries of northeastern MN for generations. The prospect of a limited number of jobs for a limited period of time would be more than offset by the collapse of fishing, tourism, seasonal residencies etc etc etc, not to mention future decades of cleanup costs that PolyMet would undoubtedly shrink from and leave to the tax payers. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. There are critical failures. The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Frank Trapanese 4202 Wright St Red Wing, MN 55066

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Trapanese

18502

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I live in Red Wing and a few years ago committed the majority of my life savings to purchase a lake lot in St Louis county. Thus, I am both a concerned citizen and a stake holder. It is the duty and ethical responsibility of the EPA, DNR, the Corp and other governmental agencies to protect ordinary citizens and the environment. I ask that you fulfill this duty by not letting PolyMet get by with a poor quality assessment based on unrealistic data. The effect of PolyMet's likely pollution would devastate the now vital fishing and tourism industries of northeastern MN for generations. The prospect of a limited number of jobs for a limited period of time would be more than offset by the collapse of fishing, tourism, seasonal residencies etc etc etc, not to mention future decades of cleanup costs that PolyMet would undoubtedly shrink from and leave to the tax payers. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. There are critical failures. The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Frank Trapanese 4202 Wright St Red Wing, MN 55066

50584

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I live in Red Wing and a few years ago committed the majority of my life savings to purchase a lake lot in St Louis county. Thus, I am both a concerned citizen and a stake holder. It is the duty and ethical responsibility of the EPA, DNR, the Corp and other governmental agencies to protect ordinary citizens and the environment. I ask that you fulfill this duty by not letting PolyMet get by with a poor quality assessment based on unrealistic data. The effect of PolyMet's likely pollution would devastate the now vital fishing and tourism industries of northeastern MN for generations. The prospect of a limited number of jobs for a limited period of time would be more than offset by the collapse of fishing, tourism, seasonal residencies etc etc etc, not to mention future decades of cleanup costs that PolyMet would undoubtedly shrink from and leave to the tax payers. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. There are critical failures. The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Frank Trapanese 4202 Wright St Red Wing, MN 55066

Frank Verderame

4294

How can anyone even consider allowing this project to proceed. For short-term monetary gain which probably will not even provide a high percentage of benefit to Minnesota, we risk our treasure. As a user of the Boundary Waters whose extended family has enjoyed this resource for over 70 years, and a student of environmental studies, I cannot see, given the track record of such mining operations, how this will not have a serious and long-term impact on the area, changing it, irreparably, forever. Please don't let a foreign entity spoil one of the last remaining true wilderness areas in the US and leave the taxpayers holding the bag for generations. Far more money can be made in the long run by keeping the area wild and pristine and focusing on smaller projects with less negative effect. Frank Verderame 20635 Manor Rd Excelsior, MN 55331 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frank Wattunen

18206

My name is Frank Wattunen, F-R-A-N-K, W-A-T-T-U-N-E-N. I've heard a lot on both sides. I do get a little emotional. "Profit" is not a nasty word. All of your income, all of your livelihoods rely on profit from somebody. Businesses don't exist without profit. PolyMet should make a profit. It doesn't matter where they're from. They're willing to invest their time and money to create jobs. Copper-nickel is not a curse; it's a blessing. Everybody talks about the BWCA. I spent more time in the BWCA before it was the BWCA than most of you people ever have or ever will. My future's home, permanent home and not a constant weekend home is on the border of the BWCA. I want everyone to enjoy the BWCA, but not turn to be a religious zealot regarding water quality. Technologies change. There's a famous place in Ely that's fished very heavily going by the name of Stinky Ditch. That's where Ely Municipal used to discharge all of their waste. That has been totally cleaned up. It's a great fishery on Shagawa Lake. Yes, mining scars the earth. It's not pretty. It never will be pretty, but it can be done right. We have the experts. Let them do their jobs. Twenty years. A lot of us -- I work there in the summertime. My folks worked there. Reserve Mining Company, huge, huge, huge plant. Yes, they did pollute Lake Superior with their discharge until they got it all straightened out. Again, thanks for listening. It can be done. Logging, mining and tourism can coexist.

Frank Wood

20193

February 26, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit Dear Lisa Fay - Our adult lives have been lived in Minnesota. We love our entire state but the beautiful northern lake and forest country has a special place in our hearts. We spent many happy days camping and canoeing there. Now in our mid-eighties we are limited in what we can undertake but our memories are fresh and often freshened by reports from our friends and younger family members about their trips. We want to save this precious resource for them and others. We understand the desire of Minnesotans who want to live in the midst of this special place and also earn a good income. We think the time has come to plan for sustainable employment rather than relying on jobs in mining which have a limited duration. We are disappointed that anyone is ready to risk the health of the entire region for a few hundred jobs. The fact that we happen to live in a particular place does not give me the right to do anything we choose to that environment. Previous mining has already done damage. Consider the pollution of the St Louis River. Look at the isolated instances of damage where sulfide bearing ores have been mined. We do not believe there is a "safe" way to manage the poisonous residue from such mining. Concentrating the poison using the filtration process proposed does not solve the problem. Consider the history of Butte MT, particularly the Berkeley Pit. What responsible person would place such a pool of poison in the midst of a network of lakes and streams Just recently we have seen a tank leakage in West Virginia and a slurry dam failure in Georgia. In the first case, the corporation involved sought protection in bankruptcy—a move that is not unusual for firms in a tight place. Promises do not last when the profits are gone. Corporations have no heart or soul—this makes them useful for some human purposes but not for protecting the environment. We hope to be able to respect the process used in evaluation the pros and cons of this request for a license to mine. We know that there are powerful commercial interests pressing for approval. They are seeking profit. We understand the DNR's two-fold responsibility both to protect and use the natural resources of our state. In this case we believe the proposed use will cause too much damage to the environment to be permitted. Minnesotans like us want to pass something irreplaceable on to future generations without nasty scars. Sincerely – Frank H. and Raquel K. Wood 141 Bedford Street Southeast Minneapolis, MN 55414

Franklin Illegible

42536

See attachment

Fred Hickox

30296

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project SDEIS. Sulfide mining can not be performed safely without causing long term pollution and environmental damage. In the long term the tax payers will be paying for this mine with lost tourism jobs, health care costs, and clean-up costs. It would be more cost effective for the tax payers to pay the mining companies millions to just go away. Save our money, save our health, and save our environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land is not in the public interest Sincerely, Fred Hickox 2705 Rockhill Dr NE Grand Rapids, MI 49525-1242 (616) 866-7638

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Fred Rogers

58043

This project is indeed a choice between jobs and the environment. What is very clear is that the jobs are relatively short term - 10-20 years - and the environmental risk and degradation are very long term - 100-500 yrs. This is a difficult choice for some, but an essential choice for all. No mine is worth it. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

58143

I oppose the proposed project and urge the State of Minnesota to reject it. Jobs are important, and so is the environment. I strongly oppose the land swap as sub [ILLEGIBLE] to avoid wetland protection. It should not be allowed. 99% of the material mined will be waste, creating unrealistic and immense, perpetual liabilities. I grew up in Pennsylvania and have been long term acid mine run-off. It is not pretty. It is a very destructive result, and Minnesota is a [ILLEGIBLE] and thus more vulnerable than Pennsylvania. There is no precedent where this damage was not the result of sulfide mining. 50% of the US copper comes from recycling. We are recycling less than half of what is thrown away. We should be mining the waste we have created and are creating – not destroying more of the planet to create, ultimately, more waste. These new jobs will also disappear and when they do, what will remain? Will our grandchildren think it was worth it! Really! Thank you.

Fred Schumacher

52278

Fred Schumacher 3460 N. Range Line Rd Gheen, MN 55771 218 787-2212 [HYPERLINK "mailto:fredschem@gmail-com"](mailto:fredschem@gmail-com)fredschum@gmail-com I oppose granting a permit for the proposed Polymet mining operation near Ely. The mining period is too short, the number of jobs created too small, the experience of the company in mining non-existent, the possibility of damage too great, and the remediation period too long. The trade offs are not worth it. Note that the EPA recently halted the permitting process for the Pebble Mine near Bristol Bay, Alaska because of concerns over environmental damage. Thank you. Sincerely, Fred Schumacher

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Fred Thompson

45317

COMMENT ON POLYMET NORTHMENT SDEIS To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit, St Paul, MN 55155 From: Fred and Pamela Thompson, 1223 Little Creek Road Brimson, MN 55602 Email: MWVisuals@aol-com PLEASE NOTE: The following is not a form letter regarding Polymet/Northmet's proposal to mine copper nickel and other minerals in Minnesota's Arrowhead Country: To whom it may concern: Pamela and I have been residents in northern Minnesota's Arrowhead Country for forty-four years. We are among the founders of the Iron Range Historical Society. Our business, Midwest Visuals Inc.(MWVisuals@aol-com), created dozens of educational slide shows and videos about the region's history, its environment and its nonprofit organizations and business institutions. In 1979, under contract with the State of Minnesota, we produced Iron Range Country, a 232-page book about the history and culture of Minnesota's Vermilion, Mesabi and Cuyuna Iron Ranges. Minnesota's mining history is a classic example of a boom and bust economy. Many companies came and left after they exhausted the mineral riches our region offered. What did they leave us. Ultimately, hundreds of hills of overburden too sterile to grow trees and other plants; deep holes in the ground; a holding pond contaminated with asbestos like fibers; hundreds of homes worth only a few thousand dollars and many unemployed workers. When the iron mines opened in the late 1800s and early 1900s, they provided employment for thousands of immigrants. This ended in the 1970s, a mere 80+ years after the opening of the first mines when the "natural ore" mines gave out. Another, more modest boom took place after the discovery of a means to economically produce iron from the area's abundant taconite ore deposits. This boom lasted until the price for iron plummeted and it was no longer profitable to ship ore from Minnesota. Results: more unemployment, more sterile overburden, more costs to the Minnesota taxpayer. It is only lately that we are again experiencing some modest growth given improved economies and world-wide demand. Now, Polymet and its investors, along with other mining companies, want to exploit our region's other mineral resources. This time, it's copper, nickel and other minerals that are located in a sulfide ore base. Unfortunately, unlike iron mining, the world today has much negative experience with this type of mining. We've been through this before. Does anyone remember INCO's and AMAX's efforts to obtains permits to mine Minnesota's copper nickel deposits in the 1970s. After pressure from citizen groups such as the Minnesota Copper-Nickel Coalition, Minnesota took on the task of a complex study of the long term effects of this new (for the state) type of mining. Its study came to the conclusion that there were still many questions left unanswered. And then: the price for copper and nickel plummeted making mining unprofitable. AMAX and INCO faded away. Can this happen again. Of course. What did we learn from the 1970s that's still relevant today. When it rains on the overburden from iron mining, the result is mostly rusty water. Not so with a sulfide ore body. It is well documented that the acidic runoff from sulfide mine overburden must be captured and contained, potentially for hundreds of years. And who will pay for this monitoring. Polymet. Consider the company's history. PolyMet has never operated a mine. It is dependent on Glencore, its largest investor, for much of its revenue. Glencore is the world's largest commodities company and one of the world's largest global mining companies. Unfortunately for Minnesota, however, it also has a long history of environmental pollution, human rights violations and anti-labor practices. Are we asking Glencore to be the responsible party. Given its history, is this a company that Minnesota can trust. Increased employment. Yes, initially there will be s

Fred Vos

54154

I do NOT support PolyMet mining. The environmental issues are far too serious to risk. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Freddy Bear

47562

I am opposed to the PolyMet Mining Inc Project because I believe the environmental risks and future financial costs out way near term economic benefits. Instead I think the state should fund research to develop new mining technologies that are environmentally safer and less intrusive. Charles Douglas Marks 614 Taylor St NE Minneapolis, MN 55413

Frederic Boger

42592

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frederic Stephens

16199

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Frederick K Campbell

54784

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Frederik de BENOIST

40284

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Frederik de BENOIST 1 allée RAMEAU les clayes sous bois, TX 78340 FR

Freds Gmail

6712

To whom it may concern: I have been reading about this project through the DNR website, trying to become familiar with its scope, its impact –both environmentally and financially – upon the area – and I trust that all precautions will be taken, implemented and sufficient in order to protect the watershed. My questions/concerns revolve around the duration of the environmental impact upon water quality for the next “200 years at the Mine Site and 500 years at the Plant Site”. I have been unable to read where my following questions are answered; specifically regarding money/finances/responsibility – 1- Where is the money coming from in order to support the operations that prevent any negative environmental impact for the next 200-500 years. 2- Is there going to be a reserve set up in order to support monetarily the operations that prevent any negative environmental impact for the next 200-500 years. 3- Who is responsible in supporting the operations, and watch-dogging the operations, that prevent any negative environmental impact for the next 200-500 years. While I understand that Polymet will be required to protect the environment and that the MNPCA / MN EPA will be the watchdogs along with the DNR, might I suggest the following, if isn't already in place: The DNR, MNPCA and the MN EPA, be the watchdogs for the next 200-500 years. After the appropriate annual operational budget calculations are made, that an annual fee be assessed upon Polymet and its successors that is based upon the annual volume of water contaminated and the costs necessary to support containment operations of that volume for the next 200-500 years. Finally, all monies need to be placed into a non-accessible reserve (non-accessible by any present or future State Governments) that will support all environmental operations for the next 200-500 years. Thank you for your anticipated response to my questions and suggestions. Fred Whitney Frederick R. Whitney 2768 Highway 61 Two Harbors, MN 55616 218-834-7168

Freese

54856

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Friends of the Boundary Waters 42984

Dear Lisa Fay, Attached are comments from the Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness on the proposed NorthMet mine SDEIS. Our comments include expert reports and attachments too large to send electronically in an email. I will be copying those to a disk and delivering those and a hardcopy of our comments to the DNR office today before the deadline. Please consider all the reports and attachments as part of our formal comments to the DNR for this project. Thank you so much. Let me know if you have any questions or problems with the attachment to this email or with the disk containing the reports. All the best, Betsy Daub - Betsy Daub Policy Director Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness 401 N. Third Street, Suite 290 Minneapolis, MN 55401 612-332-9630 HYPERLINK "mailto:betsy@friends-bwca-org"betsy@friends-bwca-org

Friends of the Cloquet Valley State Fore 54904

See attachment

Front Desk 17365

I agree with the attached letter, save the land and water. It is all we have left. Lynne Grenier

G. D. 57877

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Gabe Ernst 43803

I have seen the area that this mine will damage and I am completely against this mine as well as other non-ferrous mining. The amount of damage that this will to the watersheds and their associated recreation and tourism does not add to a good decision to bring a mine here. Please push back against this corporate interest that will inevitably lead to further poverty in our region just like the last time mining collapsed. We have moved beyond this economically and there is no reason to regress back again. Thank you, Gabe Ernst

Gabriel de la Iglesia 48167

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gabriel de la Iglesia 8930 W Flagler St Apt 108 Miami, FL 33174

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gabriel Skelly 38794

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Gabriel Skelly 8937 N Minnehaha Cir Minneapolis, MN 55426-3728

Gael Zembal 15406

Hello, Please find attached my comment on the NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you for your time, Gael Zembal

50931

Hello, Please find attached my comment on the NorthMet Sulfide Mine SDEIS. I have also sent a copy to Ms Fay of the DNR and Mr Bruner of the US Army Corps of Engineers. Thank you for your time, Gael Zembal

Gaelynn Lea 5933

Why I oppose the NorthMet Mine and thus believe the SDEIS should be rejected: My name is Gaelynn Lea Tressler. I am a musician and I am proud to call Duluth home. Two of my bands, [HYPERLINK "http://violinscratches-com/2014/01/17/why-i-oppose-sulfide-mining-in-minnesota/www.snobarnmusic-com"](http://violinscratches-com/2014/01/17/why-i-oppose-sulfide-mining-in-minnesota/www.snobarnmusic-com) Snöbarn and [HYPERLINK "http://www.lea-sparhawk-crows-com/"](http://www.lea-sparhawk-crows-com/) The Murder of Crows, recorded tracks for the [HYPERLINK "http://thearrowheadstory.bandcamp-com/"](http://thearrowheadstory.bandcamp-com/) Arrowhead Story – an album created to raise awareness about the risks of Sulfide Mining. I am against the proposed PolyMet mine for many reasons. Of course, some of my opposition stems from my spirituality – I believe that humans are supposed to protect, not destroy, the Earth that God gave us. I also believe that it is our duty to alleviate suffering whenever possible, in this case, suffering from the future harm and disease caused by toxins that will almost certainly be released by this proposed PolyMet mine. But there are other reasons to oppose Sulfide Mining, even if one is not of a religious background. First, it just seems like a bad business deal: We loan PolyMet our land for 20 years, less than one generation's time, and they will leave it polluted for 500 years. That means over 16 generations of future Minnesotans would be affected by pollution caused by the PolyMet Mine. If I tried to get a business loan and said I'd have it paid back in a speedy 500 years, I'd be laughed out of the loan office. Why are we even considering this mine as a plausible business idea. And that is if everything goes RIGHT. What if something goes wrong and we end up facing much more pollution than we were told to expect. I just can't trust a for-profit company to honestly have the environment's best interest in mind; ultimately it's about the bottom line, it has to be. So even if PolyMet tells me that this mine will have the newest safeguards in place, creating minimal damage to the environment, I still hesitate to believe them. And it appears to be for good reason: For example, one study found that, among modern mines in the US that predicted that no acid mine drainage would occur, 89% of those mines DID have acid mine drainage during operations or after closure. And just in case it's not clear, there are many reasons to fear acid mine drainage: acid mine drainage kills fish, wildlife and plants. Mining by-products such as arsenic, manganese and thallium, have been shown to increase the risk of cancer and other illnesses in humans. Make no mistake, there WILL be disease created by this mine. Are profits really worth anything if they're at the expense of human life. And, if 500 years of pollution somehow doesn't bother you, maybe the costs to the taxpayers will: Experts who have studied other mining projects across the country said even those that start with financial safeguards can end up costing taxpayers millions of dollars. In Montana, they underestimated the volume of water needing treatment after a gold mine had closed, and state taxpayers had to create a \$34 million trust fund to pay for it. Northern Minnesota cannot afford a miscalculation of that magnitude. Another study says that water treatment would cost between \$3-5 and \$6 million per year after the mine closes. Northern Minnesota cannot afford to foot that bill. Not for one year, not for 500 years. There are other, safer, better ways to grow our economy. For example, Maurices is soon expanding its corporate office, and they're slotted to create 600 jobs right here in Duluth. PolyMet will only create 360 full-time jobs, with HUGE liabilities attached. Let's focus on industries with less risk and more jobs. I vote as conscientiously as I can, I live as conscientiously as I can. My household, and my friends, regularly take actions to preserve the earth and our own health. And now a FOR-PROFIT company is hoping to come in and risk my health and the planet's vital water supply all for money I will never see. Where is the political, so

Alphabetical by sender's first name

GaiaTrading 20110

I want to register my opposition to mining in BWCAW - long term consequences presently unknown. Thanks for your consideration - Barbara Putnam; St Louis Park, 55426
gaiatrading@yahoo-com GaiaTrading

Gail Bollis 46059

DNR I urge you NOT to accept the SDEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage and

Gail Frethem 40144

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Gail Frethem 5241 10th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1701 (612) 823-6633

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Gaebe

10031

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gail Gaebe 12648 tanglewood rd audubon, MN 56511

18775

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gail Gaebe 12648 tanglewood rd audubon, MN 56511

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Gaebe

39853

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Gaebe

41671

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Gaebe

50849

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gail Gaebe 12648 tanglewood rd audubon, MN 56511

Gail Gail McMullen

42438

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Gail Gail McMullen 1734 N Kingsley Dr Apt 4 Los Angeles, CA 90027-3722

Gail Gilliland

21539

Please see the attached document.

Gail Gray

26481

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in ALL other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Sulfide mining in Minnesota threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. And this feeds into ALL the other Great Lakes, great because they are fresh water. I have grave concerns about this project's impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, risks to water quality, risk and loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The federal land give-away to a mining company is not in the public's interest, it is not in the interest of wildlife, it is not in the interest of keeping our Great Lakes clean and fresh. Sincerely, Gail Gray 5213 Franklin Blvd Cleveland, OH 44102-3329

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Gray 28852

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and on into the rest of the Great Lakes, including my Lake Erie. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Gail Gray 5213 Franklin Blvd Cleveland, OH 44102-3329

Gail J. Hartly 6215

I urge you not to let this mine be built. It would be short term financial gain for a relative few, compared to the long term gain, on several levels, for countless individuals and businesses for the countless generations to come. Thank you, Gail Hartly 34562 Fern Rd Lanesboro, MN 55949

Gail Jacobson 40090

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action I'm grateful for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Gail Jacobson 1747 Carl St Saint Paul, MN 55113-5201 (651) 647-5019

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Linnerson

40272

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Gail Matthews

42647

See attachment

gail roberts

42899

Attached are my comments on the NorthMet SDEIS titled: PolyMet/NorthMet Project Violates DNR Strategic Goals. Thank you for your careful consideration. Gail C. Roberts 1150 Ivy Hill Drive Mendota Heights, MN 55118 gcroberts777@yahoo-com

48158

See attachment

54491

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Rosenquist

15806

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Gail Rosenquist 1514 N 8th Ave E Duluth, MN 55805-1115

16683

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gail Rosenquist 1514 N. 8th Av. E. Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gail Rosenquist

50059

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gail Rosenquist 1514 N. 8th Av. E. Duluth, MN 55805

Gail Smallridge

40437

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Gail Smallridge 1310 Boston Corners Road Millerton, NY 12546 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gale Havrilla

40492

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, Please do not let mining destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. Comments apply to both the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands plus as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. I live near Silver Bay and a number of the once fishable streams have been reduced to foul smelling drainage ditches void of the once healthy aquatic system due to leachate from the taconite settling ponds. I fish the St Louis River and Lake Superior and do not want to see additional pollution entering them. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters are priceless natural resources that help protect out waters and provide habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so less of it will travel downstream and accumulate in fish causing harm and brain development problems in the children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. 2/3 of North Shore children have already been shown to have harmful levels in their systems. The problem should not knowingly be allowed to worsen. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Deny the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to tr

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gale Lecompte

16185

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Galiena Anderson-Lind

16580

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Galiena Anderson-Lind 261 99th Avenue NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

49987

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Galiena Anderson-Lind 261 99th Avenue NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Garret T. Wright

44963

Greetings, I wish to throw in my input concerning the proposed mining project taking place in northern Minnesota. I will state my background and bias first: I am an Iron Ranger, raised (not born), and I am a graduate of a liberal arts school, Bethel University, in St Paul which gives me a left leaning, environmentalist sentiment. I do value the habitat in northern Minnesota. I get the privilege of fishing the boundary water lakes every fishing opener, and I own 1500 shares in Polymet stock. As one can see, I can be a very torn character in this debate. My conclusion is this: There is a demand for nickel, copper, and other precious metals in the market today. If we do not mine these resources in Minnesota, another country, state, or providence will mine these resources. And I'm afraid if another region mines these minerals, tight restrictions, regulation and watchdogs will be less existent in those regions – resulting in a greater risk for environmental loss, employee exploitation, business mis-management. If these precious metals are mined in Minnesota, a very strident-progressive state; the commonwealth would keep a close watch on the company PolyMet which will pressurize them into making responsible business decisions when it comes to preserving the environment. We need the environmentalist community in this debate; not to terminate the project as a whole, but push for it and hold it accountable during its development. Much thanks. -Garret Wright Dept. of Human Services Caution: This e-mail and attached documents, if any, may contain information that is protected by state or federal law. E-mail containing private or protected information should not be sent over a public (nonsecure) Internet unless it is encrypted pursuant to DHS standards. This e-mail should be forwarded only on a strictly need-to-know basis. If you are not the intended recipient, please: (1) notify the sender immediately, (2) do not forward the message, (3) do not print the message and (4) erase the message from your system.

Garrett Bonem

52258

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Garrett Bonem 6400 Heaven Dr Howell, MI 48855

Garrett Ferderber

22744

Dear Ms Fay, Below is a form letter that I sort of believe in. I will say that I am concerned about this project as a former resident of Ely, MN and as someone who hopes to share the wonders of that area and of Lake Superior with my future children and grandchildren. I hate when science gets muddled by politics and money. It is really hard to tell what is really going on with this project because the information available is from two sides that seem to be taking extreme views of each other. I would like for there to be some sort of response to the allegations made in this letter and in the comments you are receiving regarding the NorthMet project. I would like to hear relatively easy to understand information about how the NorthMet site is or is not actually proceeding in accordance with state and federal laws. I would like to know that the people of Minnesota actually stand to gain more than a polluted hole in the ground in the long term and that our leaders are fulfilling their obligations to our future and not acting irresponsibly for short term gain. But like I said, it is a challenge to feel like there is honesty from both sides and usable information for the public. I would love for representatives from both sides to sit down and talk over the concerns. Thank you for your time. Garrett Ferderber Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Garrett Ferderber 4021 11th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407 6122268658

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Garrett Labarre 15536

Katy Olson 2345 Woodbridge St Roseville, MN 55113

Garry Budolfson 10417

DEAR BOARD, I HAVE LOTS OF CONCERNS ABOUT YOUR DIRECTIONS ON PERMITTING TO NONE AMERICAN BUSINESS. OVER FLOW SPILLS WILL HAPPEN, HOLDING A NON-AMERICAN FIRM LIABLE FOR TOTAL DOLLARS IS A WISP-IN-WIND WISH.TAILING PONDS IN EUROPE HAVE NOT HELD, YOU SHOW NO DATA FOR A EPIC RAIN EVENT. I HAVE BEEN CAMPING IN THAT REGION WHEN WE GOT 11 INCHES IN TWO HOURS. HOW ABOUT THAT EXTENDING FOR SEVERAL HOURS. SULFATE PARTS PER MILLION YOU CALL TO THE PARTRIDGE RIVER SYS AND HYPERLINK "http://B.W.CA"B.W.CA. LEAD AND ALUMINUM SEEPAGE IS EXPECTED. MERCURY IN TAILING,LIMITED.. TO WHAT. NO FROM ME, GARRY BUDOLFSON , STACY MN

Garry Leaf 58121

I am sorry I am unable to be at the last of three public hearings this evening on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Statement for the proposed PolyMet mine.As you can imagine, Sportsmen are following this closely, as we live and breathe the outdoors. Minnesota is one of the best places in the world for hunting and angling. For example, we have amazing trout and walleye fishing throughout the state. Deer hunting is so important to our culture that the opener is designated each year as a hunting opportunity for Minnesota's Governor. And we have association organizations for virtually anything that can be hunted or fished.Setting aside for a moment the tremendous job prospects for our states (and many hunters and anglers for that matter), I wanted to add my comments to this issue as it relates to the process itself.Sportsmen have strongly supported Commissioner Landwehr and I believe Minnesota has some of the most responsible environmental permitting standards in the United States. They are far better than so many places in the world, where these critical metals, like copper and nickel, are currently coming from.There are passions that erupt during a permitting process like this. My comment is that the DNR needs to be trusted to do its job, and if companies like PolyMet are able to show that they can meet or exceed the standards, we should welcome the jobs that will result.Thank you for all that the DNR does, and for protecting Sportsmen and women here in our great state. Thank you for your responsible permitting process and for efficiently bringing jobs online for those companies that can meet the standards.

Garth R Lee 42643

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary

57535

Here's the link to the SDEIS as posted on the DNR website. There you can download and read chapter by chapter <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html> And here's a good article written by Carla Arneson, who lives near Ely. <http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/news/2014/01/05/community-voices-polymet-s-sdeis-perpetual-water-treatment-and-sulfide-mining-are-sy> It's shaping up to be an interesting battle. But of course, there is huge money in the pockets of these companies, and there are politicians who fear for their re-election status if they oppose it. So, we'll see. Peace, GC From: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:18 PM To: Undisclosed recipients: Subject: ATTN: Notice of Availability of Supplemental Draft EIS for PolyMet NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange DO NOT REPLY TO THIS EMAIL. THIS MESSAGE AUTOGENERATED. [419] You are receiving this email because our records indicate you have participated in the ongoing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for PolyMet's proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. The purpose of this message is to alert interested parties of the availability of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the project. Attached please find the transmittal letter from the three Co-lead Agencies: US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); US Forest Service (USFS); Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). The text of the transmittal letter is provided below. Thank you for your interest in the project. To Interested Parties: The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the US Forest Service (USFS) have jointly prepared the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. The SDEIS describes the anticipated environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the proposed PolyMet Mining, Inc. (PolyMet) NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, located near the cities of Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt in northeastern Minnesota. The SDEIS is posted on MDNR's website at: <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html>. The NorthMet Project would create an open pit copper, nickel, cobalt and precious metals mine with adjacent stockpile areas; refurbish a portion of the former LTV Steel Mining Company (LTVSMC) processing plant and construct a new hydrometallurgical facility at the plant site; construct a new tailings basin facility on the site of LTVSMC tailings facilities; and add to existing utility infrastructure and rail lines. The Land Exchange would consist of USFS conveyance of Superior National Forest Lands encompassing the NorthMet mine site and surrounding lands to PolyMet, and USFS acquisition from PolyMet of up to five tracts of private lands within the Superior National Forest proclamation boundary. The Land Exchange is subject to Forest Service Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process (objections process) regulations at 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B. The Land Exchange legal notice, identifying requirements under 36 CFR 218, will be available on the Superior National Forest website, <http://www.fs.usda-gov/goto/superior/northmet>. The Biological Assessment and Biological Evaluation for the proposed NorthMet project are also posted on the Superior National Forest website. The USACE public notice for the SDEIS and public meetings, and the public notice for the USACE Section 404 Clean Water Act Permit, are available on the Army Corps of Engineers, St Paul District website, <http://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/ProjectsStudies/PolyMet.aspx>. Following the anticipated publishing of the SDEIS notice in the Federal Register on December 13, 2013, the MDNR, USACE, and USFS invite written comments on the SDEIS during the public comment period that ends March 13, 201

Gary & Lois Travis

36628

To whom it may concern, I am greatly concerned about allowing the PolyMet mine to proceed. There are so many ways the environment can be irreparably damaged even if there are funds set aside and plans made for these damages. So much death will occur if the nearby waters are poisoned or the surrounding land is poisoned, how can you repair or replace that. Recovery could take a century or more. How can we leave that as a legacy to our children and grandchildren. Please don't allow our pristine North to suffer the fate of so many locations already poisoned across this country, even when safeguards were put in place, Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, Alabama, many places on the East coast Thank you for considering my concerns. Lois Travis 840 2nd Ave S South St Paul, MN 55075

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary A Russell

39053

---Original Message--- From: gar6@juno-com [mailto:gar6@juno-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:53 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Gary A Russell 4301 11th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-3213

Gary and Connie DeGrote

42449

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Gary and Connie DeGrote 1108 Woodland Trl Northfield, MN 55057-5285

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Anderson

46956

Dear Mr Jimenz, Along with a group of friends I spend a lot of time at our camp next to the Superior National Forest outside of Findland, MN. I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Boelhower

44854

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The SDEIS for the PolyMet sulfide mine is still inadequate and environmentally unsatisfactory. It makes unsubstantiated claims without facts, often based on assumptions that are flawed. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. There are several local wells in the area; yet there is no analysis of how these wells might be affected. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. Sulfate and mercury pollution increase mercury contamination of fish. St Louis River mercury contamination of fish is already higher than in other Northeastern Minnesota regional waters and higher downstream than upstream. One out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with mercury in their blood above safe levels. This is a very significant danger to the human population. Clear and thorough analysis of the effect of additional sulfates in the St Louis River and Lake Superior on the uptake of mercury in fish must be studied. We cannot risk mercury poisoning of our human population. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. These wetlands are irreplaceable. This is a rich habitat for biodiversity, both plant and animal; it should not be sacrificed. It is not replaced by adding dissimilar pieces of land in other parts of the state. The significant function that the wetlands play in this region would be lost to both plant life, animal life, and the natural processes related to purification, sedimentation, and natural water regulation. Polymet's waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. Its plan to purify the water is inadequate. Reverse osmosis systems need to be significantly expanded. It is ridiculous to make the assumption that there will not be significant leakage and seepage in several directions. PolyMet would dump tailings in an unlined tailings basin designed in the 1950's on top of streams in order to leak. This old LTV basin already violates water quality standards. The SDEIS does not adequately address leach out from this basin. With the immense amount of blasting in the area, it is likely that significant rock fractures will occur. PolyMet has not substantiated its claims that nearly all seepage could be captured by pumps at one end of the 2-mile wide tailings basin. Fractures already known to exist at the PolyMet mine and plant site would transport pollution. There is geological evidence to suggest that seepage must be treated in several locations, and there must be back-up systems in the event of failure. PolyMet's 526-acre permanent, unlined Category 1 waste rock pile would be less protective than its old proposal, which would have provided lined stockpiles for long-term waste heaps. Finally, we must seriously ask the question whether or not it is environmentally responsible to propose a mining process in a water-rich environment that will require water purification systems to operate effectively for 100 or 200 or 300 or 400 years, especially when it is clear that seepage and run-off would affect wild rice growth-a sacred food for tribal members of the region; when it is clear that seepage would make its way to Lake Superior and raise the mercury level in fish which when eaten raises the level of mercury in humans. Polymet's own analysis allows 1506 micrograms per liter (ug/L) criterion of manganese at the plant which is 15 times higher than the health risk limit set by the Minnesota Health Department to prevent brain damage in infants, children and adults. The PolyMet project would

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Burt

7

If a terrorist showed up in our backyard, and polluted the water, land, and air, but he created a few jobs in the process, would that be a good thing or a bad thing in the long run. The intentions of the Polymet corporation are, on the surface, good ones for some people, but not for everyone, and not in the long run. They want to create jobs, and create a small amount of wealth for a few people, and create a large amount of wealth for an even smaller group of people. They also want to make people in this area dependent on them for the jobs they create, and the money it will, supposedly, bring to the area, but this will only be true for as long as the mine also makes them extremely wealthy. It's been written that if a person wants to be free, they not only have to be responsible for their intentions and their decisions, they also have to be responsible for the CONSEQUENCES of their decisions. I have yet to see any mining company, any fracking company, any oil company, any coal company, any nuclear company, any too-large-to-fail bank, or any corporate CEO or corporate board, put down in writing that they will, in full measure, be financially responsible for any problems or hardships they create, and for as long as it takes to fully fix the problems or hardships. If the Polymet corporation was able to guarantee that they would hold themselves financially accountable for any problem or hardship they created, I might consider their business proposal valid. If the corporation was a not-for-profit business, I might consider them to be sincere. I don't see either of these things happening. Most corporations of this nature want to socialize risk and responsibilities, and privatize profits. They really don't care whose back does the labor, as long as the money keeps rolling in to their bank accounts. I doubt that any of them will live next door or downstream from any of the pollution or problems they create. I believe the CEO and board of Polymet will, as much as possible, try to keep themselves isolated from any of the consequences that result from their economic intentions and decisions. What I see is a corporation that is willing to do anything, or say anything, to get their way. If you scratch the surface of this corporation, I believe you will find a bully who wants to control the way other people think and react towards them. I also believe that if you scratch the surface of any bully, you will find a coward. It is only those who are afraid that feel the need to control other people, and how people think and act. When you deal with a corporation like this, with the priorities they are based on, what you almost always have is a group of people who will tell you the part of the truth that makes them look good, or, at least, doesn't make them look bad. They love the lie that preserves their image, but never the unflattering truth. And yet, if we are to make any kind of rational decisions about this corporation, and their business proposition, we need to get to the full truth, and not just the part that makes them look good, such as the jobs they boast will be created. I don't believe this corporation will ever hold themselves fully accountable for the consequences of their intentions and their decisions, which means they will never be free of their need for half-truths, intrigue and subterfuge. The people that work for them, or try to work with them, will never be free either. Such is the nature of the current corporate mentality.

19952

It's been written that the person who can see both sides of an issue, usually doesn't have money tied up in either side. Here are some simple questions that cannot be easily answered. What was the carbon footprint of the Super Bowl and the Sochi Olympics. What is the carbon footprint of a NASCAR race. What will the carbon footprint of the World Cup soccer games be. What will the carbon footprint be for building the new Viking's stadium. What was the carbon footprint of the current SI Swimsuit edition. And what is the carbon footprint of the PolyMet and G-Tac mines going to be. For what it's worth, you can pick any major event, or any major mining and fossil fuel situation, and ask the same question. The list is endless. For the people who are involved in, and dependent on, any event which is connected to their livelihood, one will probably find them adamantly on the side of holding that event. They will probably not be very interested in giving up or curtailing their event of choice. So how do we choose which events to give up, when every event will evoke the same kind of resistance. Ironically, if things continue as they are, the more fossil fuels we use, and the more events we hold and attend, the less options the earth will eventually allow us to have, when the temperature rises, and the weather gets really crazy. If things continue as they are, the population is expected to end up around nine billion people by the year 2050- If things continue as they are, the temperature of the earth is expected to rise by 4 to 6 degrees Centigrade by 2100- When that happens, the earth will only be able to support half a billion people at most. What is going to happen to the other 8-5 billion people in the 50 years before 2100- If that happens, events like the Super Bowl, the Olympics, World Cup soccer, NASCAR, the Vikings, the swimsuit issue, PolyMet and G-Tac will be meaningless. The main irony, which most people continue to ignore, is that we would all be on the side of change, and saving the earth, if we were a rational breed of mammals. But, no, we would rather continue supporting and being involved in "events," even though it will kill most, if not all of us, in the long run, if things continue as they are. Gary Burt PO Box 143 Marble, Mn. 55764 218-247-3134

54708

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Clements

16502

From: Gary [mailto:gclm@visi-com] Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 2:43 PM To: TDabney@fs.fed.us; Fay, Lisa (DNR); douglas.w.bruner@usace.army.mil Subject: Public comment on the Polymet SDEIS Greetings, As representatives of the Co-Lead Agencies for the study of this mining proposal, I'm including all of you in my comments. It occurs to me that each of your organizations has a particular expertise and interest in how this plays out, and I thank you for the opportunity to comment. I recognize, as I'm sure you do, that there is an extremely delicate balance of factors to be considered as the decision is made whether this SDEIS is an adequate improvement over the one that failed so miserably, or whether the questions that remain are still essentially unanswered. For me, there are several key questions that have not been adequately addressed. The first is the question of the proposed land exchange. It is clear to me that the original legislation that created the Superior National Forest recognized the undesirable nature of mining for sulfide bearing ores. The proposed exchange clearly violates the intent of that legislation, if not the letter of it. And I believe that the proposal also would be in clear violation of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, because of the total imbalance of the wetlands acreage that Polymet's operation would destroy, and also because I cannot find any definitive study of the relative assessed valuation of the two parcels. I believe that such a valuation is required as part of any land exchange. Therefore I believe that it would be wrong, if not illegal, for the Forest Service to go ahead with this exchange as proposed. The second major question that has not been answered for me is the question of water treatment, both from the current LTV plant tailings pit, which is already known to be leaking, and the area where the sludge that is to eventually be captured from the reverse osmosis process is to be dumped. In fact, it seems inconclusive just where that sludge, which contains an even more highly toxic mix of pollutants, will wind up. Is it to be in some off-site landfill, where it poses even more untreated harmful potential, or is it to be in the area shown on the map near the mine site itself. In either case, this material is the worst of the worst, and the plan for its long term treatment protection is very unclear. Even worse is the totally inadequate study of the ground water flowage in the area. The Minnesota Geological Survey studies show fracturing beneath the mine and plant site areas that go well beyond what is stated by Polymet, and to use only "computer models" as a definitive statement of how much leakage there might be out the bottom of the system, and exactly where that groundwater flows, is pretty much ridiculous. Let's see an actual physical study of what waters are down there and where they feed. Do they feed the Partridge River. Do they supply Colby Lake, a source of city water for Hoyt Lakes. Do these ground waters supply a number of area rural wells. The Polymet estimations include millions of gallons that will escape treatment. Just how much magnesium, mercury, and arsenic will end up being leached from the earth as these waters flow into that ground water. A third major question is the one of the reverse osmosis procedure itself. I know that this procedure has been used on small scales to take particulate matter out of drinking water, but to use, again, a computer model rather than hard actual experience somewhere to extrapolate that this process will actually work on this massive scale across this massive time period totally stretches the imagination. The Flambeau mine in Wisconsin that is cited as an example is known to have been in violation at several points during its operation, and does not give us the scale of experience we need in order to have confidence that this kind of system will actually work in an operation the size o

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Clements

51028

Greetings, As representatives of the Co-Lead Agencies for the study of this mining proposal, I'm including all of you in my comments. It occurs to me that each of your organizations has a particular expertise and interest in how this plays out, and I thank you for the opportunity to comment. I recognize, as I'm sure you do, that there is an extremely delicate balance of factors to be considered as the decision is made whether this SDEIS is an adequate improvement over the one that failed so miserably, or whether the questions that remain are still essentially unanswered. For me, there are several key questions that have not been adequately addressed. The first is the question of the proposed land exchange. It is clear to me that the original legislation that created the Superior National Forest recognized the undesirable nature of mining for sulfide bearing ores. The proposed exchange clearly violates the intent of that legislation, if not the letter of it. And I believe that the proposal also would be in clear violation of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, because of the total imbalance of the wetlands acreage that Polymet's operation would destroy, and also because I cannot find any definitive study of the relative assessed valuation of the two parcels. I believe that such a valuation is required as part of any land exchange. Therefore I believe that it would be wrong, if not illegal, for the Forest Service to go ahead with this exchange as proposed. The second major question that has not been answered for me is the question of water treatment, both from the current LTV plant tailings pit, which is already known to be leaking, and the area where the sludge that is to eventually be captured from the reverse osmosis process is to be dumped. In fact, it seems inconclusive just where that sludge, which contains an even more highly toxic mix of pollutants, will wind up. Is it to be in some off-site landfill, where it poses even more untreated harmful potential, or is it to be in the area shown on the map near the mine site itself. In either case, this material is the worst of the worst, and the plan for its long term treatment protection is very unclear. Even worse is the totally inadequate study of the ground water flowage in the area. The Minnesota Geological Survey studies show fracturing beneath the mine and plant site areas that go well beyond what is stated by Polymet, and to use only "computer models" as a definitive statement of how much leakage there might be out the bottom of the system, and exactly where that groundwater flows, is pretty much ridiculous. Let's see an actual physical study of what waters are down there and where they feed. Do they feed the Partridge River. Do they supply Colby Lake, a source of city water for Hoyt Lakes. Do these ground waters supply a number of area rural wells. The Polymet estimations include millions of gallons that will escape treatment. Just how much magnesium, mercury, and arsenic will end up being leached from the earth as these waters flow into that ground water. A third major question is the one of the reverse osmosis procedure itself. I know that this procedure has been used on small scales to take particulate matter out of drinking water, but to use, again, a computer model rather than hard actual experience somewhere to extrapolate that this process will actually work on this massive scale across this massive time period totally stretches the imagination. The Flambeau mine in Wisconsin that is cited as an example is known to have been in violation at several points during its operation, and does not give us the scale of experience we need in order to have confidence that this kind of system will actually work in an operation the size of which Polymet contemplates. Finally, as a Minnesota taxpayer and grandfather of two who will be around long after the proposed operation is finished, I am appalled that there is not a more complete explanation

Gary Duggleby

46209

Hi, I just commented on PolyMet's open-pit copper-sulfide mine plan and wetland destruction permit. To build its mine, PolyMet proposes to directly destroy 913 acres of high quality headwater wetlands and indirectly harm up to an additional 7,351 acres of headwaters wetlands due to air pollution, water pollution, and water diversions. These wetlands are in the headwaters of the Partridge River, an important tributary to the St Louis River and ultimately Lake Superior. Most absurdly, PolyMet's plan includes NO replacement of any indirect wetland losses. Headwater wetlands are critical to protecting water quality and fish populations downstream. Please join me in telling State and Federal agencies to reject PolyMet's inadequate mine plan and wetland destruction permit. There are many, many, many more different industries that would bring a lot more jobs, that would not compromise on the Nation's finest canoeing and camping wildlife areas. Thank you, Gary Duggleby Minnetonka, MN 55345

46214

Hi, I just commented on PolyMet's open-pit copper-sulfide mine plan and wetland destruction permit. To build its mine, PolyMet proposes to directly destroy 913 acres of high quality headwater wetlands and indirectly harm up to an additional 7,351 acres of headwaters wetlands due to air pollution, water pollution, and water diversions. These wetlands are in the headwaters of the Partridge River, an important tributary to the St Louis River and ultimately Lake Superior. Most absurdly, PolyMet's plan includes NO replacement of any indirect wetland losses. Headwater wetlands are critical to protecting water quality and fish populations downstream. Please join me in telling State and Federal agencies to reject PolyMet's inadequate mine plan and wetland destruction permit. There are many, many, many more different industries that would bring a lot more jobs, that would not compromise on the Nation's finest canoeing and camping wildlife areas. Thank you, Gary Duggleby Minnetonka, MN 55345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary E Glass 54500

See attachment

Gary Fifield 46920

---Original Message--- From: garyfifield@comcaStnet [mailto:garyfifield@comcaStnet] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 10:07 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board I am sure you have all of the numbers and reasons for not approving the mining proposal. I am sure you have received many of the pre-written letters from concerned individuals through the Environmental Partnership. This is not one of them. My statement is simple: We cannot afford the risk that is inherent in this project. The forces of mining for profit are very strong. The people living in the area, many of them, see jobs and livelihood resulting from the project. I do not think the number of jobs or the time they will last is adequate to justify the risk involved. We must not let the large absentee corporations make our future for us if it is too risky for those living here. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, I am told, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS and, in fact, the idea of mining in the proposed area. Thank you. Sincerely, Gary Fifield 1893 Berkeley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1631

Gary G. Kohls 7717

Duty to Warn The Corporation as Psychopath: Do Mining Corporations like PolyMet and GTac Meet the Definition. by Gary G. Kohls, MD An earlier version of this essay was posted at: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-us-corporation-as-psychopath/5345811> "Slavery is the legal fiction that a person is property. Corporate personhood is the legal fiction that property is a person." - Anonymous The NeoConservative, pro-corporate, anti-democratic Roberts' 5/4 Supreme Court's decision in the 2010 Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission ruling (granting personhood to corporations and allowing unlimited, anonymous monetary contributions to political candidates) has emboldened the already powerful and very corruptible multinational corporations (that now have achieved dominion over politics and the economy in the United States) to "buy" any number of politicians and brain-wash many voters in many state and national elections. The US Supreme Court has made legal the absurd notion that inanimate corporations like PolyMet and GTac, potential despoilers of northern Minnesota and Wisconsin's irreplaceable wetlands, aquifers and aboriginal land and water rights deserve the same privileges (but not the same responsibilities) as living humans. Soberingly, after the ruling came down, there was only a brief bit of anger and outrage from our national leadership over this democracy-threatening decision, and the outrage was quickly drowned out of the public consciousness by a well-timed, mainstream media-orchestrated "tempest in a teapot", namely Toyota's recall of tens of thousands of accelerator pedals (that had only infrequently been the cause of significant accidents). The following question must be asked: If corporations are given the privileges of personhood shouldn't they also bear the same responsibilities and incur the same punishments as individuals when living breathing humans commit crimes against humanity, poison the drinking water or rape the land. Peace and justice activists briefly applauded when the citizens of Shapleigh, Maine protected their water rights last March from the insatiable water-extracting corporate giant Nestle. (See video and more information on this episode at: (<http://www.afterdowningstreet-org/node/40335>)). Nestle, one of the most infamous of the countless number of multinational corporate exploiters, has no allegiance to Maine, Minnesota or Wisconsin or any other locality where they try to extract water that never was theirs; but when the water is gone or polluted and when the minerals have been depleted, so will Nestle, PolyMet and GTac, and so will be Exxon/Mobil, British Petroleum, Halliburton, Deep Water Horizon, British Petroleum, Coca-Cola and Perrier or whatever other corporate intruder that poisons or extracts the people's resources for the benefit of their shareholders and the predators at the corporate headquarters, none of whom will have to live with the poisoned environment that they leave behind. The good citizens of Maine recognized the foxes that tried to get inside their henhouse, and they did the right thing by vigorously resisting, and little David - with justice and his little slingshot on his side - won a rare victory against the evil giant Goliath. This small victory for justice should illustrate what must be done if real democracy is ever to thrive again in America. The disastrous, unconstitutional Citizens United decision must be reversed with a constitutional amendment. The future of the nation, our children, the planet, our drinking water, natural habitat and aboriginal rights are all at stake. And corporations, just like most psychopathic entities, don't seem to care. It is important to understand that the allegiance of corporations is to its shareholders, executives and management teams, and not to the people whose lives and health depend on the sustainability of the land, water, air and food supplies. Most corporate sha

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary G. Kohls

23539

Regarding my testimony below: my phone # is 218-728-9756 and my mailing address is 1306 8th St, Duluth, MN 55805- Thank you for your interest Gary G. Kohls, MD
Duty to Warn The Corporation as

Sociopath: Do Mining Corporations like PolyMet Meet the Definition. by Gary G. Kohls, MD "Slavery is the legal fiction that a person is property. Corporate personhood is the legal fiction that property is a person." - Anonymous In 2010 the NeoConservative, pro-corporate, anti-democratic Roberts' 5/4 Supreme Court's decided in the Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission ruling to grant personhood to corporations by allowing unlimited, anonymous monetary contributions to political campaigns and candidates. This ruling, called by many to be the worst Supreme Court decision of the past century, has emboldened the already powerful and corruptible multinational corporations (that now have achieved dominion over US politics as well as the economy) to "buy" any number of politicians and brain-wash voters by multi-million dollar ad campaigns that the rest of us can't afford to counter in state and national elections. The US Supreme Court has thus made legal the absurd notion that inanimate corporations like PolyMet and GTac (potential despoilers of northern Minnesota and northern Wisconsin's irreplaceable wetlands, aquifers and aboriginal land and water rights) deserve the same privileges (but not the same responsibilities) as living humans. After the ruling came down, there was only a brief bit of outrage from the so-called national leadership of our essentially "one-party system" (one-party, that is, when it comes to the GOP and Democratic Party's corporate and militarist agendas). What outrage was expressed was quickly drowned out by a well-timed, mainstream media-orchestrated "tempest in a teapot", namely Toyota's recall of tens of thousands of accelerator pedals (that had only infrequently been the cause of significant accidents). >> The following question about the consequences of the Supreme Court's democracy-threatening decision must be asked: If corporations are given the privileges of personhood, shouldn't they also bear the same responsibilities and incur the same punishments as individuals when they commit crimes, poison the water and air or rape the land. Peace and justice activists applauded when the citizens of Shapleigh, Maine protected their water rights last year from the insatiable water-extracting corporate giant Nestle. (See video and more information on this episode at: (<http://www.afterdowningstreet-org/node/40335>)). Nestle, one of the many multinational corporate exploiters, has no allegiance to Maine, Minnesota or Wisconsin or any other state where this foreign entity tries to extract water or minerals that never were theirs to begin with. But when the minerals have been depleted and the water has been polluted or drained, Nestle, PolyMet and GTac will be gone, and so will Exxon/Mobil, British Petroleum, Halliburton, Deep Water Horizon, British Petroleum, Coca-Cola, Perrier or whatever other corporate intruder that ruthlessly extracts or poisons the people's resources - all for the economic benefit of their faceless investors, shareholders and CEOs at their out-of-state corporate headquarters, none of whom will have to live with the poisoned environment that they have left behind. The good citizens of Shapleigh recognized the foxes that tried to get inside their henhouse, and they did the right thing by vigorously resisting; and another underdog David - with a lot of justice, a lot of pluck and a little luck on his side - won a rare victory against another evil giant. >> That small victory against injustice should illustrate what must be done if American democracy is ever to thrive again. The outrageous Citizens United decision must be overturned with a constitutional amendment. (See www.movetoamend-org for more.)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary G. Kohls

38857

Duty to Warn The Corporation as Sociopath: Do Mining Corporations like PolyMet Meet the Definition. – Part Two By Gary G. Kohls, MD "Slavery is the legal fiction that a person is property. Corporate personhood is the legal fiction that property is a person." – Anonymous Experienced psychologists tell us that sociopathic individuals that have committed crimes have to be locked away or otherwise isolated to protect society from them. As a review of last week's column, part 1, I reprint below the seven diagnostic criteria that are used to diagnose antisocial (aka, sociopathic or psychopathic) personality disorder in humans. Be mindful that only three of the seven are needed to make the diagnosis. 1) callous disregard for the feelings of other people 2) the incapacity to maintain human relationships 3) reckless disregard for the safety of others 4) aggressiveness 5) deceitfulness (repeated lying and conning others for profit) 6) incapacity to experience guilt and 7) the failure to conform to social norms and respect for the law. Other helpful traits that are commonly manifested by sociopaths include: Lack of conscience Lack of remorse for evils done to others Indifference to the suffering of its victims Rationalizes (makes excuses for) having hurt, mistreated or stolen from others Willingness to exploit, seduce or manipulate others No sign of delusional or irrational thinking Cunning, clever Usually above average intelligence Always looking for ways to make money or achieve fame or notoriety Willing to cause or contribute to the financial ruin of others Untrustworthy Cannot be trusted to adhere to conventional standards of morality. So a number of questions need to be asked. Given the fact that human sociopaths need to be avoided, marginalized or locked up, we need to ask what needs to be done with corporate entities that meet three of the seven criteria above. What needs to be done with corporations that have a history of deceiving, lying, cheating, raping the land, poisoning the water, fouling the air or otherwise acting unethically. Given the anti-constitutional 2010 Roberts' Supreme Court ruling granting personhood to corporations (Citizens United), shouldn't sociopathic corporations be dealt with just like their human counterparts when they act criminally. Shouldn't long prison sentences be given to the CEOs, Boards of Directors and management teams. Shouldn't there be confiscation of property or even capital punishment in the case of egregious cases including mass deaths as in the cases of Union Carbide, Coca-Cola and Merck (examples: the Vioxx and Gardasil deaths). I hasten to add that I am against capital punishment for humans, but any person with a conscience and more than a double digit IQ knows that corporations are not really human. Corporations don't bleed and don't cry out in pain during the execution process, although they may plead for mercy while shedding insincere crocodile tears. Capital punishment for corporations, contrary to the data on capital punishment for humans, would prevent a lot of future sociopathic behaviors. <<<What Should be Done With Corporate Rapists.>>> What about the crime of rape as applied to corporations. Rape has several definitions, including the following ones that are in my dictionary: 1) Any violent seizure or hostile action against a weaker opponent; 2) to rob or plunder; 3) the act of seizing and carrying off by force; 4) the crime of having forcible sexual intercourse without consent. Corporations that plunder, pollute or poison Mother Earth or execute hostile mergers and acquisitions of weaker companies meet some of the above definitions for rape. Shouldn't our society punish corporate rapists as severely as we punish the human kind. What about the known lethal poisons that thousands of unregulated chemical corporations knowingly discharge into the water, air, soil and food. Should the

Gary Geisler

39356

Dear Ms Fay, We oppose the PolyMet copper-nickel mine proposal. Human civilization is unsustainable in it's present form. The negative affects of global warming due to our ever-increasing fossil fuel emissions are predicted to accelerate, even if we were to end all our consumption tomorrow. It's quite possible, even probable, that civilization will eventually collapse as severe droughts, violent storms and rising sea levels disrupt the production and distribution of food and energy supplies to our ever-growing populations. I'm afraid a lot of potential customers of this new copper source, will wind up dead. Clean water will become an increasingly rare resource for the future generations that survive. Do you really think they'll be able to maintain another poisonous legacy of our short sighted folly for many centuries to come without the equipment and know-how to do so. Sincerely, Gary and Sara Geisler St Cloud, MN

Gary Glass

43015

Dear Sirs and Madam: Please find attached as a pdf file my comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement provided to me by Lisa Fay, Mn DNR. Also included is a statement of my qualifications as an expert in environmental science and the chemistry of pollutants, especially mercury. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Gary E. Glass, Phd 218-525-2384 143 Occidental Blvd. Duluth, MN 55804 Attachment - pdf -

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Guttormson

16190

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary H Johnson

16241

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Gary Horning

22374

After reading several editorials and attending the meeting in St Paul, the state should realize that PolyMet will hire the best attorneys available to negotiate clean up and water treatment costs. So should the state. If we simply rely on DNR regulators, we will lose. We need to go outside and hire very aggressive and skilled negotiators that will watch out for the taxpayer. PolyMet only cares about their bottom line, not us. Do not let the state get taken to the cleaners like Uncle Zigi did to Uncle Mark. Gary Horning 13810 26th St N Stillwater MN. 55082 651 430-2058

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Huss

43450

I am writing to voice my absolute disgust with the Polymet project. Northeastern Minnesota, and the BWCAW in particular contain some of the greatest natural places not only in Minnesota, but in the entire nation. Clean air, beautiful forests, and magnificent lakes and streams with high water quality are why people live in this state and why countless numbers of people want to visit here. People don't visit Minnesota and spend their tourist dollars so that they can see how wonderful the open-pit mines are. The NorthMet deposits are located on National Forest System (NFS) lands. NFS land by definition is co-owned by all of the people of the USA, not just Minnesotans. Therefore, this is a decision that can not exclude what is in the best interests of ALL stakeholders involved (not just the less than 2000 people of northeast MN that might get jobs). There is so much more at stake here than the jobs that might be generated from such a project. I understand that the residents in northeast MN would benefit greatly from the jobs, but they are not the only and most important stakeholders that need to be considered here. According to the NorthMet project documents, operations of the mine would only last approximately 20 years. It would create approximately 500 direct jobs during the 18 month peak construction phase and only 360 direct jobs during the operation phase. There would be additional 'indirect' and 'induced' employment of 332 'estimated' additional construction-phase jobs and 631 'estimated' operations-phase jobs. There is the disclaimer that these 'indirect' and 'induced' employment numbers include temporary, part-time, full-time, long-term and short-term positions. There is an added note that states 'Some of the skilled workers would relocate from outside the region'. According to the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) 'it is uncertain how long the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be a very long time'. The 'models' estimate that the water at the mine site will have to be mechanically treated for a minimum of 200 years and at the plant site for a minimum of 500 years (of which you will not be demanding the money to pay for the 500 years of water treatment up front and placed into an escrow account prior to starting the project). I guess you are so desperate to have them tear-up and pollute our State that this never entered the equation. On 3/12/2014, the MPCA was supposed to recommend new standards for sulfate emissions for the protection of the wild rice crop in Minnesota. After two years of studying the issue, they concluded that they aren't certain of how sulfate affects the wild rice crop. In fact, the sulfate may not have any affect on the crop, but it may be when the sulfate settles to the bottom of the lake and becomes sulfide is when the issues affecting the wild rice may be occurring. But, they stated that until they analyze the actual data more thoroughly and more scientists look at it they aren't willing to make any conclusions or set any new standards at this time. Also this week, it was reported that the EPA at the request of the MPCA granted a variance to the Clean Water Act allowing Mesabi Nuggets to release chemicals including sulfate into the environment in northeastern Minnesota. And if not for the lawsuits of some environmental groups, they would still be allowing Mesabi Nuggets to release these chemicals. The EPA issued an apology and said they should have never allowed the variance. These two examples show how difficult it is to know the effects of pollution even a couple years down the road. So now you think that your model of water treatment for 500+ years makes perfectly good sense and can easily be supported by your 'modeled' data. What kind of stewards of our land, water and air are you trying to masquerade behind. No one with any credibility could even dare to extrapolate data from a 'model' projected 500 years out

Gary Johnson

43719

The PolyMet mine will provide a few good jobs for 20 years, or so, and then it will leave behind 500 years of devastation. It would be impossible to escrow enough money to deal with that aftermath. Additionally, it would be absolute insanity to permit something which will leave behind such a huge need for toxic cleanup. Not to mention all the issues that are more important than money-such as the health issues this mine will cause in the while it's in operation. Gary Johnson | President – MAPE Local 501
Saint Paul, Minnesota Office: 651-259-7220 Mobile: 651-983-8108 Personal e-mail: [HYPERLINK "mailto:ibscoinc@msn-com"ibscoinc@msn-com](mailto:HYPERLINK)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Kohls, Md

24027

Mar 4, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please be aware that multinational corporations share most of the characteristics of antisocial personality disordered individuals (aka psychopaths/sociopaths). That means that they tend to lie, cheat and deceive while appearing normal and acting trustworthy. They are motivated by greed, wealth, power and prestige and will do anything necessary (even illegal if they can get away with it) to achieve their goals. Although they often are charismatic, they ultimately lack in empathy. When they are caught in criminal behavior, they usually show no remorse and only compensate their victims for losses when court-ordered to do so. When ordered into therapy/rehabilitation they are very good at pretending to rehabilitate, often fooling even the best psychotherapists or judges. I wrote an essay about the corporation as psychopath, a version of which can be found at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-us-corporation-as-psychopath/5345811> - Please read it thoughtfully before risking becoming a sucker for a Big Lie con job that might make Minnesota regulators a laughingstock in the smoke-filled rooms of the Big Mining bosses of PolyMet. Gary G. Kohls, MD, Duluth, MN PS: Please access another article of mine about the consequences of giving carte blanche to multinational mining corporations at: http://duluthreader.com/articles/2013/03/09/1513_bringing_death_to_your_hometown. It is titled Bring Death to Your Hometown (after the Bruce Springsteen song of the same title). The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Gary Kohls, Md 1306 E 8th St Duluth, MN 55805-1632 (218) 728-9756

49495

Mar 4, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please be aware that multinational corporations share most of the characteristics of antisocial personality disordered individuals (aka psychopaths/sociopaths). That means that they tend to lie, cheat and deceive while appearing normal and acting trustworthy. They are motivated by greed, wealth, power and prestige and will do anything necessary (even illegal if they can get away with it) to achieve their goals. Although they often are charismatic, they ultimately lack in empathy. When they are caught in criminal behavior, they usually show no remorse and only compensate their victims for losses when court-ordered to do so. When ordered into therapy/rehabilitation they are very good at pretending to rehabilitate, often fooling even the best psychotherapists or judges. I wrote an essay about the corporation as psychopath, a version of which can be found at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-us-corporation-as-psychopath/5345811> - Please read it thoughtfully before risking becoming a sucker for a Big Lie con job that might make Minnesota regulators a laughingstock in the smoke-filled rooms of the Big Mining bosses of PolyMet. Gary G. Kohls, MD, Duluth, MN PS: Please access another article of mine about the consequences of giving carte blanche to multinational mining corporations at: http://duluthreader.com/articles/2013/03/09/1513_bringing_death_to_your_hometown. It is titled Bring Death to Your Hometown (after the Bruce Springsteen song of the same title). The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Gary Kohls, Md 1306 E 8th St Duluth, MN 55805-1632 (218) 728-9756

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Maciejewski

20075

To Whom It May Concern: I believe that any sulfide mining in Northeastern Minnesota will not only destroy surface in the area including Lake Superior, but it will also destroy much of the ground water in that area. A substantial part of the economy of Northeastern Minnesota depends on surface water of many lakes including Lake Superior, and obviously ground water is necessary for that economy to prosper. It seems very foolish to put at risk thousands of jobs related to the recreational economy including all the related jobs for a few hundred temporary jobs provided by the sulfide mining project. In addition, many people have retired in Northeastern Minnesota because of the pristine surface water including good ground water for their wells and the related recreational opportunities. Thousands of more jobs have been created in many areas that are the result of numerous people retiring or having a cabin in Northeastern Minnesota. MN Rule 6132-3200 does not allow perpetual treatment: "To receive a permit to mine, the permittee must be able to close the mine in such a way that it is stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impact and release of substances, and is maintenance free." The PolyMet SDEIS states that "long term" (>500 years at the Plant Site and >200 years at the Mine Site) treatment of wastewater is needed which means the site will not be maintenance free at closure. Low sulfur rock (Duluth Complex 0-15% S, Virginia Formation 0-2-1% S) will produce acid mine drainage. The Virginia formation comprises the north wall of the east pit. In-pit disposal of waste rock with sulfur concentrations of 0-2% has required perpetual wastewater treatment for the Zortman Landusky mine in Montana, a superfund site, requiring \$948,000 per year for reclamation maintenance paid for by taxpayers. This would mean that on a related basis the Polymet mine will require over \$500,000,000 of reclamation treatment at the Plant Site and over \$200,000,000 at the Mine Site. If Polymet goes bankrupt after mining that area, Minnesota taxpayers will not be very happy to pay the above mentioned bills. Polymet should be required to set aside at a minimum the above mentioned amount of funds or no mining permit should be issued. Heavy metal leaching is one of the greatest environmental liabilities associated with mining, especially in pristine environments like the Project mine site, that have economically and ecologically valuable natural resources (Reclamation Research Group (Bozeman, MT) for USFWS Anchorage, Alaska, "Acid Mine Drainage and Effects on Fish Health and Ecology: A Review" (2004), Ex. G.) There are no hard rock surface mines that exist today that can demonstrate that heavy metal leaching can be stopped once it occurs on a large scale. (Earthworks Factsheet, "Hardrock Mining: Acid Mine Drainage"). Inaccurate pre-mining characterization and interpretation often results in a failure to predict impacts to water quality and aquatic life. (J.R. Kuipers et al., Comparison of Predicted and Actual Water Quality at Hardrock Mines, 2006). Evidence from literature and field observations suggests that permitting large scale surface mining in sulfide-hosted rock with the expectation that no degradation of surface water will result due to acid generation conveys enormous risk to water quality and fisheries. (Id.) Finally, the word "Moose" does not appear at all in the SDEIS cumulative effects analysis, despite consistent concerns raised by tribal cooperating agency staff to co-lead agency staff during the environmental review process. As of August 19, 2013, moose are now listed as a MNDNR species of concern. Gary J. Maciejewski P.O. Box 323 Lutsen, MN 55612

Gary Markfort

38207

Hello, I am really against this mine. There is no copper mine in existence that has not done extensive damage to the environment. This mine threatens our most important resource, fresh water. Fresh water is more valuable than any other natural resource. We'll I believe the mine is going to happen, regardless of any input against it. Therefore, those who prosper most should be the ones cleaning up the mess and paying back the people of MN for irreparable damage. My firm belief is that the owners of Polymet, (not the company) employees, their subcontractors, individual shareholders, should pledge their personal fortunes to repairing all damage. Once they have pledged and the pledge is in writing, and mn has the right to confiscate their individual fortunes, then they can start mining. To often we hold the company responsible, but companies have an automatic out, they change leadership, they go bankrupt, they just cease to exist We need to hold the individual's responsible and throw away the corporate veil. Thank you for reading this communication. It is a bit extreme, but no freshwater is a very serious business. Freshwater is one of the main reasons I live here. I lived for awhile in Texas where you can not drink the tap water, bathing in it is not real cleansing either. Look at west Virginia near Charlotte. More jobs will be lost in the end than are gained by this mine. Just say no to the mine. Sent from mobile device Gary Markfort Every time you wake up on the right side of the grass; its gonna be a great day.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Meier

39406

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Gary Robinson

54750

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Rost

41557

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

GARY THOMPSON

3234

The expected contamination and water treatment requirement for 500 years cannot be seen as a reasonable trade-off for jobs, and even prosperity, for only 20 years. Moreover, the cost of treatment for 500 years cannot be calculated with any reasonable certainty. How can we expect a company, or a bonding company, or even a state held escrow fund to be available in 500 years. We can't trade our valuable resources for such a ridiculously small return. Gary Thompson 190 Wildhurst Rd Excelsior, MN 55331 952-474-7971

Gary Tubb

40883

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gary Tubb 387 Pinewood Spur Copley, OH 44321-1241 (330) 668-8496

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gary Wernersbach

39740

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gary Wernersbach 26745 128th St NW Zimmerman, MN 55398-4683 (763) 856-5204

Gary Zarling

16206

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gavin Danfelt-Martin

21383

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I would like everyone's parents, children and selfs to be able to drink freely from our refreshing ground water. PolyMet can do better than their current SDEIS. I believe even though the mining will create jobs that doesn't mean that our workers should be subjected to making our groundwater less drinkable. Money and economy are important but at what price. PolyMet is mistaken by relying on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because there are people in this state that care about the environment more than money and have taken time to speak out for the welfare of this clean beautiful state. Keep it clean should be just as important to PolyMet. I'd like to see answer and comments on the following issues with the current PolyMet's SDEIS: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Would it hurt to be very thorough when making sure a resource that keeps us alive stays healthy for us. Sincerely yours, Gavin Danfelt-Martin -a concerned citizen and water drinker Gavin Danfelt-Martin 209 5th St SE #101 Minneapolis, MN 55414

51024

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I would like everyone's parents, children and selfs to be able to drink freely from our refreshing ground water. PolyMet can do better than their current SDEIS. I believe even though the mining will create jobs that doesn't mean that our workers should be subjected to making our groundwater less drinkable. Money and economy are important but at what price. PolyMet is mistaken by relying on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because there are people in this state that care about the environment more than money and have taken time to speak out for the welfare of this clean beautiful state. Keep it clean should be just as important to PolyMet. I'd like to see answer and comments on the following issues with the current PolyMet's SDEIS: • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Would it hurt to be very thorough when making sure a resource that keeps us alive stays healthy for us. Sincerely yours, Gavin Danfelt-Martin -a concerned citizen and water drinker Gavin Danfelt-Martin 209 5th St SE #101 Minneapolis, MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gavin Spraby

41844

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Gavin Spraby Hibbing, Minnesota

Gay Trachsel

6085

Gay Trachsel. POBox 3675 Duluth, MN 55803 218-728-5478 > > > > Sent from my iPad

18335

My name is Trachsel, spelled T-R-A-C-H-S-E-L. I am from Duluth and I'm a scientist and I have worked in the health field for 40 years. My sister died from mesothelioma. She was not a miner. She did live, though, within mining sites and drank the water, as well as breathed the air contaminated with mining particles. I do not see any reference to the major health risks to mining districts and surrounding communities to lifetime exposures. Please, I ask you to include in the SDEIS the risk for workers and the surrounding communities for at least 70 years, as Minnesota uses for guidelines, not for 35 years, as the SDEIS does on Page 5421-426. My sister was older than 30, but she was less than 60 when she died. Also, the projected healthcare costs to the State of Minnesota should be included in this statement and they are not. As a scientist, I know that some assumptions are made because models are used; not actual data. And in making conclusions in this case, the idea that this mine can be 99 percent sure that seepage will be contained and decontaminated and will flow in a certain direction, north, is not a fact, but it is an assumption. The SDEIS needs to prepare a statement with alternative water models and the impact of the seepage that most likely will occur and what contaminants will be in the seepage. This mine is an experiment. The material that is presented in this SDEIS has never occurred in copper-nickel mining anywhere else and it is imperative that alternatives will be looked at that will protect the streams that feed the three watersheds. We are now at the peak fresh water in the world. We can't afford to destroy it. Alternatives are imperative. 300 jobs for 20 years is not a good trade for 500 years of irreversible water contamination. A lot of those jobs will be for contamination cleanup and health care workers. So that at the end we can say, "We poisoned the water, but we created a lot of jobs."

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gay Trachsel

39964

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, I am a health care worker and I have seen the implications of polluted water and air. It is required that the public interest is addressed by Minnesota law. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-sit

Gayathri Ramanathan

38605

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, This is regarding the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS which I feel is inadequate in addressing the public health concerns. I am very concerned about 1)Mercury pollution besides others like manganese, lead and aluminum in water and the fish population 2) air pollution resulting from all the mining-related activities - diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates which are carcinogenic. Plus I think there are huge gaps in the SDEIS on various other pollution concerns. Corporations should take full responsibility and not externalise cost of doing business to the communities/taxpayers by polluting the air and water and our food supplies and causing diseases . I hence request you to reject the SDEIS. Thanks Gayathri Ramanathan 115 2nd avenue south Minneapolis, MN 55401 612-333-7981

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gayl Gustafson

42506

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gayl Gustafson 229 Earl St St Paul, MN 55106

Gayle VanGuilder

43737

3/13/14 I have reviewed the SDEIS for the Polymet Project, and fully approve of the proposed processes and mitigation systems as well as the science used in designing them, and ultimately constructing them. I also believe from an economic standpoint, that expediting the current processes so Polymet could begin construction immediately would bring a desperately needed, immediate economic boost to the Iron Range, not to mention the added benefit of more public lands, through the land exchange. I fully support the SDEIS in its entirety. Gayle J VanGuilder 6853 Wilson Rd Makinen Mn. 55763

Gaylyn Bickug

54160

I do not support Poly Met mining! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Gene

3437

Hello, Poly Met wants to ruin one of Minnesota's true pristine northern forests. Not only will it ruin the Minnesota treasure for generations to come, the pollution from I will be all but irreversible for decades to come. The assurance money that is supposed to be set aside to clear up the pollution and damage caused by mining, won't be there for pollution clean up and restoration of the pristine treasure. Like the tobacco settlement money that was for stop smoking campaigns and to help people quit smoking, the legislature will use that assurance money for other purposes. The jobs created by mining won't be worth the destruction to this Minnesota treasure and the damage to the environment. How will they even start to clean up the pollution this will cause to the ground water. This is an ecological disaster waiting to happen. I would hope that this project would be given the thumbs down. Sincerely, Gene

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gene Betts

18091

I'm Gene Betts. I live in Knife River, Minnesota. I represent myself, and I moved up to Knife River, North Shore area in 1975 because I came from Minneapolis up here almost every single weekends. I love this area. I do support the PolyMet Project. The reason that I think that the PolyMet Project will be a good project and they'll do what they say they're are going to do is because Minnesota has some of the strongest regulating bodies anywhere in the world. Do I trust PolyMet? No. PolyMet would have to build a relationship with me just as any of you would before I would trust you. So I'm depending on these regulatory agencies to do their job. One of the other reasons I think PolyMet will do this is because they're going to spend between \$400 million and \$500 million before they make a nickel. If they don't do their environmental work, they will be shut down and somebody's going to lose \$400 million or someplace along that. Another reason I think they will do their job is because there are four or five other projects similar to this that will be looking at PolyMet, and if they don't do it, those projects won't happen. The environmental area that's impacted I think will end up being cleaner simply because what PolyMet is required to do will help clean up the pollution that's already here. It's been mentioned a couple of times about if this project were built in China, all you got to do is watch your TV about once a week and find out you can't see a block in China. They don't care in China. It's all about money. I want to thank the people who are considered the real environmentalists, although I consider myself a real environmentalist, because they have made this project so much better, and they another reason I believe it will be successful, because they're not going to quit. They're going to keep watching this. One of the other big quality-of-life issues is a living wage, and living wages support all the infrastructure below them. All the service jobs, all our hardware stores, all our garages. Thank you, very much.

18332

My name is Gene Betts. B-E-T-T-S. I live in Knife River, Minnesota. And I represent myself. Little bit of mining history. A lot of people -- hundreds of years the way it sounds -- but I moved here in 1975 so that I could enjoy the quality of life that is available in Northeastern Minnesota. I think it's really important to not just look at the environmental impact statement for what it is. It's really important to look at the regulatory agencies that are going to enforce what PolyMet says it's going to do. Because I truthfully don't trust PolyMet. I truthfully don't trust any of you. You're going to have to work on me pretty hard to get me to trust you. But I do trust these regulatory organizations. And I watched them help clean up Minnesota from when I moved here. I watched them clean up other messes left by other mining organizations. I watched those mining organizations declare bankruptcy. Part of the reason I think PolyMet will work is because somebody is willing to put \$500 million of money before they even open the door, before they make a dime. And if they're in business for 30 days, they can get shut down by a regulatory organization and somebody is going to lose \$500 million. The next thing is, this probably is the first one of these big copper-nickel mining things. And those other companies they don't want PolyMet to fail. If PolyMet fails, they don't get a chance. So I support PolyMet. I support their good jobs. Part of the quality of life in this area is good jobs. Good paying jobs. Part of the tourist industry survives because I'm here in the winter to pay for going to the restaurant and going to those other places. I understand the concern. I love this area. I don't want it to be contaminated or ruined. And I don't believe it will be. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gene Champagne

45593

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. As a Special Education Teacher and Consultant I am keenly aware of the link between heavy metals and learning difficulties in children. I am also aware of the increased risk of cancer from living in the mining ranges of the Upper Great Lakes / Lake Superior Region. We cannot afford to recklessly go forward for a quick economic fix that will not only cost millions and possibly billions of dollars down the road in remedial education and menial job skill training due to health impacts on the central nervous system. The cost of needlessly throwing productive lives away because we rushed forward carelessly without assessing all of our risk and options is unthinkable. The minerals are going nowhere. They will still be in the ground for years to come. The only benefit in rushing into this without assessing all of the risk is to the mining company. The public may end of paying billions in untold costs if we do not do this right. Private profit and socialized costs are an unacceptable violation of the public truSt PLEASE, conduct a Health Impact Assessment before moving forward with this or similar future projects. Best practices net best results. Sincerely, Gene Champagne PO Box 21 Big Bay, MI 49808-0021

Gene Christenson

39260

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. There is no real need, except profit motive, to create tailing ponds that need decades to treat. Why isn't the water treated in real time like other industries. Why are the tailings not put to beneficial use at some other location instead of creating an environmental nightmare that everyone knows PolyMet will eventually walk away from. If proper operations are not financially viable for PolyMet then they should not be doing this project. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gene Christenson 1312 Portland Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-6905 (657) 645-9373

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gene Fowler

46418

I would like to direct my comments not to the specific issue of PolyMet's Environmental Impact Statement, but to the larger issue of copper/nickel mining in Minnesota. I know that this may not what you are looking for, but I want to go on public record as being totally opposed to any copper/nickel/sulfide mining in the state. There has never been a copper mine anywhere in the world, ever, in any environment other than a total desert, that did not leach sulfuric acid into the groundwater. It has never been done and can not be done. Water combines with the sulfides to produce sulfuric acid. Large quantities of sulfuric acid can not be contained over long periods of time. That is an indisputable fact and all one has to know to reject PolyMet's permit application. It doesn't matter what is in their Environment Impact Statement - it is all smoke and mirrors to maintain the fiction that copper mining can be done environmentally safely. It can't. Minnesota should ban all copper/nickel/sulfide mining in the state unless and until it has been proven to be environmentally safe somewhere else. We should not be wasting time and money evaluating meaningless Environment Impact Statements. Meaningless, because they are offered in support of something that can not be done. More specific to PolyMet, why would one ever consider granting a mining permit to a company which has no competency in mining. Here are excerpts from PolyMet's 2013 annual report, signed by Jonathan Cherry, the CEO and Douglas Newby, the CFO: From page 9: "We have had no production history and we do not know if we will generate revenues in the future. While we were incorporated in 1981, we have no history of producing minerals. We have not developed or operated any mines, and we have no operating history upon which an evaluation of our future success or failure can be made. We currently have no mining operations of any kind. Our ability to achieve and maintain profitable mining operations is dependent upon a number of factors, including our ability to successfully build and operate mines, processing plants and related infrastructure ourselves. We may not successfully establish mining operations or profitably produce metals at any of our properties. As such, we do not know if we will ever generate revenues. We have a history of losses, which we expect will continue for the future. If we do not begin to generate revenues we may either have to suspend or cease operations. As a development stage company with no holdings in any producing mines, we continue to incur losses and expect to incur losses in the future. As at January 31, 2013, we had an accumulated deficit of \$88-4 million. We may not be able to achieve or sustain profitability in the future. If we do not begin to generate revenues we may either have to suspend or cease operations. We currently have negative cash flow from operating activities. The Company cannot predict if or when it will operate profitably, to generate positive cash flows." From page 10: "We may not have adequate, if any, insurance coverage for some business risks that could lead to economically harmful consequences to us. Our businesses are generally subject to a number of risks and hazards, including: • industrial accidents; • railroad accidents; • labor disputes; • environmental hazards; • electricity stoppages; • equipment failures, and • severe weather and other natural phenomena. These occurrences could result in damage to, or destruction of, mineral properties, production facilities, transportation facilities, or equipment. They could also result in personal injury or death, environmental damage, waste of resources or intermediate products, delays or interruption in mining, production or transportation activities, monetary losses and possible legal liability. The insurance we maintain against risks that are typical in our business may not provide adequate coverage. Insurance against some risks (including liabil

Gene Smith

38909

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gene Smith 11701 Van Buren St NE Blaine, MN 55434-3062

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Geneva Wychor

45051

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Geneva Wychor Geneva Wychor East 1st Street Apartment 2 Duluth, MN 55812

45053

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Geneva Wychor Geneva Wychor East 1st Street Apartment 2 Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Genya Welch

11400

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Genya Welch 1813 Red Oak Rdg Carver, MN 55315-4568 (952) 448-0535

11401

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Genya Welch 1813 Red Oak Rdg Carver, MN 55315-4568 (952) 448-0535

11404

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Genya Welch 1813 Red Oak Rdg Carver, MN 55315-4568 (952) 448-0535

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Genya Welch

16624

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Genya Welch 1813 Red Oak Ridge Carver, MN 55315

50014

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Genya Welch 1813 Red Oak Ridge Carver, MN 55315

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Geoff Lynn

15975

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I've lived in Minnesota now for close to 7 years. I grew up in a state (Montana) where the legacy of mining has dotted the land with Superfund sites including many where the water will need to be treated perpetually. While jobs and the economy are important, resource extraction provides temporary benefits, typically at long term cost to the environment and to many who will never benefit from the economic impact. Mining companies have a long track record of irresponsibility, regardless of the promises they make. I am against this development and am strongly urging my friends and family in Minnesota to voice their opposition. Sincerely, Mr Geoff Lynn 1605 Marshall Ave Apt B Saint Paul, MN 55104-6205 (406) 431-7286

Geoffrey Gates

18338

I am Geoffrey Gates, G-E-O-F-F-R-E-Y G-A-T-E-S. I went to college here and went to medical school here. I didn't live here for 25 years and then I came back. And the reason I came back was partly "Minnesota Nice." This is incredibly a heated (phonetic) topic, and yet people clap for one side or another. And this is incredible, actually absolutely incredible, and I thank you all. My comments are I am opposed to this particular proposal, but I'm for resource management. I am proud of this state for having honest regulatory agencies, with democrats, republicans, and even wrestlers. I am very proud that this steel from this state built the nation, the forest built the nation. We still have an extraordinary state to live in up here in the northeast. This project is different, though, for us or for iron mining. This has a toxic waste, which has to be cared for almost as long as this continent has been around. Well, Christopher Columbus, 1492 -- that even goes back before Washington. Okay, that's 500 years. Um, we have difficulty with financial assurance for something as simple as teacher pension funds. They were fully funded 20, 30 years ago, and now the taxpayers may have to bail them out for reasons that -- oh, I don't for certain understand it. But it has to be done. How are we going to take care of this toxic material long after this company is gone? Twice the length of the country. We do need these materials. In World War II there were nickel issues in armor, copper issues in shell casings, so what we did is we went to our coins and we took the nickel out of circulation and we put it in different materials, we took the penny out of circulation and we made it out of different materials, because we needed the nickel and the copper, the nickel. We took that out of circulation. If we are really that desperate, we can look at the 140 million or billions of pennies that are out there, we can look at the 40 billion nickels that are out there, which have more copper and nickel than this mine can produce. It is not that critical; the tailings are. Thank you.

Geoffrey Rich

46061

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, After reviewing the details, even with slight economic reasons, I believe the proposed mining is too risky to our unique resources in Minnesota, and I am fairly conservative in beliefs and would still agree with this. I am an outdoors-man, hunter, fisher, and Eagle Scout. Although I am all for other projects which can help the national and state economic resources, and eliminate our foreign dependence, I do not think this mining should happen at this time. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Geoffrey Rich 11460 17th Pl NE Saint Michael, MN 55376-4237 (763) 242-8101

george crolick

43222

Risks are high-, Our track record is poor-,No cost in delaying-, environment is worth more than economic benefits. George Crolick Property Owner Northern Minnesota

George Gordon

21989

Just when did I "provide comments" on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. I do not recall doing so. Thank you. George J. Gordon On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 6:34 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George Greene

57987

Just think about the fact that none of us will be here 500 yrs from now. What will those people think of our decisions today. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

George Halvorson

6285

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Don't put your faith in PolyMet's willingness or ability to satisfy future claims in the event that something goes wrong. A brief survey of pollution litigation should inform you that even where states are able to claw back compensation for environmental pollution, they spend an enormous amount of money doing so and the return rarely reflects the damage done. As the population of MN grows, the Boundary Waters will only increase as an economic resource for the state. Don't risk them. Best, Charles Former employee of Gunflint Lodge and a longtime enjoyer of the BWCA George Halvorson 131 W 110th Street Apt. 6F New York, NY 10026

George Illegible

58002

The cost to our future are not balanced with the short-term benefits that will be provided to private investors. This asymmetrical ____ guarantees that the public will bear the costs without compensation. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George Johnson

16192

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

George L Withbroe

54847

See attachment

George Lah

6601

As a resident of NE Minnesota since 1960, I have seen many ups and downs economically and environmentally. While the pendulum has swung positively and negatively for both concerns we generally are able to maintain a healthy balance. The natural resources of our area are the basis for the majority of our economy. Not only from an environmental/tourism standpoint, but also from a harvest/production standpoint. I applaud both sides of the issues regarding the Polymet proposal for their hard work and diligence. Because of the concerns on both sides I believe that a healthy balance has been reached. Polymet can and will provide essential metals to the global economy and will do so in an environmentally conscious fashion. Now is the time to move ahead with this project for the people of NE Minnesota. George A. Lah 805 W Prospect Ave Cloquet, MN 55720 218 393-8045 glah@compudyne-net

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George Logan

46917

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("PolyMet SDEIS") fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction of t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George R. Dunn

42992

To Whom It May Concern: See below and attached my Public Comments on Proposed PolyMet Mining Project: Public Comments on Proposed PolyMet Mining Project From: George R. Dunn 1707 Taylor Avenue, Saint Paul, MN 55104 (651) 224-7687 HYPERLINK "mailto:grdunn@juno-com"grdunn@juno-com I write to urge the Minnesota DNR to reject the draft EIS and to eventually deny any permits for the proposed project. It is time for the debate about sulfite mining to end. This project and the other numerous proposed sulfite mining projects are dangerous, destructive, and divisive. This proposal and other perspective projects create an unacceptable risk to the environment and ecosystems of northeast Minnesota. For my public comments regarding the proposed PolyMet Mining Project, please note the following: The comment period should be extended. The shortened public comment period should be extended to at least the customary length of time. Although this is an amended Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"), the issues and complexities of the project demand that the comment period be extended. The amended EIS is essentially a complete workover of the original EIS. The volume of material, complexities of the issues, evolving revelations, and recently discovered discrepancies all demand that the comment period be extended. Information has come out since the release of the draft EIS calling into question issues of hydrology assumptions, effectiveness of the reverse osmosis process, and the plan for future water treatment. These issues are of such significance that meaningful public input can only be achieved through an extension of the current comment deadline. Failure to explain the long-term plan. The applicant's failure to explain the plan for long-term water treatment is a fatal defect in the proposal. Although the EIS, itself, also fails to identify the length of time water treatment will be necessary, all parties agree that water treatment will be needed for essentially an indefinite period of time (eg, 500+ years). It is sobering to think that the State of Minnesota would even contemplate relying on a corporation to treat water for 500+ years in connection with a mining project that is scheduled to last 20 years. Time and time again across this country and throughout the world corporations have made promises similar to what PolyMet has made in its proposal, yet in every instance they have failed to follow through. The current state of corporate and bankruptcy law is such that there are no legally binding mechanisms to get a commitment from PolyMet (or its multinational corporate overlords) to treat the water for the length of time that will be necessary. The inevitable conclusion is that the financial responsibility for treating the impacted water will fall on the shoulders of the taxpayers of the State of Minnesota. This future financial obligation that would be assumed by the taxpayers of this state far outweighs any possible economic advantage the state and/or its people would benefit from by granting PolyMet the right to use the state's mineral resources and water. Additionally, the EIS fails to outline what sort of financial assurances and security PolyMet would be required to post in order to go forward with the project. I would submit that there are no financial assurances or security that PolyMet could offer that could possibly balance out the future cost of water treatment and, more importantly, the future cost of remediation that would be required in the case of an environmental disaster. Additionally, with the increase in the frequencies of severe weather events it seems increasingly likely that a catastrophic event like a dike rupture or a containment pond overflow is likely. Let us not forget the rain that fell in Duluth in June of 2012- Questions regarding the effectiveness of the proposed reverse osmosis process. Recent information from independent experts call into question the effectiveness of th

George Rounds

28780

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have been lucky enough to have canoed Boundary Waters Area on many occasions and find it to be one of the most pristine areas in the midWest if not the nation. It would be criminal, in my opinion, to permit any mining of resources in the region that would contaminate, and eventually kill, this national treasure, So please do not allow the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental to operate anywhere near this treasured land. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, George Rounds 2735 Park Pl # D Evanston, IL 60201-1336 (847) 864-5671

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George Salner

16094

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

George W Miller

54558

Remember Silver Bay & Reserve M [illegible] dumping asbestos rock & water into Lake Superior. Thanks to Myles Lord the man responsible. Thank you for stopping this tragedy. In 201 Duluth Metals signed a \$227 million agreement with a Chilean firm to advance mining 3 miles from the wilderness. PolyMet Mining Corp a Canadian Co has never actually operated a mine. Please stop this from happening. Do not permit the damage which will take over 2000 years and for 20 years of mining?

George Withbroe

43048

To: Tim Dabney, U.S. Forest Service Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Ave. Place Duluth, MN 55808 From: George Withbroe, Ph.D. Subject: The proposed PolyMet mine. I am deeply concerned about the proposal to develop a large copper-nickel sulfide mine near the BWCA, or, for that matter anywhere in Minnesota. It appears that this mine will be a major source of pollution, particularly to water. How can we develop a mine which will be a major source of toxic pollutants for hundreds of years, a mine which will have a high probability of becoming a financial burden to the taxpayers for decades after the owners of the mine have made their profits and left the state. For a decade I was a senior executive at NASA headquarters. I am well aware of how things go wrong on complicated projects, failures resulting from unanticipated problems which occur in spite of intense efforts to have a failsafe system. I doubt that a mining company whose primary goal is financial gain will be as careful as is required when dealing with a product that offers so many opportunities to produce destructive, long lasting, toxic pollutants. This is a beautiful state. Its beauty and wonderful natural resources should not be compromised by an industry that has a well earned reputation for being environmentally unfriendly. I have a daughter and four grandsons living in Minnesota. What legacy will we leave them? George L. Withbroe

Alphabetical by sender's first name

George Wollenburg

31663

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. It is short sighted to risk long term damage to a pristine area that presently is heavy into tourism. To be risking centuries of damage for an industry that will only exist while it is profitable to themselves is a morally corrupt thought. What little the residents of Minnesota might gain from this industry will be long forgotten when PolyMet abruptly shuts down and leaves an environmental mess. If PolyMet is anything like similar industries, they will respond with a huge team of lawyers that will fight every effort in court rather than doing anything. No man made correction to fix an environmental disaster will ever approach what nature gave us from the start. Sincerely, George Wollenburg 19646 Ulysses St NW Elk River, MN 55330-2135 (763) 441-3233

George Young

42915

Please see the attached letter in support of PolyMet. Thanks and regards, George Young

Georgia Anderson

57930

This pristine area in Northeastern Minnesota must not be destroyed for a few bits of metal--wetlands, wildlife, forests must be preserved--This mine abuts the Boundary Area, which is known and appreciated worldwide--Our family has canoed the Boundary Waters many times. Too spectacular to be desecrated. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Georgiana Anderson

39024

From: georgiana anderson [mailto:simba@backpack-net] Sent: Saturday, March 08, 2014 3:50 PM To: Stine, John (MPCA) Subject: PolyMet I write because the proposed PolyMet mining project is a dismal idea and one that evades any proper Environmentally-sound treatment. The very idea that you could get PolyMet to be responsible in 500 years for the degradation that will follow that mine, is ridiculous and obscene. The environmental issues/problems will arise immediately and will need to be addressed immediately. The areas that support Wild Rice culture will be affected and may never be reversed if sulfide is allowed to invade those Wild Rice wetlands. So we will lose a uniquely Minnesota treasure not to mention the damage that the Native Americans would sustain to their history and legacy. Sulfide mining will have other more insidious results, Sulfuric Acid. Is that something we want to produce. Not that way. There is another treasure that will be threatened, a national park that draws in people from all over the country and Europe, The Boundary Waters. Those lakes are vulnerable to acid drainage and toxic metal as are indeed, the Wild Rice growing areas, and the water supply for communities around the proposed mine. The Environmental Review process should be lengthened. This is too complicated an issue to be hurried along. You need to take the time to evaluate. There are very few pros to this plan. Only one that I can think of and that is jobs. Well, lot of jobs will be created for people cleaning up this mess forever and ever. Is that the way we want to develop jobs. I hardly think so. Why did the EPA give the PolyMet EIS a failing grade. Why is Minnesota not paying attention. Why is the Minnesota Environmental Review board complicit in this process. There is only one answer; corrupt politics and ignorance. There is only one solution: deny a permit. Thank You, Georgiana Anderson Georgiana Anderson, 436 Holly Ave, St Paul, Mn. 55102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Georgiana Anderson

41795

-Poly Met is predicted to be a hazard that may still be a threat for 500 years. PolyMet is going to put up enough money to deal with this degradation for the next 500 years. I doubt that that can be accomplished. -Wild Rice requires clean water and sulfide will kill the rice if it invades the Wild Rice wetlands. They are a unique treasure for Minnesotans with great meaning for Native American's history and legacy.. -When sulfide is mined, it has the potential to produce Sulphuric Acid. -The Boundary Waters are visited by Americans and Europeans. This tourism brings money to the state. Those waters are vulnerable to acid drainage and toxic metals. The Environmental Review process needs to be extended. The period allowed is too short. This is too important for Minnesota for it to be cut short. -I have heard that the EPA gave the PolyMet EIS a failing grade. All the more reason for the period to be extended. The permit should be denied. -I understand that this means jobs. 500 years of jobs cleaning up the mess. Thank You, Georgiana Anderson

54720

See attachment

Gerald Brown

19915

I support the PolyMet Project. My concerns for environmental protection have been satisfied. The economic benefits of this project and protection of the environment are not mutually exclusive. I urge approval and permitting by all governmental agencies charged with responsibility for NorthMet permitting. Gerald J. Brown Attorney at Law, # 001199X 8820 Deer Run Drive Victoria, Minnesota 55386 Mobile: 218-31 .0-1672- Fax: 888-634-2038 HYPERLINK "mailto:geraldjohnbrown@gmail-com"geraldjohnbrown@gmail-com ..

Gerald Casey

54118

I do NOT support PolyMet mining. I believe they will leave ground water polluted for a millenium and the state will be stuck with the cleanup bill. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Gerald Erickson

54119

We believe the environmental review process has NOT been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will NOT ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Therefore we oppose the mining project. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Gerald Krueger

54125

I believe the environmental review process has NOT been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will NOT ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will NOT address potential environmental impacts and will NOT meet all state and federal regulations. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Gerald L Sundberg

57210

Until it can be proven that no run off will be done, I'd say no to mining. Also I see a problem for others as well. If they don't mine here they'll just make a mess somewhere else. We need these minerals and the jobs they create, but at whose expense? Either fix the problem or chance our life styles. Gerald L. Sundberg 2507 Lauren Rd Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gerald Nadreau 38975

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gerald Nadreau 24191 Dial Ave Tomah, WI 54660-4328

Gerald Robert Arnebeck 54886

See attachment

Gerald S Stiff 42734

See attachment

Gerald Striegel 38890

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Gerald Striegel 400 Beacon Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-3526

38973

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gerald Striegel 400 Beacon Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-3526 (651) 603-8721

Gerald Wambach 38804

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gerald Wambach 51871 169th Ave Bemidji, MN 56601-9608 (218) 333-0891

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Geraldine Davidson

57349

My name is Geraldine Davidson. They said that this pollution being created is a new type of pollution to this area. According to the studies, they say it's in compliance. My concern is the accumulation or the cumulative effect of all of these different pollutions that are in compliance, but added together, what types of health complications are there? Especially since it is new, they just probably don't know yet. Because they said none of them are related to cancer, but there are other problems. For example, there is a study out of Canada that methylmercury, a byproduct of mining, is in our streams. They have now made a link that it suppresses your body's natural ability to break down plaque. And so now they are finding that methylmercury is contributing to cardiovascular disease because of the plaque not being able to be broken down. So what responsibility will the company have when they do make this link in the future, 50 years from now, when they make a link of the different health problems that are created by this new pollution? Now I am changing subjects here. The mineral rights, how much are they paying? The mineral rights that they are mining? Because they are going to be destroying that land. How much are they going to be making in the open market versus how many union jobs will there be for the total number of jobs that are created? How many of those are going to be union wages, with benefits, compared to their profits? My concern, too, is the quality of the air. They claim that they are going to be cleaning it, but are they going to have natural ways to clean up the land? Other than the usual methods of pollution control, such as probably having filters and that kind of stuff. But what other efforts or measures will they take to help clean the air and clean the water from all of this? Like planting more trees. I know they say they will have containment measures in place, in reservoirs, and all of their safety containment, but who is responsible 50 years from now when it breaks down and all of that pollution is brought out into the environment? Who is going to be paying for that? Who is going to be paying for the health complications that people just don't know are there? Like mesothelioma, they didn't know about it back when those miners were working. Now, is the mining company paying for their health or is it the government; us, the taxpayers? One last thing is that some of the land that they want to mine is next to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. I oppose this Land Exchange because it will ruin that pristine area. Okay. That is it.

Geraldine Polasky

41622

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Geraldine Polasky Gheen, Minnesota

geri

43993

I forgot to put down my address, could you please add to my comment. Kendall L Johnson 27 6th Street NE Crosby MN 56441 [HYPERLINK "mailto:ger64@charter-net"](mailto:ger64@charter-net)ger64@charter-net 218-772-0206 From: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 12:14 PM To: [HYPERLINK "mailto:ger64@charter-net"](mailto:ger64@charter-net)geri Subject: RE: I support PolyMet Mining Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Alphabetical by sender's first name

geri 44087

To whom it may concern, I come from three generations of miners from all over the Iron Range in Minnesota. I know you have seen all sorts of comments both pro and con about the PolyMet project. Both to save your time and not give you a load of baseless conjecture and stats about pollution and destruction of the earth I have only one comment. Take a look at the Cuyuna Iron Range in Crosby MN which is now a state recreation area. The mining started here in the early 1900 and ended in 1985, and is now a state recreation area with Trout fishing, boating, canoeing, and Mountain Biking. If the mining industry could do there job and leave us this wonderful rec area with old and outdated technology just think what we can do today. The benefits for this project will be seen for hundreds of years. If the committee wants to see a beautiful old mining area come to Crosby MN and take a look you will not be disappointed, There is no reason to not proceed with Polymets plan. Thank you Kendall L Johnson US Army ret 218-772-0206 [HYPERLINK "mailto:ger64@charter-net"ger64@charter-net](mailto:ger64@charter-net)

geri Jensen 20205

Feb 26, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. February 26, 2014 As a biologist and a resident of northern Minnesota, and with a mining engineer in the family, I have reviewed the options and submit a strong plea against the PolyMet copper-nickel mining proposal for our northern Minnesota. As a major retirement destination with an ever increasing tourism industry northern Minnesota depends on a sustained natural environment with exceptional fresh water quality which is in direct conflict with the proposed mining. Creating the mine itself would first destroy thousands of acres of living plant and animal life and jeopardize the fresh water system which supports all life. There is no acceptable land trade or replacement of such destroyed communities. When we are so concerned and protective of our water resources that we demand a permit to add a 6'X8' deck on a house and disallow building an outhouse, how can PolyMet possibly rank consideration. What about common good. And jobs. When our nation permitted environmental destruction to build the Panama Canal and dams such as the Grand Coulee, we had less knowledge of ecology, and there were presumed centuries of benefit expected. This is not the case with mining. Mining by its very purpose is an extraction process, finite, non-renewable, take and run with all mines at some point abandoned. A civil engineer friend describes mining as the rape of the earth. PolyMet would have a few decades at best and would begin and end leaving a wake of destruction. There is no proven, safe and lasting containment method nor treatment, and there are always mishaps, accidents, acts of God, and mistakes made. The cost of any is far greater than the benefits. Money can't fix it. How desperate can we be. What national crisis or need could be so dire as to entice the DNR to even consider a permit to deliberately destroy a well-functioning and highly valued resource, a Parthenon of nature. Some have held up a cell phone to illustrate our need for copper and other valued minerals for high tech devices. Then we should be less careless with the copper we alrea

Geri Wellem's 39317

I was born and raised on the Iron Range. I am 100% opposed to copper/nickel mining in MN. Our environment is more important than jobs. I remember Reserve Mining and I have been to Milepost 7- As usual, the mining companies will take what they want and leave us with environmental damage that will be with us for eternity. All for a few jobs for a few years. I say NO. Geri Wellem's Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Germain Walseth

45182

What does the MN DNR stand for. If not to protect and manage our natural resources. I am appalled that the MN DNR is allowing mining companies to pollute our natural resources FOREVER. And for what.. I am a resident of Ely, Mn and have lived in Ely, MN for 18 years. Before that, in Minneapolis for 10 years. I am so grateful to have enjoyed 28 years of Minnesota's beautiful natural resources and I am ashamed and saddened that future generations will never know the Minnesota that I have known. The mining companies WILL pollute our water, air and land. It's what they do. And mining companies will get out of paying for all the damage they have done. It's what they do BEST It's unfortunate that you will allow sulfide mining. As well as not extending the comment period. Not allowing MN tax payers a chance to voice our concerns. Obviously, it doesn't matter what the MN tax payers think, you've already made up your mind. Sulfide mining must NOT be allowed in MN. Germain Walseth Ely, MN

Gerri Williams

18330

Good evening. My name is Gerri Williams, G-E-R-R-I. And I'm a resident of Duluth. I'm not Slovenian. My most recent position was as a research associate at the Water Resource Research Institute in Washington, DC. But I represent no organization. I speak for myself. I grew up enjoying the beauty that Minnesota offers. I'm now a Duluth resident. I'm grateful for the stewardship of previous generations who passed on this heritage to me. I am not anti-mining. I recognize the benefits of the tools and technologies of modern life that enable (inaudible), including that of mining. But the public interest demands that a mining operation must prove it's appropriate to drain the location and then minimize risk to the natural habitat and to human communities. It is very troubling the proposed mine located on one of the state's most sensitive and environmental rich areas of wetlands is an open-pit mine. PolyMet (inaudible) natural resources has rejected the approach of an underground mine. The mine site itself would destroy 913 acres of wetlands and endanger more than 7,000 plus acres of surrounding wetlands. What I would add is that we really have to accept what PolyMet says on faith, because PolyMet has never operated a copper mine before. That's right. A fledging untested company is going to experiment with the health and safety of our water as part of its learning curve. Minnesota officials recognize the importance of wetlands as stated in section 103A202 stating, "The legislature finds that it is public interest to preserve the wetlands of the state to conserve surface water, maintain water quality, and promote comprehensive and total water management planning." In conclusion, it is a given the open-pit mining method that PolyMet proposes will harm wetlands. I ask the co-leading agencies to take into account that just five years ago the citizens of this state voluntarily agreed to raise their own taxes to fund a 25-year effort to enhance, protect, and restore water quality in Minnesota. Preserving wetlands must be considered crucial to this goal.

42845

See attachment

43376

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a Duluth resident, I have spent months of reviewing materials, both pro and con, about the proposed Polymet mine—articles, videos, letters to the editor, and the SDEIS executive summary and appended documents. I have also spoken at one of the public meetings. To me it comes down to the extensive – and potentially permanent – damage to wetlands, watersheds, animal habitat and human health that such a mine (like all other copper mines) would inflict. This is balanced against the possibility of a handful of comparatively short-term jobs and the efficacy of an untested mining conglomerate operate to avoid this damage. The record is clear that every copper mine in the world leaves in its wake destruction and damage that lingers for decades, and could persist for centuries. It is apparently the case that safe copper mining is an impossibility in its present state of development, and that reverse osmosis and other improved technologies remain unproven at the scale and duration required for industrial mining. In the case of Minnesota, copper mining situated in sensitive wetlands would add to the potential disaster. Please help Minnesota maintain its record as a forward-looking, environmentally strong model for the nation and the world. Please deny the permit for the proposed Polymet copper mine. Sincerely yours, Gerri Williams Gerri Williams 326 N. 12th Avenue E Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gerri Williams 43379

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a Duluth resident, I have spent months of reviewing materials, both pro and con, about the proposed Polymet mine—articles, videos, letters to the editor, and the SDEIS executive summary and appended documents. I have also spoken at one of the public meetings. To me it comes down to the extensive – and potentially permanent – damage to wetlands, watersheds, animal habitat and human health that such a mine (like all other copper mines) would inflict. This is balanced against the possibility of a handful of comparatively short-term jobs and the efficacy of an untested mining conglomerate operate to avoid this damage. The record is clear that every copper mine in the world leaves in its wake destruction and damage that lingers for decades, and could persist for centuries. It is apparently the case that safe copper mining is an impossibility in its present state of development, and that reverse osmosis and other improved technologies remain unproven at the scale and duration required for industrial mining. In the case of Minnesota, copper mining situated in sensitive wetlands would add to the potential disaster. Please help Minnesota maintain its record as a forward-looking, environmentally strong model for the nation and the world. Please deny the permit for the proposed Polymet copper mine. Sincerely yours, Gerri Williams Gerri Williams 326 N. 12th Avenue E Duluth, MN 55805

54845

See attachment

54883

See attachment

Gerrit Crouse 7135

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, PolyMet's proposed NorthMet open-pit mining project is the 1st of many attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeast MN. The initial draft EIS was harshly criticized by EPA. The supplemental draft EIS proposes irreversible environmental damages and should be denied. The mine would include 3 open pits, 2 at depths of 600 feet. 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would be eliminated in the region, which has already lost many 1000s of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is now home to dramatically declining lynx and moose. The sdeIS vaguely acknowledges the mine would "adversely impact" 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat, which is critical lynx habitat. It barely mentions moose, except to acknowledge the mine "will affect moose individuals." Affect, as in extirpate. Lakes and streams near and downstream of the mine site already violate state water-quality standards. To meet standards for sulfates, mercury, and other chemical poisons and pollutants, the sdeIS acknowledges PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for 500 years. But it doesn't explain just how PolyMet can assure funds will be available for 100s of years after the mine has closed. According to EPA hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry: 40% of Superfund sites are now devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The sdeIS gives no answers. It doesn't ask the question. The proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest The Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited here. But it is proposing to exchange these lands to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. It has provided no information to demonstrate that this is in the public interest This sdeIS should be rejected. I write as an emeritus member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS). Reference: "Summary for Decision-Makers", /Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Synthesis/ (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005). Gerrit Crouse 38 4th Avenue Nyack, NY 10960 US

Gerry Gingles 39745

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Boundary Waters are a state and national treasure please don't sacrifice them for the almighty dollar. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gerry Gingles 405 3rd St E Canby, MN 56220-1517 (507) 223-5773

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gerry Gingles 48895

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Boundary Waters are a state and national treasure please don't sacrifice them for the almighty dollar. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gerry Gingles 405 3rd St E Canby, MN 56220-1517 (507) 223-5773

Gerry Rosenberg 39811

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Gerry Rosenberg 6825 Harold Ave Golden Valley, MN 55427-4927

Gerry Snyder 42826

See attachment

42880

See attachment

54756

See attachment

54833

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gib Ahlstrand

47507

Hello, I am simply forwarding the 3 points about some sketchy financial details in the Polymet mining proposal as expressed today by my State representative, Phyllis Kahn. I completely agree with these concerns and urge that they be given serious consideration before this project is approved or even allowed to go ahead into the Permit to Mine phase. Sincerely, Gib Ahlstrand, 50 Barton Ave SE, Mpls. MN 55414- I. In chapter 3, pages 136 to 138, you list information that includes the preliminary cost estimate of closure. The source cited is "Foth 2013-" I've looked at the Foth memo cited in the SDEIS. The Minnesota DNR has simply copied information from PolyMet's hired consultant without confirming or fact-checking their work. If the Minnesota DNR and its co-lead agencies are unable to fact-check the work they presented on financial assurance, how are we to expect that they are capable of the adequately protecting the citizens of Minnesota. II. This project should not go forward unless a third-party insurer, such as Lloyd's of London, can be found. The simple fact is, if a third-party private entity will not take on PolyMet, the state shouldn't. Private insurers have expertise in managing risk that the State of Minnesota can't match. Additionally, policymakers could tap the assurance funds for other purposes. Private insurance is clearly superior to a state managed approach in this case. III. In the SDEIS you say that financial assurance will be done in the Permit to Mine stage. Looking at the most recent MinnTac Permit to Mine document, there is one short paragraph on financial assurance. This project shouldn't go forward without robust public debate, and the opportunity for legislative hearings, if what we can expect is a paragraph from the DNR in the Permit to Mine phase. You must ensure that the public, including financial experts and those elected to represent the citizens of Minnesota, have a chance to weigh in on financial assurance. It has not been your practice to do so in the past; will it be in this case.

Gil Baldich

18356

Hi there. I would like to start off by saying this is not a project, it is an experiment. It has never been done in Minnesota. I am Gil Baldich (phonetic). I am from Ely, Minnesota. I am in a band with the Baldich nephews and I am good friends with them. He was saying that China has a lot of copper right now, and that's funny, because that copper is from here and is going to go to China. So, to give them more copper doesn't make sense to me. And then I would like to talk about mining as well. I have grown up and seen them swimming in the mine pools. You know, that is a different kind of mining. That is iron ore mining. This is a completely different kind of thing. It is like fishing. Like I always remind people like crab fishing and salmon fishing, they are completely different things, but you can't be a salmon fisherman and fishing for crabs. It is completely different. Now I got to get to my paper because I only have two minutes. I was born and raised in Bemidji, Minnesota and I was a college student at St. Scholastica in Duluth. I am very concerned about the effects this so-called mining project will have on my home. Not very far away from this PolyMet mining site, the effect on the (inaudible) Tailings Basin. It will be four times (phonetic) more higher in the groundwater than the levels currently are. At the LTV tailings basin, manganese is far above Minnesota's health risk limit, but that is also expected to increase by 45 percent (phonetic). All of this is on SDEIS Page 159, Chapter 5 (phonetic). Lead (phonetic) in drinking water is known can cause brain damage. Manganese can cause neurological damage and reduce IQ in children. (Reading.) This is very alarming to my family and me because PolyMet in the EIS reports that 27 (inaudible) wells downstream of the tailings basin. As citizens, your town will be drinking this water. And some of those wells already have high levels of toxic metals. SDEIS Chapter 4, "(inaudible) does not contain any knowledge whether or not pollution from tailings basin affect these wells." (Reading.) The SDEIS must be redone to analyze any impact from the tailings basin groundwater of the wells my family and friends drink from. Why has there not been an analysis of the pollution of the drinking water of the Minnesota citizens just downstream from the tailings basin? What is protecting the water that my family and friends and daughter drink from year-round and day after day. Go Ely.

Giminon Nahgahnub

42653

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gina Everett

44868

Hello my name is Gina Everett. I am a lifelong resident of the state of Minnesota and I have a few concerns that I am hoping can be addressed. I believe the Polymet SDEIS is inadequate in the following areas: •It does not adequately look at reducing impacts to wetlands by considering underground mining vs. open pit mining. Economic feasibility is not supposed to be the primary factor for alternative methods in an EIS. •What evidence is there that the proposed treatment of contaminated water by reverse osmosis actually works on projects of this scale. •The water treatment process is not specific enough. What are the plans for the toxic sludge generated by reverse osmosis. How is the reverse osmosis system guaranteed to keep up with the quantity and continuous supply of contaminated water. •The proposed wetland reclamation and regeneration would not equal the high quality wetlands that the mine will destroy. •What are the effects on human health, especially in the unborn and very young, of exposure to the pollutants emitted into the air and water, especially as these pollutants accumulate to higher levels. •What insurance is there against underground drinking water contamination and what procedures will be followed to clean up any contamination that occurs. •As abundant clean water becomes more scarce world-wide and thus more valuable, this resource should be weighted higher for impact considerations the farther the timeline of impacts goes into the future. For example, clean water is likely to be more economically and environmentally valuable 100 years from now than it is today, therefore, any long term negative impacts done now should be assessed as more harmful than is currently considered. •What are the health risks to employees who are exposed to sulfide mining conditions. •What is the potential for soil contamination away from the mine site and what health risks are present for people who come into contact with this soil, especially for those growing their own food. •The Superior National Forest is a national asset and the proposed land exchange is not adequate compensation for US citizens. •How will the survival and reintroduction of rare species found in the disturbed wetlands be assured after mine closure. •Adequate funding is not guaranteed in the event of any environmental accidents while the mine is still operating or for the extensive period of water treatment needed after the mine closes. I am a mother and plan on raising my children here in Minnesota where I also hope my children can raise their children. So i'm sure you can see why these issues would be of my concern. Thank you My email address is GMOMMYEVERETT@GMail-com

Gina Holje

38539

March 6, 2014 Attention: Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Environmental Review Unit, 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25- St Paul, MN 55155-4025 RE: Public / Written Comment re the PolyMet Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Dear Ms Fay, Please include the below comments to the public record regarding PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mining project and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("SDEIS"). Any environmental impact assessment (draft, supplemental, or final) that fails to comprehensively analyze the issue of "financial assurance" in the context of addressing pollution remediation / treatment work for up to the 500-year period that this project's lingering effects will require is a completely inadequate review. It therefor fails to comply with the legal requirements for adequate environmental review under both federal and state law. The time for the responsible parties producing the SDEIS to perform a detailed analysis of this issue is now long past due, and cannot wait until the permitting process commences. Until and unless the public has an opportunity to provide comment on a comprehensive analysis of the "financial assurance" issue, the true possible environmental impacts of the PolyMet project cannot be known. If the DNR is incapable of providing this analysis now, then it is self-evident that that agency is unfit to do its job as the lead party in performing the environmental review. Respectfully submitted, Gina Holje, 5333 Oliver Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55419, gholje@usa-net

Gina Lauria

42056

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Gina Lauria 41 W Walnut Ave Painesville, OH 44077-2923

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gina Lauria

42057

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gina Lauria 41 W Walnut Ave Painesville, OH 44077-2923

42058

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gina Lauria 41 W Walnut Ave Painesville, OH 44077-2923

42059

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gina Lauria 41 W Walnut Ave Painesville, OH 44077-2923

42062

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gina Lauria 41 W Walnut Ave Painesville, OH 44077-2923

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gina Marano

39519

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gina Mckenzie

5676

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Gina McKenzie 602 4th St NE Minneapolis, MN 55413 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gina Mckenzie

16294

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

gina rueck

40405

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, gina rueck schinkelst reutlingen, ot 72768 DE

Ginga Newton

40038

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please don't put our natural resources in jeopardy. We live in a valuable area and don't need to have any of our water resources contaminated. Sincerely, Ginga Beza Newton 5814 Elinor St Duluth, MN 55807 Sincerely, Ms Ginga Newton 5814 Elinor St Duluth, MN 55807-1215 (218) 390-1694

Ginner Ruddy

43062

March 7, 2014 Dear Mr. Dabney, For the past 35 summers I have taken at least 1 canoe trip in the BWCA. The Wilderness is a place of refuge for me—it makes my heart sing. Please protect this incredible place by not supporting the PolyMet proposal. We owe this to future generations. Thank you Ginner Ruddy

54751

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ginner Ruddy 54752

See attachment

58048

We must protect our land! Please do not let mining take place Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Ginner T Ruddy 54753

See attachment

Ginny 43087

I wish to voice my support for the Polymet project. I have lived in the Ely area for 59 years. I love the area and trust that the state and federal agencies will do their job and protect our air and water. Enough is enough. Please get in with the permitting process and allow our area to gain hundreds of jobs so that our children can also live in this area. It shouldn't have to be just a retirement community or for tourism. Please put people to work. Thank you. Virginia Anderson 90 W Chandler St Ely, MN 55731 Sent from my iPhone

Ginny Knapp 552

Please prevent acid mine drainage from polluting our waters and to save us the huge future taxpayer costs of trying to cleanup the mess. No new mines. Virginia Knapp 2483 79th St E. Inver Grove Heights MN 55076

giuliano rigotti 40401

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, giuliano rigotti via vicenza trento, ot 38061 IT

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gladys Schmitz

43235

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gladys Schmitz 170 Good Counsel Drive Mankato, MN 56001

Glen Helgeson

9797

I recommend the DNR not approve the EIS for the proposed PolyMet mine project. This nickel sulfide mine would be a short-term gain for an unnecessary long-term risk. Trading 200-500 years worth of mining pollution for only 20 years worth of jobs is irresponsible. Furthermore, treatment costs could exist forever. Do we really want to treat water pollution at a mine that has been closed for centuries just for 20 years of operations and 400 jobs. I say, "no". Trading 200-500 years worth of mining pollution for these jobs is simply irresponsible. PolyMet environmental study is inconclusive on water treatment. The EIS only covers the 20-year plan and is only specific about how much area would be mined and how much waste would be generated. The EIS doesn't provide details on how PolyMet would pay for water treatment. It doesn't provide details on how state officials can be sure the required financial guarantees will be there to adequately treat the water for centuries to come. The DNR and PolyMet is not really sure exactly how long will water treatment will be needed. Even the PolyMet officials say it's very uncertain. Furthermore, they won't know enough about potential contaminants until PolyMet begins unearthing and monitoring their impact. It would be too late for the public to stop the project if this were to happen. No one knows if PolyMet will be able to capture all the contaminated water. Even though they plan to treat the water with a reverse osmosis process, they won't know for sure whether they can capture all the water at the mine site and at the tailings basin. Acid mine drainage could potentially seep into the fractured bedrock allowing contaminated water to seep through and reemerge outside the mine site. Historically copper-nickel mines have never operated without polluting surrounding waterways, even when environmental impact statements for projects have been approved. It's too risky to permit mines with this track record in a water-rich and sensitive environment that drains into Lake Superior or the Boundary Waters. Glen Helgeson 901 Parkview Terrace Golden Valley MN 55416

58106

I recommend the DNR not approve the EIS for the proposed PolyMet mine project. This nickel sulfide mine would be a short-term gain for an unnecessary long-term risk. Trading 200-500 years worth of mining pollution for only 20 years worth of jobs is irresponsible. Furthermore, treatment costs could exist forever. Do we really want to treat water pollution at a mine that has been closed for centuries just for 20 years of operations and 400 jobs? I say, "no". Trading 200-500 years worth of mining pollution for these jobs is simply irresponsible. PolyMet environmental study is inconclusive on water treatment. The EIS only covers the 20-year plan and is only specific about how much area would be mined and how much waste would be generated. The EIS doesn't provide details on how PolyMet would pay for water treatment. It doesn't provide details on how state officials can be sure the required financial guarantees will be there to adequately treat the water for centuries to come. The DNR and PolyMet is not really sure how long will water treatment will be needed. Even the PolyMet officials say it's very uncertain. Furthermore, they won't know enough about potential contaminants until PolyMet begins unearthing and monitoring their impact. It would be too late for the public to stop the project if this were to happen. No one knows if PolyMet will be able to capture all the contaminated water. Even though they plan to treat the water with a reverse osmosis process, they won't know for sure whether they can capture all the water at the mine site and at the tailings basin. Acid mine drainage could potentially seep into the fractured bedrock allowing contaminated water to seep through and reemerge outside the mine site. Historically copper-nickel mines have never operated without polluting surrounding waterways, even when environmental impact statements for projects have been approved. It's too risky to permit mines with this track record in a water rich and sensitive environment that drains into Lake Superior or the Boundary Waters.

Glenn A Partick

42774

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Glenn Barth

39184

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Dr Glenn Barth Eden Prairie, MN 55346 glenn@goodcities-net Glenn Barth 7340 Hunters Run Eden Prairie, MN 55346

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Glenn Bertelson

40046

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

glenn guntenspergen

20831

To the Commissioner of the Minnesota DNR: I have attended one of the informational meetings on the Polymet SDEIS and have reviewed the document and watched the news carefully. What concerns me is that the SDEIS acknowledges that the mine site will require water treatment and monitoring for 100s of years after the mine closes. And of course, during operations, there will be significant land disturbance and development of piles of tailings. The potential environmental damage and the enormous cost of protecting the environment outweigh the 200 or so jobs and the value of the minerals to be extracted. No such mineral mine has ever been shown to be environmentally protective; every instance world wide has caused a great deal of damage to surface and ground water, wetlands, and the landscape in general. It is virtually impossible to estimate the cost of 200-500 YEARS of containing the sulfate and other toxins and treating the water; no amount of assurance bonding or trust fund will be enough to cover the risk of failure of the protective measures. Consider the recent disasters of coal ash spills, 500 year flood in Duluth, and other rare but entirely possible disaster. This is no routine treatment process. We do not know whether the rock to be mined contains gunnerite, a mineral that is known to cause mesothelioma and one that the state has gone to great lengths to prevent becoming airborne. This alone is a huge risk. This mine will be in the Lake Superior watershed and has the potential to poison wild rice beds in our waterways and lakes. Recent studies have shown that 10 ug/L or more cause wild rice to decline in viable seed production and the growth is damaged. We cannot risk this important cultural and economic resource, as well as the riverine and riparian wetlands that might be damaged by sulfide containing water. As much as we all use the metals that Polymet would generate in our technology, we cannot afford to risk so much costly and long-lasting environmental damage for a few years of jobs. As much as I oppose the NIMBY attitude, we must protect our freshwater resources for future generations. the SDEIS recognizes the threats and the evidence convinces me that we should not permit sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. The integrity of our fresh water and our Minnesota culture that is based on clean fresh water and healthy watersheds for our quality of life cannot be put at risk. I urge the Minnesota DNR to refuse the permit the Polymet mine and other similar proposals (especially any that affect the BWCA or the Lake Superior watershed). We need to find alternatives to the metals required for technology - let's encourage such innovation in our state instead of ruining our natural resources for what is becoming old technology. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Polymet SDEIS. I am proud that our State of Minnesota is a democracy that gives all our citizens a chance to voice their opinion on these important matters. Sincerely, Janet Keough 2787 Northwoods Lane Duluth, MN 55803 nyssa52@northlccom

Glenn Oliver

54536

Our fresh water is to important to risk. All the water up there will reach Superior sometime.

Gloria C Walters

42692

See attachment

Gloria Dosch

41853

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Gloria Dosch 9062 Woodthrush Ct Hebron, MD 21830-1087

Gloria Jacobs

40097

Sirs: I believe that we need to maintain the pristine conditions of the BWCAW and not allow PolyMet to mine the land as they propose. We need to act as stewards of the environment because if this proposed mine is completed then you can bet your bottom dollar that chemicals will leech and the whole site will be impacted and useless. It just isn't worth the risk in the long term as a mine in the short term will poison the environment for generations to follow. No to PolyMet.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gloria Nugent

35664

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. If you give permission for a SULFIDE mine to operate in ANY PORTION OF THE GREAT LAKES, YOU ARE BASICALLY POISONING THE LARGEST SOURCE OF FRESH WATER IN THE WORLD. CAN YOU DRINK IT NO. WILL IT KILL THE WILDLIFE THAT DEPEND ON A FRESH WATER SUPPLY. YES WILL THE CITIES, THAT DEPEND ON A FRESH WATER SUPPLY WITHER AND DIE. YES. IS ALL THIS WORTH PUTTING MORE MONEY IN CORPORATIONS POCKETS. NO, NO, NO. Are you going to let GOOD SENSE PREVAIL, or are you going to be INCREDIBLY STUPID AND RUIN MORE OF OUR PRECIOUS RESOURCES. THIS COUNTRY ABSOLUTELY CANNOT AFFORD MORE CORPORATE ABUSES . Sincerely, Gloria Nugent 3854 Washington Rd Carsonville, MI 48419-9311

Gloria Scoonover

16003

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Glory-June Greiff

31837

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, As a concerned citizen and environmentalist, I submit these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corporation NorthMet Mining Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. My first reaction was what are these people thinking and do we never learn to consider the unintended consequences. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. It threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, which includes Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I see nothing that assures me that this will not happen should this project go forward I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the region's natural resources and public health. Among these are risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is decidedly not in the public interest Sincerely, Glory-June Greiff 1753 S Talbott St Indianapolis, IN 46225-1758 (317) 637-6163

GMS Industrial

3

It should be obvious this proposal should Not be allowed considering all the environmental factors. Sent from my iPad

Gordon H Kimball

44085

After reviewing the SDEIS we submit the following comments for response: The ability of PolyMet Corporation to perform this large scale project or meet the long term financial commitments called for is not proven. PolyMet has no record of successful mining. The average life of a multi-national corporation engaged in large scale business is estimated to be 40 – 50 years. It cannot be assumed they can or will perform the expanded, difficult and long term commitments described in the SDEIS. The SDEIS does not fully or adequately describe or project the cost of the following: Reclamation and Closure Fixed Engineering Controls Annual Post-closure Monitoring and Maintenance for the 200 to 500 year monitoring period Contingency Mitigation Transition From Mechanical to Non-Mechanical Water Treatment methods Due to the serious consequences and long term exposure described in this proposal we believe the SDEIS must fully address the potential for PolyMet to cease existence and performance of financial obligations. In order to make an intelligent decision regarding this proposal we believe the following questions need to be answered. What potential failures or problems exist for long term maintenance and environmental protection. If they happen, what will be the mitigation and correction required. What is the annual cost of Monitoring and Maintenance for the years after mine closure. Who will pay for it if and when PolyMet no longer exists. The SDEIS states \$3-5 – 6-0 million per year for Monitoring and Maintenance. What is the annual projected cost per year in the time period 50 – 500 years expressed in 2014 dollars. What assumptions about inflation and economic conditions can rationally exist to make these projections valid. Who will pay for shortfalls in long term Monitoring and Maintenance funding. What legal and financial obligations exist for the permitting agencies and governmental bodies that participated in this SDEIS and / or approved permits. What process exists for securing binding commitments now for financial participation in the 200 – 500 year period of exposure. If none, we believe this is a valid reason for not approving this SDEIS according to State law and regulations. Will the State of Minnesota be liable to cover shortfalls in long term Monitoring and Maintenance funding. What percentage. What is the potential cost expressed in 2014 dollars. What is the likelihood the State will be able to and be willing to cover costs for the critical long term Maintenance and Monitoring time period. Will St Louis County, the cities of Aurora and Hoyt Lakes be asked to help cover shortfalls in long term Monitoring and Maintenance funding if needed. What percentage. What is the potential cost expressed in 2014 dollars. What is the likelihood they will be able to and be willing to cover costs for this time period. What mechanisms can be put place that obligates these governmental bodies to participate in funding long term Maintenance and Monitoring/ Sincerely, Gordon H. Kimball Nancy O. Kimball 3036 Edgerton Street Little Canada, MN 55117

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gordon Kircher

16173

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Gordon Larsen

54140

I don't trust anyone with a dog in the fight, they will say anything to make money, and will be gone before trouble comes. Make Polymet board members personally responsible for clean up, I bet they will not trust the finding. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gordon Manary

39549

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

gordon marino

42054

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, gordon marino northfield, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gordon Murdock 38758

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. That said, I also urge you to do everything possible to create environmentally safe jobs in NE Minnesota. Unfortunately the PolyMet mine does not meet this criterion. Sincerely, Dr Gordon Murdock 1489 Hythe St Saint Paul, MN 55108-1426

Gordon Palzer 39127

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Gordon Palzer 2221 Scheffer Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1161

Gordon Shetter 58060

The lands and waters will exist long after mining, and any potential benefits, is gone. It isn't worth the risk of our resources for corporate profits. The people need solutions that produce long term jobs and local prosperity, not resource extraction. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gordon Sirvio

11329

From: Gordon Sirvio 42302 Chase Lake Road Deer River, MN 56636 To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Memo: The PolyMet environmental standards needs to reflect the fact that our climate is changing. Climate at the mining site will become more extreme. Generally, it is projected, there will be lower natural precipitation but there will also be more frequent severe storms. Holding ponds need to be managed for not just a single 100 year storm using the climate standard from the 20th Century but the more likely event of this type of storm occurring 2 or more times in the same period of time. So we have a dual problem. With the diversion of water to the mining process, plans need to be made for how the surrounding land will be affected. Plus drain fields, dams and erosion controls need to be modified for the increase in periodic severe weather. This will mean modifying the accepted 20th Century environmental standards. Also, unless there is a 'real' current pollution cleanup solution, all protection standards for waste materials will need to be considered for the top timeframes actually experienced for cleanups of past mining sites. This means that, if in the past a 50 year projected safe zone that has not been successfully passed with mining waste sites of current and past projects, the projected time period should be extended to 75 or possibly 100 years. People have a tendency to plan for the future with an assumed increase in technology. This should not be done until that technology actually exists. It is unwise to bet the environment on a guessed future. HYPERLINK "<http://www.paulbunyan-net/users/gsirvio>"Sirvio's Keep

Gordy Grundeen

21583

Our proposal "Using Solar Hydrogen to reduce sulfite minerals" at the Polymet mine site is: Gordy Grundeen Blue Sky Sciences, Inc. 8270 Hidden Bay Trail Lake Elmo MN, 55042 651-770-1056 gordyg@teksolr-com

Gordy Meier

38594

March 5, 2014 Mr, Bruner, Thank you for taking the time to collect public comments regarding the Sulfide Mining Proposal for Northeast Minnesota. We would appreciate your understanding why we are in TOTAL OPPOSITION to sulfide mining, and in particular, the sulfide mining proposal in our back yard in Ely and we want the proposal to sulfide mine Rejected. It is apparent to us, that under the quest to create jobs and for a questionable long term economic gain, there is a willingness to risk the environment, not be concerned for MN citizens and Northeast residents, ignore the devastating impact to existing Northeast tourism, real estate markets and the wild rice industry. Environment Sulfide mining has never been done successfully, without a huge negative impact to the environment. This damage cannot be repaired by just creating a Super clean-up fund, but in addition would take many lifetimes to correct, if ever. The acid runoff and ground water contamination would devastate lakes, rivers, the BWCA and Lake Superior. This is exactly why Wisconsin has now put a moratorium on any further sulfide mining in the State without demonstrated proof sulfide mining can be done without impact to the environment. ie the Flambeau mine. We in Minnesota are blessed with a pristine wilderness area of Northeast Minnesota and the BWCA which truly sets us apart from anything in the lower 48 states- is that worth risking. Economy Copper and nickel are currently in the limelight due to high prices, demand and availability- this too will go the way of iron ore-taconite and steel when China and other countries, all with low labor and process rates, start mining and processing these metals. When the US becomes a high cost producer, and they lose the demand for their product, then watch the mining companies pack up and leave with no regard to what is left or happens to the jobs, environment or economy in the Northeast. People need to wake-up and start measuring the TOTAL DOLLAR impact to the Northeast when mining and the ruined environment cause the current real estate market, tourist industry and wild rice industry to dry up. Personal My wife and I have spent 50 years in the Ely, Bear Head State Lake Park area. Over 30 years ago we purchased 5+ acres on Eagles Nest Lake #3. We cleared the property and built a year round log home. This home is a heritage for my daughter to retire to and for our grandson to enjoy as he grows up. The Eagles Nest Lakes Chain of 4 lakes, are pristine wilderness spring fed lakes. If this sulfide mining proposal goes through we stand a huge risk of ground and surface water contamination which would render our lakes and wells not usable. With that our property which we poured over 30 years of time, money, sweat and tears into would be worthless. Thanks for taking time to read this and we pray that all the folks involved with this sulfide mining proposal weigh the decision with common sense and facts and then VOTE THIS SULFIDE MINING PROPOSAL Down. Thanks for your time and consideration. Regards, Gordon and Kay Meier 6101 Century Blvd. Brooklyn Park, MN 55429 763-561-0676 AND 3780 Rustic Wood Rd Ely, MN 55731 218-365-5567 E-mail HYPERLINK "<mailto:GHM1942@gmail-com>"GHM1942@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gordy Meier

49449

March 5, 2014 Mr Tim Dabney; Thank you for taking the time to collect public comments regarding the Sulfide Mining Proposal for Northeast Minnesota. We would appreciate your understanding why we are in TOTAL OPPOSITION to sulfide mining, and in particular, the sulfide mining proposal in our back yard in Ely and we want the proposal to sulfide mine Rejected. It is apparent to us, that under the quest to create jobs and for a questionable long term economic gain, there is a willingness to risk the environment, not be concerned for MN citizens and Northeast residents, ignore the devastating impact to existing Northeast tourism, real estate markets and the wild rice industry. Environment Sulfide mining has never been done successfully, without a huge negative impact to the environment. This damage cannot be repaired by just creating a Super clean-up fund, but in addition would take many lifetimes to correct, if ever. The acid runoff and ground water contamination would devastate lakes, rivers, the BWCA and Lake Superior. This is exactly why Wisconsin has now put a moratorium on any further sulfide mining in the State without demonstrated proof sulfide mining can be done without impact to the environment. ie the Flambeau mine. We in Minnesota are blessed with a pristine wilderness area of Northeast Minnesota and the BWCA which truly sets us apart from anything in the lower 48 states-- is that worth risking. Economy Copper and nickel are currently in the limelight due to high prices, demand and availability--this too will go the way of iron ore-taconite and steel when China and other countries, all with low labor and process rates, start mining and processing these metals. When the US becomes a high cost producer, and they lose the demand for their product, then watch the mining companies pack up and leave with no regard to what is left or happens to the jobs, environment or economy in the Northeast. People need to wake-up and start measuring the TOTAL DOLLAR impact to the Northeast when mining and the ruined environment cause the current real estate market, tourist industry and wild rice industry to dry up. Personal My wife and I have spent 50 years in the Ely, Bear Head State Lake Park area. Over 30 years ago we purchased 5+ acres on Eagles Nest Lake #3. We cleared the property and built a year round log home. This home is a heritage for my daughter to retire to and for our grandson to enjoy as he grows up. The Eagles Nest Lakes Chain of 4 lakes, are pristine wilderness spring fed lakes. If this sulfide mining proposal goes through we stand a huge risk of ground and surface water contamination which would render our lakes and wells not usable. With that our property which we poured over 30 years of time, money, sweat and tears into would be worthless. Thanks for taking time to read this and we pray that all the folks involved with this sulfide mining proposal weigh the decision with common sense and facts and then VOTE THIS SULFIDE MINING PROPOSAL Down. Thanks for your time and consideration. Regards, Gordon and Kay Meier 6101 Century Blvd. Brooklyn Park, MN 55429 763-561-0676 AND 3780 Rustic Wood Rd Ely, MN 55731 218-365-5567 E-mail [HYPERLINK \"mailto:GHM1942@gmail-com\"GHM1942@gmail-com](mailto:HYPERLINK \)

Gosia Mitros

40412

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Gosia Mitros 3112 Creekbend Ct Sachse, TX 75048 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Grace A. Nelson

43470

Dear [Decision Maker], My name is Grace Nelson, a student at the University of St Thomas and furthermore an advocate for protecting the land of my home state Minnesota. I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Minnesota. I can see where you see the sulfide mining benefiting our state with the use of its minerals and providing jobs, but I do not see how those benefits outweigh the long term negative effects of the sulfide mining. As a homegrown Minnesotan, it is hard for me to think that the beautiful landscape of Minnesota will be dug up in order to make room for these mines. I also am not very fond of the negative effects of sulfide mining in terms of pollution of the land and its natural resources. I am a resident of Minnesota and would like to protect our land. I have many childhood memories of adventures up north and I know that the beautiful landscape and natural bodies of water are some of Minnesota's greatest treasures. I do not think that the benefits of 20 years of mining outweigh the negative long term effects on the land and on the people living in the surrounding area. Thank you, Grace Nelson

Grace Christenson

39773

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Tim Dabney U. S. Forest Service Douglas Bruner U.S Army Corps of Engineers DENY THAT MINE. My name is Grace Christenson and I am 11 years old. I am against the proposed PolyMet sulfide mining. I care for northern Minnesota and all animals that could be affected. I think of northern Minnesota as a beautiful place for animals and humans to experience. The PolyMet sulfide mining would harm animals, the food chain and nature. The 11 endangered species population would decrease even greater than it currently is because of pollution and loss of habitat. Both lynx and moose are endangered and are protected by the Endangered Species Act. Unique wetlands would be harmed by PolyMet's mine. PolyMet does not state the matter of how they will clean up the mess from the mining. Only 1% is useful, the remaining 99% is toxic waste. This will leave us with hundreds of years of clean up, impacting human health. Babies born on the north shore already have a high mercury level from iron ore mining and a even higher level would occur from sulfide mining. Tourism is a big part in northern Minnesota jobs, if mining were to occur people would stop visiting. I am opposed to Polymet mining. I have written this from my heart and I hope you care about it as much as do. Sincerely, Grace Christenson Grace Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N White Bear Lake MN 55110 [HYPERLINK "mailto:gracekchristenson@gmail-com"gracekchristenson@gmail-com](mailto:gracekchristenson@gmail-com)

grace e palmer

14838

Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed PolyMet mining operation in our beautiful northern forest area of Minnesota. I have traveled to several western states and seen first hand the long-term damages done by copper mining. As a property owner in northeastern Minnesota, I ask you to not let this environmental disaster happen. The long-term damage done by this project will continue for years after you and I are gone. It is just not worth it. Sincerely, Bruce A. Palmer 418 Otis Avenue St Paul, MN 55104

14970

Dear Madam or Sir, Pure water, clean air, and viable soil are our only true wealth. The proposed PolyMet mine threatens all these, thus threatening the health of generations to come. The mine could close after 20 years, providing only one generation with jobs, while the monitoring of the watershed will need to go on for hundreds of years, becoming the responsibility of countless generations. The mining company could declare bankruptcy at any time, leaving financial guarantees unmet and taxpayers to pay for necessary closure, clean-ups and endless future monitoring. The risks so far outweigh the possible benefits that no guarantees of money are adequate. Please stop this mining project from going forward Protect our and our children's only true wealth. Sincerely, Grace Palmer 418 Otis Avenue St Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Grace Erba 40853

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Miss Grace Erba 410 Roy St Winona Lake, IN 46590-1804 (574) 269-0067

Grace Geier 1772

I would like to take this opportunity to say no to sulfide mining. Sulfide mines have historically been environmental disasters, and when mining companies disappear, it is left to the state and the federal government to do the clean up- don't let this happen to our beautiful state. Furthermore, I understand that mineral resources are important But water is a resource too- and one more instrumental to our survival. Moving forward with sulfide mining in a region where we don't understand ground water and where some of the largest fresh water reserves are located is pure insanity. Protect our state, protect our water. Please do not move forward on sulfide mining.

Grace Heitkamp 37178

To Whom it May Concern: NO, NO, NO, NO, NO, NO, NO to PolyMet. I do not trust that they have the best interests of the state of MN and especially its people at heart. How can we gamble with our natural beauty and life-sustaining water. Sincerely, Grace Heitkamp 11677 Gilbert Trail, Lonsdale, MN 55046 507-744-4661 artist

Grace Kelly 46938

Minnesota is being sold a false choice between picking between jobs and environment. We can do both. The Solutions Project maps out an transition project of going to wind, water and solar that would create 63,500 construction jobs and 39,300 operation jobs. Contrast that with the 360 jobs that Polymet is promising. Polymet is proposing a different type of mining than we have had before. It is a mining that is heavily polluted with heavy metals and sulfates. Storage is simply done in open pits, open to the weather, open to seepage. Even the company's own models show pollution with expensive treatment for 500 years or more. Let's be real. Once pollution gets into the underground aquifer, there is no undoing it. Our rivers will carry the pollution all over. At that point, we will have to treat all our drinking water or suffer the health effects. We have an incredible growing brewing industry that will be put at risk because good water is essential to brewing. Let's face it, we are being held hostage for 360 jobs. Polymet can go elsewhere and will go elsewhere if it has to pay for safe mining. There are still third world countries who will allow any type of toxic mining. Minnesota wants to lose those 360 jobs, because the cost of losing safe drinking water is way too high. Do any green energy project from the Solutions Project. Please consider raising my income taxes now for green projects instead of having me pay more for clean water forever. It will cost me much less. Companies are good at ducking financial consequences. They simply bankrupt the shell company or change the laws. Even if you can get a company to pay there is still no financial amount can cover permanent water pollution. Tell me what amount would make you want to watch loved one die early from these toxic effects. Lets face it, there is no financial amount of money that can fix this pollution. No compromise is acceptable. Just say NO. Grace Kelly 1660 Hague Av St Paul, MN 55104 651 246 6717

Grace Lanasa 15341

HYPERLINK "https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/file/d/0B2ITMKXJ8eMkUjNzZHRXV1pvNWM/edit.usp=drive_web" Copper.docx

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Grace Sheely 45039

Comments from Grace Sheely 14325 Grenier Road, Minnetonka, MN 55345 [HYPERLINK "mailto:gracesheely@gmail-com"gracesheely@gmail-com](mailto:gracesheely@gmail-com) I am a 2014 Water StewaRd I believe that water resouces are too scare and this project is an unnnecessary risk to the MN waters. The MN waters that would be affected are entirely upstream from everyone in the state. Any mining error or contamination would damage and impact tourism and the MN quality of life. This project is not needed now. Please count my comment as a vote against Polymet. I also do not believe that the company behind the operations will be solvent and financially able to manage any mishap or its contamination costs. Thank you. Grace

Grace Strong 12884

Fran and I are in Japan for the month. See you in January.

Grady O'Neill 57176

I think it is a horrible idea. We need to preserve our wilderness.Grady O'Neill2616 North 21st StreetSuperior, WI 54880

Graham Murdock 33503

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining in and of itself may not be considered dangerous in many areas. However, when such action is taken in an area, any area, close to one of our most precious natural resources, fresh water, it must not be permitted. Sure, proponents will tell us that have done everything possible to assure the safety of our precious and limited fresh water supply, that there is no danger of such being contaminated. until one of two things are involved .greed and stupidity. We can perhaps control greed and the poorly designed process shortcuts that develop from that; However . stupidity has no cure. We simply cannot put ourselves in a position to second guess this pending disaster. . Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt I strongly oppose it. Sincerely, Graham Murdock 937 S Feldkamp Ave Springfield, IL 62704-2311

Grand Portage Band 42990

Dear Ms Fey, Mr Bruner, and Mr Jimenez: Please find attached copies of the Grand Portage Band comment letter Exhibits C. - H., for the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. Sincerely, Margaret Watkins

42991

Dear Ms Fey, Mr Bruner, and Mr Jimenez: Please find attached a copies Grand Portage Band comment letter Exhibits A. - B., for the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. A third e-mail will be sent with Exhibits C - H. Sincerely, Margaret Watkins

42994

Dear Ms Fey, Mr Bruner, and Mr Jimenez: Please find attached a copy of the Grand Portage Band comments regarding the proposed PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the US ACE 404 Wetlands Permit Notification, and an Index of Exhibits. The exhibits will be attached in a follow-up e-mail. Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments. Sincerely, Margaret Watkins

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commer 22390

Please see the attached document – My testimony at the Aurora Polymet Public Meeting . Bud Stone - President Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce One NW Third Street Grand Rapids MN 55744 HYPERLINK "mailto:bud@grandmn-com"bud@grandmn-com 218-326-6619 1-800-472-6366 Toll free HYPERLINK "http://www.grandmn-com"www.grandmn-com HYPERLINK "http://www.facebook-com/grchambermn"www.facebook-com/grchambermn

Grant Johnson 18225

My name is Grant Johnson, G-R-A-N-T, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I have a master's degree in public health at the University of Minnesota in community health promotion. I'm from Duluth, currently living in Minneapolis, but working up north in Aurora and other cities on the East Range. I run and -- well, more snowshoe these days on the trails behind Giant's Ridge, swimming in Lake Embarrass almost every day in the summer when I drive by in Biwabik and fish up there every chance I get. And before I begin, I want to give a nod to my great grandfather, who worked in the mines in Hibbing when the mines were just starting. So with my connections up north, if someone were to ask me do I support mining, my reply is yes. I do support mining and the Iron Range, but I do not support the kind of mining that is proposed with the copper-nickel mining. I believe that this mining is a threat to the environment and to our water supply. We are fortunate that the iron ore mining that has been done in the past is fairly clean and at the end of the process is just a big pit and mounds that we all see with little to no toxicity. But I have major doubts about this current copper-nickel mining and the impact that it will have. From what I've read in the research, the risks to our water supply is potentially compromised. This is our water we need to live, not just playing. So we are fortunate to have such a vast water supply in Minnesota and I want to keep this safe. The environmental threats to our water supply puts risks -- health risks to our towns up north and moreover, even puts at risk the tourism industry up north. And more on the -- more on the economic impact, I am disappointed that most of the profits from the mining won't stay in Northern Minnesota or even Minnesota. As we talked about PolyMet, it's not from Minnesota or even the United States. Again, it's from Toronto. So I feel that they're not completely invested into our community, even though we may think they are, being from up north, but they're not. So again, if anyone asks me if I support mining, my answer is yes, but at this time, with the risks involved and potential major financial gains being exported, I cannot support the copper-nickel project. Thank you.

grant k 15471

As a native to Minnesota state, I would like to voice my OPPOSITION to the Northmet mining project. As a child i frequently visited much of the wilderness on the range and would like it to stay as just that, wilderness. I would like to see northeast minnesota to remain pristine and untouched by industrial pollution so my children will be able to experience the wonder of our pristine lakes and rivers and our great forests. The north met mining project is a bad news for the future of Minnesota's natural environment. Sincerely Grant E Kahl 5751 Bergquist RD Duluth MN 55804

Grant Thrall 3875

Mining for these metals is not in anyone's interest, other than those who would profit financially, foreign or local, in the short term. Our environment is far too precious to even consider damaging our nation's, or Canada's, watersheds in the short term. But 500 to 2,000 years of pollution management for the short term gain is unconscionable. Grant Thrall 4038 Blaisdell Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409 612-827-7054

10727

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, properly, which will provide legal justification for rejecting the sulfide ore mining plan. I am a father, lover of nature and Minnesota taxpayer. The proposed mining endangers my children, the BWCAW and guarantees Minnesota will be on the hook to pay for the perpetual cleanup of a project that would give a small number of people jobs, and little revenue for the state. Sincerely yours, Grant Thrall Grant Thrall 4038 Blaisdell Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Grant Thrall 15094

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: Please reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as just plain wrong. National forests are created to be preserved, in perpetuity. Any land swap would be one that would diminish the concept of national forests, especially in favor of a commercial interest. It is also inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. Sincerely Grant Thrall Grant Thrall 4038 Blaisdell Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409 612-827-7054

18430

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, properly, which will provide legal justification for rejecting the sulfide ore mining plan. I am a father, lover of nature and Minnesota taxpayer. The proposed mining endangers my children, the BWCAW and guarantees Minnesota will be on the hook to pay for the perpetual cleanup of a project that would give a small number of people jobs, and little revenue for the state. Sincerely yours, Grant Thrall Grant Thrall 4038 Blaisdell Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409

51075

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, properly, which will provide legal justification for rejecting the sulfide ore mining plan. I am a father, lover of nature and Minnesota taxpayer. The proposed mining endangers my children, the BWCAW and guarantees Minnesota will be on the hook to pay for the perpetual cleanup of a project that would give a small number of people jobs, and little revenue for the state. Sincerely yours, Grant Thrall Grant Thrall 4038 Blaisdell Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409

Grant Wesley Anderson 54780

See attachment

57252

The cumulative effects analysis area must include the St. Louis River. The EIS limits the area to the Partridge and Embarrass River watersheds. This decision was not scientifically supported. There must be additional work to assess cumulative effects on the St. Louis River as the St. Louis is in a watershed where the mining discharge occurs. There's no scientific rationale for not including the St. Louis River. The impacts of the St. Louis should be top priority due to the size and importance of this watershed. Grant Wesley Anderson 6783 Nelson Rd Culver, MN 55779

Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Co 42952

Good Afternoon, Attached are the Comments from the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission on the SDEIS of the proposed NorthMet mine project. Please contact me with any questions or concerns. Esteban Chiriboga - Esteban Chiriboga Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission 550 Babcock Dr Rm. B-102 Madison, WI 53706 Phone: 608-263-2873

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Great Northern Solar

43595

Dear DNR People: Please confirm that you have received this and it is added to the record. The proposed Mine's EIS is full of gaps, incomplete analysis, and problems that call into question how accurately it describes the environmental impact of the proposal. The mine plan inaccurately describes wild rice waters, understating the area that supports stands of wild rice. In addition, the mine plan claims to reduce sulfates, but that assumes that expensive water treatment will continue for hundreds of years. Millions of gallons of untreated polluted water will escape every year, and the mine plan predicts an increased chance that water exceeding the sulfate standard will be released at times, years after closure. PolyMet is proposing something Minnesota has never allowed before. The company's own computer models show that hundreds of years after the mine closes, water seeping into groundwater and flowing into streams and rivers at the site will be polluted with heavy metals and sulfates. Unless all of this water is captured and treated, the mine will pollute surrounding waters. Minnesota law requires that a closed mine site be "maintenance free," but PolyMet's mine plan calls for hundreds of years of monitoring and expensive water treatment. Worse, these models don't even show that the pollution stops after 500 years. They just stopped modeling at 500 years. In other words, the pollution could go on for even longer. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from the dirtiest coal power plants in Minnesota. PolyMet's electricity supplier, Minnesota Power, got 85% of their power from coal in 2013- PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. One part of the PolyMet mine plan is an estimate of how much in taxes the mine would pay if permitted. The tax estimates in the PolyMet mine plan lack detail, are full of discrepancies and contain explained changes. From one draft of the mine plan to the next the estimated taxes jumped 500% without explanation. This is important, since the state taxes that would apply to a copper-nickel sulfide mine have never been used before. The copper-nickel mining industry is exempt from several state and local taxes, such as property tax and corporate income tax, and has its own unique tax structure. Therefore, the State of Minnesota should confirm these tax estimates, and not just rely on the company to provide them. There are many other problems to the proposal so I list a few important ones here. Please reject this EIS with prejudice and refuse to allow this destructive mine to be created. Thank you. Energetically, Christopher LaForge Great Northern Solar 77480 Evergreen Road, Suite #1 Port Wing, WI 54865 715 774 3374

Greenwood Vytautas Champ

58165

Something to keep in mind: there is no need for mining. I only care about the safety of our planet, and its life. Please stop doing what the doped masses want. Mining is detrimental to watersheds, the air, food, etc. Why mine for the sake of greed? It is fact that mining is terrible for the ecosystem. Any study which states that there is no detrimental is conducted by a corporation. This is tampered data. And what about the fishes which are in danger? Mining and fracking can eliminate fish like Black Redhorse, greater Redhorse, River Redhorse, Gravel Chub, Topeka Shiner, Plains Top minnow, Pallid Shiner, Wetern Sand Darters, Crystal Darter, and Bluntnose Darter. We lost the Ghost Shiner, let's not lose any more species. I know mining will occur in the southeast corner (where the species I mentioned occur) in addition to the north.

Greg Allen

18106

Good evening. My name is Greg Allen and I'm superintendent of Mesabi East Schools, this school right here; home of the Giants. I am an avid outdoorsman. I care about the environment. I use our natural resources. I canoe, camp, fish, hunt and enjoy this area. I enjoy the natural beauty of the state and believe mining can co-exist. We live in a beautiful area, where mining has existed for generations. I care about protecting the environment as much as the next guy. I support the PolyMet project. As the Iron Range's population has steadily declined, naturally, so has our school enrollment. As you may know, or may not know, school funding from the state is based on a per pupil count, which is why over the years so many schools have consolidated. And if you take a look in the large commons, you will see about 21 different school buildings that are now all students are housed in one. It is quite a wall of buildings. Many districts have been forced into short-term borrowing to cover costs. Schools on the range do not receive property tax from the mines. They receive a taconite tax, when the mines are producing. This extra funding helps, but it is not stable funding. PolyMet mining will bring in new jobs, which will bring in new families. School enrollments and our ability to add teachers, class offerings and new technology will increase as a result. I support PolyMet. The mine's economic impact will directly affect the Iron Range's schools' ability to provide a top-notch education for our children. The DNR U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have done great work. If I were grading it, I would give you an A+. Thank you for your comprehensive work. I support this project and the PolyMet project on behalf of one of the many schools that will benefit of this well-designed project. I encourage you to move forward. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Greg bastien 43115

Dear Ms Fay: The Polymet mine proposal for northern Minnesota has some immediate benefits and long term hazards. At the financial hearing conducted by the House it was clear that the review process for possible catastrophic events only takes in short term events. The failure of a holding pond or undetected ground water infiltration could leave the state with liabilities that extend to other states and Canada with only sufficient funds to handle short term plugging of holes. The \$2-4 billion down payment in a trust fund would be difficult to administer and with successors likely for the company in the future distributing any excess at the end of the period when the material from the mine is safe would be problematical. On a purely technical basis the reuse of the old mine facilities is economically prudent for the company the difference in sulfide mining and taconite mining is considerable and the safety net for water resources is and would be insufficient. All ponding would have to meet a 300-500 year impermeability standard. All processing would have to be contained with no release to outside air and water. While not impossible these safeguards would drive the cost so high that the promised 20 year window of production would close much sooner the short term gain would be that much less with fewer jobs and less payroll. Until we have mined our garbage dumps for old copper and nickel I would pass on any new ventures involving perhaps decades of debatable clean up if the worst happened. Sincerely, Greg bastien 2709 E. Minnehaha Parkway Minneapolis, Minnesota

Greg Benedict 26618

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I come from a hunting and fishing background that has a deep love for the outdoors. Much of my childhood was spent in Superior National Forest, and I know the aesthetic value that it has for many people. I have witnessed already, in the past 4 years, the extensive logging and deforestation of many of the areas me and my dad would go hunting. I know of the water pollution problems on the north shore from the refining processes. I watch slowly through the years as irresponsible mining and logging operations degrade the habitats where grouse and deer used to be numerous. Its not just about the wild game, but of the ecosystem health as well. The more forest/protected land that goes to these giant excavations, the more pollution and disruption of natural processes will occur. I won't throw statistics and numbers out there to make myself more "credible," there is no need. You don't need a scientist or a mathematician to tell you that something is wrong with polluting and depleting the very environment that we need for survival. I would feel deeply disappointed if I witnessed any more significant damage to the places I love to visit like Superior National Forest and BWCAW. They aren't just places to go, they are places that facilitate spiritual growth and understanding. Places that are relaxing, slow, peaceful, and calm. The experiences of complete wilderness are beyond anything in a book. If the money and the jobs conquer the argument, I understand. Many push the idea of money over everything. Its never about the everyday people who make connections, memories, and above all harmony with the land. However, I hold the utmost respect to you, who hear the actual voices of the people. I wrote this short testimony to let you know that this mining proposal is a ludicrous, destructive endeavor. Don't let the money cloud your vision in making the decision, and don't allow them to destroy and abuse more beauty in Superior National Forest. Sincerely, Greg Benedict 151 Excelsior Ave S Annandale, MN 55302-9610

Greg Benson 38887

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Greg Benson 1525 Woodcrest Dr Duluth, MN 55804-1426

Greg Boom 6198

Minnesota has strong environmental laws - Polymet will be environmentally responsible. The environment safety will be covered by Minnesota laws. This project will create tax money which every state needs. It will provide jobs for a area that is not over flowing with employment. Greg Boom 103 Woodland Springs Road, Denver, IA 50622

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Greg Chester

11005

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: As a resident of Northern Minnesota I urge you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. This would allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to the Ojibwe Nation. The Land Exchange sacrifices our sacred lands to a foreign corporation, not for the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. It will endanger both a valuable watershed and Lake Superior, one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world. Its diminution or loss resulting from this and several other existing and proposed mines would be a global tragedy. Its pristine waters are far more valuable than the momentary gains of a temporary mine. Rejecting the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate, the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine, and Land Exchange would be for the long term benefit of those of us living in the region. The dangers far outweigh the benefits. We live here for the clean air, soils and water and the health of our future generations. And we honor our treaties with the Ojibwe Nation. Please do not put these at risk. Sincerely Greg Chester 6312 164th St NW Cass Lake, MN 56633 218-335-6501

44601

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, The proposed PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is in my backyard I live in Northern Minnesota and live here because of its natural beauty, healthy environment to raise children and grandchildren and healthy water and fish and wild game to enjoy and eat at times without fear of contamination. We can drink our well water without fear of contaminants. Most of the continent was like this a few hundred years ago. This is one of the last areas left where a person can sink a 25 foot well and drink sweet clean water. Please do not poison this area like others have done with so much of the rest of it. I urge you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine as well as the wastes proposal because of its unacceptable risks to human and the natural ecosystems' health. Mercury is just one threat to our environment and health. This should not be dug up and released into the environment including our streams, rivers, and lakes. Some of our fish are already tainted with mercury from coal fired power plants. We do not need more. The threat to humans is very real as well as eagles and osprey. The cost benefit ratio shows that we may lose far more than we gain from the mine. What tourist would want to leave an urban environment to come to a contaminated rural area. This poisoning may drive many away. They might as well stay at home and drink their city water and breath exhaust fumes. Thank you for considering my views. Sincerely, Dr Greg Chester Greg Chester 6312 164th St NW Cass Lake, MN 56633 218-335-6501

51269

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: As a resident of Northern Minnesota I urge you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. This would allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to the Ojibwe Nation. The Land Exchange sacrifices our sacred lands to a foreign corporation, not for the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. It will endanger both a valuable watershed and Lake Superior, one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world. Its diminution or loss resulting from this and several other existing and proposed mines would be a global tragedy. Its pristine waters are far more valuable than the momentary gains of a temporary mine. Rejecting the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate, the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine, and Land Exchange would be for the long term benefit of those of us living in the region. The dangers far outweigh the benefits. We live here for the clean air, soils and water and the health of our future generations. And we honor our treaties with the Ojibwe Nation. Please do not put these at risk. Sincerely Greg Chester 6312 164th St NW Cass Lake, MN 56633 218-335-6501

Greg J

45849

Lisa I have reviewed the SDEIS for the PolyMet mining project and I believe it is complete and covers all issues. Greg Johnson 14283 Dulcimer Way Apple Valley MN 55124 Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE Tablet

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Greg Jackson

43688

Dear Minnesota DNR representative, I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to provide personal comment on the proposed PolyMet copper-nickel Mines in Northeastern Minnesota. I write this not only as a concerned outdoorsman, but also as an economist with a master's degree in natural resource economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison - one of the leading economics programs in the world. I am well aware of the cost-benefit analysis project that precedes such projects, and am also aware of the demand for precious metals for household items like cell phones and electronics. However, I strongly urge the state DNR to consider the true and lasting impacts this proposed mine may have on current and future generations. I am concerned that the analysis has not fully included the economic benefits of the landscape as is - including the recreational use, bequest, and existence value so many Minnesotans and Americans place on the Boundary Waters. Tens of thousands of recreators from around the state, country, and world, not only visit the BWCA annually, but many like myself behold the region as one of the last unspoiled wilderness areas in the continental United States. Imagining a headline that reads: "Sulphur leeches into lakes, pollutes nearby rivers, fish and wildlife at risk". I am a supporter of extraction and manufacturing jobs, especially in economically depressed areas, however, I am not convinced that the proposal as it stands now will guarantee that a) negative environmental impacts will be avoided, and b) that jobs created will last and profits from the extracted minerals will stay in Minnesota. I urge you and your colleagues to apply the highest possible standards to your review of the proposal, and to consider the long-term impacts of the project on future generations - generations who have yet to experience the wonder and quiet of the northwoods. In an increasingly fast-paced and noisy world, we need places that are unspoiled by human intrusion, and my money is on keeping the BWCA free from mining. I appreciate your time in reading this letter. Sincerely, Greg Jackson Conservation Crew Leader, Angler, Minnesotan.

Greg Keilback

2508

To those opposing the audacious activity: I ask as strongly as I can for you to have me do more. I am an ecologist and am currently working out of a nature center in Northern Illinois. I lived in the Ely area for three years while attending school before transferring on. In my position I have brought many folks back to the area and will do so again this spring. Last year we met with some of the mining speculators and listened to what they had to say. This is the same fight that the Superior National Forest and the BWCAW has seen before, just with new faces. I wish Sig was here to help fight this one too. Like Sig, I am a writer and been fortunate enough to see my work on land issues published on a national scale, although to no degree of Sig's work. Please let me know how I can be of a greater resource in spreading the word that the fight is not over. I believe that as long as there is a fight and conversation there is active hope. Greg Keilback From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 7:44 AM To: Greg Keilback Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Greg Korelich

17613

Feb 15, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr Greg Korelich 1840 Albany Dr Santa Rosa, CA 95401-3605

Alphabetical by sender's first name

greg lee 38896

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr greg lee 5501 Thomas Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-2545

greg mcneely 41884

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, greg mcneely Stpaul, Minnesota

Greg Olson 39878

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Greg Olson 7373 Ann Ct Eden Prairie, MN 55346-3111 (952) 943-0839

Greg Perrell 6243

5 generations of my family have enjoyed the benefits of living on the Iron Range. This last generation will hopefully see mining continue in a responsible way (Polymet) or they will see the demise of Northern Minnesota. God gave everything on this earth to use and enjoy. Polymets approach to use what God gave us responsibly is a perfect example of that Greg Perrell 218-969-1411 Sent from my LG Optimus G Pro™, an ATandT 4G LTE smartphone

Greg Pittelli 57539

Berkeley Pit. Learn from it. Don't destroy this beautiful place forever. Minnesota is smarter than that.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Greg Solberg

1

I do not believe the technology exists to do this without causing environmental damage. If it does, mining companies would be using it. They are not, as far as I know. Could you provide us with examples of where this so-called technology is being used successfully in other sulfide mining operations around the world. How much will it cost to treat the water for upwards of 500 years, and who will pay for it. We all understand that as soon as the mining companies are finished extracting - they are gone. Bankrupt in some cases, as we've seen in the paSt Layer upon layer of shell companies, leaving taxpayers to foot the bill. All one needs to do is look to the western United States. It's my sincerest belief that, contrary to you and the mining companies, these mining operations will produce acid rock drainage. Start reading on page 5-99- From a stockpile duration how long is temporary. Research shows that within 3 months - acid mine drainage starts to occur. Might be 30 years in a test tube, but in the wild - it can start in 30 days. If I'm not mistaken, the first failed EIS draft said that the sulphur content was 4%. And at the time, they tried to tell us that 4% was considered low. It is not, and now the concentrations seemed to have changed. Can you explain. Please read this: http://pub.epsilon.slu.se/1874/1/Kappan_Avhandling_nr_08-88-pdf Long story short, until mining companies can produce real results showing no environmental damage from current operations, I am not for sulfide mining in Minnesota. Regards, Gregory A. Solberg 1645 Millwood Ave W. Roseville, Mn. 55113

42854

See attachment

Greg Swanson

38431

The SDEIS for the Poly Met Mining Project is flawed and does not guarantee that sulfide mining can be done in Minnesota without seriously harming water and habitat. This project should not go forwaRd We need to move slowly and carefully on this effort. While a boost to our economy is always tempting, any long term adverse environment impacts will certainly vastly overshadow any short term economic benefits. Our healthy natural environment is our legacy to our successors, not our bankbooks. Thank you, Greg Swanson 651-459-5455

Greg T. Lehman, MD

42914

See attachment

Greg Tiburzi

42687

See attachment

greg tofte

40053

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely greg tofte 152 sawbill trail tofte, MN 55615 2186637829

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gregg Hoffman

54122

I OPPOSE PolyMet Mining. PolyMet should be required to make a cash deposit to the state in the amount necessary to pay for any environmental problems they create, this deposit may be refunded when all risks to the environment have passed (I believe this is estimated to be in 200 to 500 years). As a shareholder of Minnesota Power (Allete) I thank them for providing this card to express my opinion to you. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Gregg Wiitala

9289

Dear Ms Fay: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and as there is considerable evidence that this approach is not environmental sound. The area that is proposed for the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine is located in one of the most pristine areas of Minnesota and enjoyed by so many people. Potential negative environmental damage to surface and ground water quality is something hard to rectify and often not possible to rectify. I'm also sending a copy of my email to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan both should be rejected as many of the assumptions used were not realistic. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at mine site was seriously underestimated. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine projects are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) is not supported by scientific evidence. This assumption allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. It is unethical to ask future generations to pick up the tab for clean-up that occur in the future when we know what the real risk is. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. There will be improved mining processes in the future that will be better equipped to protect this fragile environment. I think the good folks of Minnesota would rather wait for a safer mining operation rather than move forward with a risky project now. Sincerely yours, Gregg Wiitala 131 Needham Rd, Grand Marais, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Greggory Jennings

39098

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Greggory Jennings, Wildlife Biologist PO Box 912 Ashland, WI 54806

Gregory and Mary Johnson

39301

Attached please find my comments concerning the PolyMet Mining Project. From: Mary S. Johnson Address: 2089 Lake Hattie Dr SW Backus, MN 56435 Tel: 218-587-4014 Email: gmjohns@tds-net

Gregory B. Gregory

31738

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If approved, the mine will pollute Lake Superior, threaten our clean water and wild lands, and endanger public health for generations to come. A decision in favor of PolyMet's proposal would open a floodgate for more sulfide mining in a large area near Lake Superior and surrounding the Boundary Waters Wilderness - considered by some as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Gregory B. Gregory 1321 N 21st St Milwaukee, WI 53205-2406 (414) 933-9167

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gregory Fox 39882

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gregory Fox 11613 Rio Loma Ln Burnsville, MN 55337-7211

Gregory Garmer 39735

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Granting Polymet permission for Sulfide mining is like letting the proverbial camel stick his nose into the tent. If one sulfide mining operation is allowed, then all others will demand equal treatment under the law. If each company digs for twenty years and then leaves behind a source of pollution that will have to be monitored and managed well into the future, pretty soon mining scars and environmental watch areas will sprout all over Northeastern MN. There is no sure way to manage the results once the Pandora of sulfide mining is let loose. Please count my vote as being against this proposal. Gregory Garmer, Duluth, MN The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gregory Garmer 2126 Water St Apt 304 Duluth, MN 55812-2155

48880

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Granting Polymet permission for Sulfide mining is like letting the proverbial camel stick his nose into the tent. If one sulfide mining operation is allowed, then all others will demand equal treatment under the law. If each company digs for twenty years and then leaves behind a source of pollution that will have to be monitored and managed well into the future, pretty soon mining scars and environmental watch areas will sprout all over Northeastern MN. There is no sure way to manage the results once the Pandora of sulfide mining is let loose. Please count my vote as being against this proposal. Gregory Garmer, Duluth, MN The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Gregory Garmer 2126 Water St Apt 304 Duluth, MN 55812-2155

Gregory Johnson 17713

Attached are my comments about the proposed PolyMet mine in Northern Minnesota. Gregory L. Johnson

Gregory M Anderson 54556

The risks are too great to the environment. I fear the clean up operations will offset any profits. This is not good for Minnesota.

Gregory N Rautell 57208

Only thing this is going to benefit is the politician's pocket books. This mining is going to pollute the land and waters so my grandkids will not enjoy what I have. And when they are done making their millions of dollars they will pull out and leave the taxpayers to clean their mess up. Just like Duluth's steel plant cleanup and cement plant cleanup. Gregory N. Rautell 5557 N. Cloquet Rd Duluth, MN 55810

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gregory P Elstad 42724

See attachment

42850

See attachment

Gregory S. Bringman 57878

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Greta Bergstrom 46344

Thanks for offering public input in this critical process. I am writing to request that you revise the draft EIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200, clarifying to the public how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the mine site be "maintenance free" upon its closing. It is my understanding that existing data in the water management plan supporting the SDEIS show that sulfates and metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. As we know, releasing sulfuric acid into our water supply will taint it. The reverse osmosis water treatment that will be required for hundreds of years appears (to me) to be in conflict with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure, bringing the project truly to a close without harm to our environment or excessive costs to state taxpayers. Please show how exactly PolyMet's North Met mining project would meet applicable water quality standards upon completion/closure given these Rules. We cannot cut corners on crucial questions required to accurately evaluate this project including making sure our water stays clean and safe (throughout as well as beyond project completion); taxpayers are protected; and we have strong safeguards in place for when things go awry which has always been the case in every other sulfide mining project that has been undertaken. Thank you. Greta Bergstrom St Paul

Greta Fay 57974

Please don't mine in the BWCAW. I grew up there and don't want it to change. Please don't dig. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Gretchen 45407

One has to look at the taconite mines past to realize the horrendous impact a copper mine would have on our state jewel-the boundary waters. The mining companies quickly disappear when the profits are gone and leave the ravaged environment for the taxpayers to clean up. Sent from my iPhone

Gretchen Amis 42570

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gretchen Amis 54779
See attachment

Gretchen Bratvold 9915

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gretchen Bratvold 3444 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gretchen Bratvold

18683

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gretchen Bratvold 3444 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406

50758

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gretchen Bratvold 3444 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gretchen Flynn

41193

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Gretchen Flynn 4300 W River Pkwy #149 Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gretchen Lindgren

41783

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Gretchen Zell

39609

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Gretchen Zell 14250 Jonquil Ln N Dayton, MN 55327-9656 (763) 323-7884

Griffin Henjum

44607

I am a young person in Minnesota and I believe this mine will have negative effects for generations to come. The hundreds of years of clean up and adverse effects on the environment is not worth the short term economic benefits.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Gus & Glenda Fisker 47276

To whom it may concern, I am concerned with the long term safety of the water. I do not believe all contingencies can be anticipated and that the state will ultimately come out poorly. There needs to be very long term, perhaps indefinite, water protection. The BWCA should be protected at all costs. Once damaged or altered, it can never be replaced. The mines will eventually come and go. Steven Fisker 590 Palmer Drive Pine River, MN, 56474 (218) 587-3156

Gwen Myers 58129

This project must not be permitted. The SDEIS is inadequate and inaccurate and confusing. How can it be that all their science cannot predict how long water treatment would be required? How can PolyMet say they will be able to answer the question after they've begun mining? Incredible!

Gwen S Myers 18887

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Gwen S Myers 12009 Hilloway Rd W 12009 Hilloway Rd W Minnetonka, MN 55305 952-545-8686

42652

See attachment

Gwen Updegraff 42871

See attachment

Gwendolyn Danfelt-Martin 21520

H B Bloomer 42848

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Haddie Hadachek

40155

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Hallie Finucane

47088

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I strongly urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. I am well aware of how mining companies strip an area of minerals or metals, and then ignore responsibilities for the mine sites and environmental damage, based on what I have seen in Arizona, where I own a seasonal home. The sites are just abandoned, and the state is left to clean up the site at the expense of the state and the taxpayers. Too often, the mining companies go bankrupt and/or just walk away from the mine and the state has no recourse for restitution. The financial responsibility for the clean up is borne by the state and taxpayers, and in the case of Arizona, the state has not had the financial resources to restore the area that was mined. What financial guarantees does Minnesota have so this does not happen to the state of Minnesota and our taxpayers. I am greatly concerned about this for Minnesota. The Polymet project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. It is clear that the main concern of PolyMet is the profits that can be obtained, and the Range wants jobs, even though the jobs are relatively short term. Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters area should not be irreversibly compromised and sustain long term damage to satisfy corporate profits. The high risk of irreversible and long term (500 year) damage to our beautiful wilderness areas cannot be sacrificed or justified for short term jobs and corporate profits. What real financial protection does the State of Minnesota have for all of the clean up that will be required. Also, since PolyMet is a Canadian company, how easily can any obligations be enforced. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I strongly urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Hallie Finucane 2447 Chatsworth St N Roseville, MN 55113-3315

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hanna Hindt

44369

Hello, I am a young citizen of Minnesota and am concerned about the issue of the insertion of a mining site. I do not support the decision to go forward with this movement. I live in a suburb of the Twin Cities, and traveling to the fresh air and beauties of northern Minnesota is a treasure. Having the mining site located outside of the boundary waters creates a strong case for the degradation inside the reserve. Run-off of chemicals is expected to occur. For me, the natural resources and quality of air, land, and water in one of the purest places in Minnesota are most important. The pride I have to live in this beautiful state is founded by the natural aesthetics and fresh air accessible to all. People travel from far across Minnesota and other states to visit and breath the fresh, not as polluted air. Being disrupted by this mining site will change the opinions of many negatively. Hanna Hindt

hanna poulsen

40483

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, hanna poulsen Tigaiga Pt. de la Cruz, ot 38400 ES

Hannah

44577

My name is Hannah Hinh and I am a senior at Prior Lake High School. As a young person living in Minnesota, I do not agree with allowing polynet to mine. Although it will provide few jobs, the ecological damage will affect the natural habitats of Minnesota and the Boundary Waters to a great extent. I don't want to go to the Boundary Waters expecting to see a beautiful lake surrounded by lush forests and find mining residue polluting the area around it. I also don't believe the company when they say that they will clean up the mess and pay for ecological damage. Most of the companies that "claim" they will clean up usually file bankruptcy and leaves the next generation to clean up their mess. I don't agree with the plan to mine due to the guarantee of ecological damage.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hannah Baxter

24430

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Minnesota's precious water resources are irreplaceable. Public health, water quality, and the lucrative tourist industry all depend on the area under consideration for this dangerous proposed mining project. Our state's remaining wetlands, lake and riparian habitats and amazing wildlife-including the threatened lynx and moose already on the decline-also stand to lose if this goes forward. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. I urge you to protect public health and the environment by rejecting this proposal. Sincerely, Hannah Baxter 1300 Yale Pl Minneapolis, MN 55403-2151 (218) 260-5251

Hannah Hoglund

39881

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This cannot be done. We need to protect our earth's clean and beautiful waters as much as we can. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Hannah Hoglund 10208 Hilltop Ct Champlin, MN 55316-2630 (763) 712-9987

Hannah Jents

54342

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am an eighth grade student attending South West Junior High School. I think that PolyMet Mining has a good plan in place. I think that this copper-sulfate mining process will benefit Minnesota. Some of the advantages that there will be are more jobs open for people for mining and mechanics. It could bring more businesses over, opportunities and industries too. There are some disadvantages though. Water and air pollution could be a problem if they are not treated right. Also some of the chemicals could harm the environment around the area too. It could affect cultural resources by stunting the growth of the wild rice if not treated properly, same with the runoff water and rivers. I do agree with the Land Exchange offers. I don't think that this will affect me right now, but it might in the future. Though, it could affect people now who are looking in to mining and mechanics or live by that area. Sincerely, Hannah Jents

Hannah Maertz

43835

My name is Hannah Maertz and I live at 2006 east 1st street, Duluth, MN 55812 I am incredibly concerned for the well-being of future generations if the PolyMet mine proposal succeeds. Even the company acknowledges the large amount of water pollution that will occur for hundreds of years after the mining takes place. As a Minnesotan, I am proud of our state's abundant water supply and our ability to ensure it's quality. I believe this mine would greatly jeopardize that. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please do not let this mine become a reality.

57265

Human life as we know it is incredibly-nay, ENTIRELY-dependent on water. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Is short term, unsustainable, monetary gain worth centuries of damage to a vital resource? Please support MN and earth friendly energy plans – not this mine! Hannah Maertz 2006 East 1st Street Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hannah Miller 45113

Who has ever lived five hundred years. Outside myth, outside Methuselah. What company has ever lived so long, to clean up the wreckage it has wrought. Think now, think ahead. There is no way that a few decades of questionable profit are worth a future of waste and pollution. Think now, think ahead. Do not allow PolyMet to proceed as planned. Sincerely, Hannah Miller

Hans Olsen 57543

December 17, 2013

Lane
6318

Hans Olsen

Ely, MN 55731

218 365

2314 Birchwood

HYPERLINK "<mailto:hansolsen44@yahoo-com>"hansolsen44@yahoo-com Lisa Fay, et al EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Copies: Wide Distribution Dear Ms Fay: This is a response to the request for public comment on the PolyMet SDEIS for the NorthMet project. I am a local citizen who supports this mining and is actively engaged in ensuring that it is done right, what I like to call Minnesota right. Offered in this spirit, here are some substantive suggestions that are intended to improve the NorthMet project plan and the associated SDEIS going into the permitting process. Please seriously consider these ideas. There is a summary followed by supporting detail, beginning with this overview: Cumulative effects: Herein there is disagreement with the decision to exclude certain cumulative factors and a suggestion for one major addition to be considered. This involves an important open decision by regulating agencies that is avoided in the current SDEIS. It must be decided whether to concentrate copper / nickel ore processing in one river drainage or disburse it across all three. Long term pollution mitigation: There is also disagreement with the decision not to consider certain catastrophic failures and a suggestion for public funding of long term secondary mitigation measures on a fairly grand scale. Water use: There are specific suggestions relative to Colby Lake and the Whitewater Reservoir. Solar panel arrays: There is a suggested alternative supplemental cover system to cap stockpiles and tailings basins. Wild Rice: There is a specific plan for compensatory mitigation that affects certain lakes and rivers that currently hold wild rice but are impaired. Infrastructure improvements. There are two suggested new public roads plus certain floodplain proposals. Maps: There are suggested improvements for maps in the SDEIS. Among other things maps need to more clearly show the Laurentian Divide. Summary: The SDEIS section on Cumulative Effects must include some high level analysis of the impact of multiple copper / nickel mines processing their ores in this immediate vicinity, and of PolyMet processing larger volumes for longer periods. There needs to be some conceptual analysis of the impact on these headwaters of multiple copper / nickel mines operating there for a hundred years. It is simply not acceptable to affirmatively permit this one mine for only 20 years without considering the more global impact that surely will follow. In fact, if this were to be the only copper / nickel mining project ever undertaken in the Duluth Complex, it should be turned down. We are not evaluating a new mine here, we are evaluating a new industry. For the same reason a specific analysis needs to be done of Twin Metals processing their ores using excess processing capacity at this same site. That possibility is too real and too imminent to be excluded from your analysis. At a bare minimum this EIS needs to identify one backup site for an additional tailings basin and needs to update the impact on the local hydrology assuming a doubling of the projected volume of ores processed in this same time frame. That analysis needs to consider refilling the West Pit at twice the forecast rate. The assessment of cumulative effects should not be limited to known specific pl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harla Partridge

40413

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Harlan

43962

The proposed PolyMet mining project is too risky. The SDEIS tells us that water pollution and other environmental harms can be prevented or contained for 20 years of mining operations and hundreds of years thereafter . . . if the reverse osmosis water treatment and other systems work as they are designed to work, if nothing goes wrong, if extreme weather events or other natural or human-caused catastrophes do not occur, if the containment barriers are not punctured or overwhelmed, etc But unforeseen things do happen; in the real world, unexpected events should be expected; and hundreds of years is a very long time. The likelihood of a breakdown in PolyMet's proposed operations is great, and the consequences to the environment would be disastrous, especially in this fragile and water-rich part of the Lake Superior watershed. The short-term economic benefits of the mine would not be worth the price of the potential long-term harm. Harlan Cavert 100 2nd St SE, #1002 Minneapolis, MN 55414 (612) 378-2919 [HYPERLINK "mailto:hmcavert@msn-com" hmcavert@msn-com](mailto:hmcavert@msn-com)

Harold Childers

54474

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harold Denenberg

40970

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Harold Denenberg 833 Persimmon Ln Langhorne, PA 19047-1777 (215) 752-3122

Harold Dziuk

44383

From: Harold Dziuk [mailto:behal@bigfork-net] Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 9:08 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan, I believe the mine should not be built as described. There are many problems with PolyMet's mine plan. All I want is to make sure that any sulfide mines opened in Northern Minnesota are safe, clean, and don't leave taxpayers with a bill. If we don't get this right the first time, the next 17 generations of Minnesotans will have to live with the consequences. Sincerely, Harold Dziuk 51301 Pine Point Road Bigfork, MN 56628-4229

Harold J Noyes

43218

Dear Comment Reviewer: I find the NorthMet SDEIS to provide a very strong basis supporting that the project move forward and I encourage the appropriate authorities to do so. There is confusion in the public media about the impacts related to the potential for ground water or surface water contamination or a potential need for an extended, undefined term of mechanical treatment. It is my understanding that extensive lab leaching tests and related modelling have been conducted that address and resolve these issues, but I do not believe this has been made adequately clear to the public, since this remains a commonly cited objection and most people cannot reasonably understand a 2300 page technical document. I recommend in your approval of the project that you provide some better summary of this collection of issues. Harold J Noyes P. O. Box 1186 Golden, CO 80402

Harold Kapaun Jr

41908

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Harold Kapaun Jr 2207 Reaney Ave E Saint Paul, MN 55119-3949

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harold Kapaun Jr

41909

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Harold Kapaun Jr 2207 Reaney Ave E Saint Paul, MN 55119-3949

Harold Nordin

43066

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MN-DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 From: Harold Nordin 5310 Oakley Street Duluth, Minnesota 55804 In my opinion the NorthMet SDEIS falls short of providing the quality of information required to ensure the appropriate environmental safeguards are implemented before, during, and after the projected 20-year life of the project. For the following reasons I feel the current NorthMet (PolyMet) SDEIS should be rejected and a revised document required: 1- The current SDEIS does not address the use of alternative methods for mining sulfide bearing ores that would reduce the impact on the environment—eg underground or subsurface mining operations which could significantly reduce adverse impact on the ecologically sensitive surface area and reduce the likelihood of water contaminants in the watershed. 2- The current SDEIS does not adequately address the issue of water quality relative to the reproduction of wild rice in waters adjacent to mining operations. Current guidelines for water quality should be enforced as currently written and allowances for seasonal variations should not be allowed. 3- The current SDEIS does not address the consequences of long terms exposure to water borne and airborne contaminants for individuals living and working within area which will be impacted by open-pit mining operations including consequences likely to occur long after mining operations have ceased. 4- The current SDEIS does not adequately address the issue of water quality relative to the reproduction of wild rice in waters adjacent to mining operations. Seasonal variances should not be granted until research is available to support such action. 5- The current SDEI does not adequately address the ability of the parent company (PolyMet) to provide the necessary financial assurances that site remediation issue can be addressed long-term notable after mining operations have ceased.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harold Radke

40132

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Harriet Liedtke

14622

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Let's keep mining out of Minnesota. Let the other states take the risk. Keep Minnesota wild and beautiful. It's our investment for the future. It makes economic sense to not burden our children with 500 years of pollution. Let's be known for our unpolluted natural resources. There are no "guarantees" worth the risk. Say No to mining. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Harriet Liedtke 15151 Greenhaven Dr Apt 124 Burnsville, MN 55306-6151 (952) 435-6715

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harriet M Liedtke

20992

We live on a planet overcrowded with people. Evolution tells us that any species that gets out of control ultimately dies off. We need to treat our environment as precious. Everything that is not eco-friendly must not be done. This mine isn't environmentally friendly. We don't need it. Minnesota is known for its natural resources. Let's not risk our future. It's not worth it. Tell them to develop a solution that doesn't pollute. That's what makes economic sense. Clean technology is real, and there are companies that can bring it about. Let's do the right thing. Say No to this mine in its present form. Harriet M Liedtke 15151 Greenhaven Dr #124 Burnsville, MN 55306

Harriet McCleary

43494

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Harriet McCleary 2440 Stevens Ave S. #2 Minneapolis, MN 55404

48483

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Harriet McCleary 2440 Stevens Ave S. #2 Minneapolis, MN 55404

Harrison Olk

57268

I have had the privilege of calling Duluth my home for six years. Throughout this time, I have learned the importance of the environment and waters that surround this area. This is something that is not only important to me, but also to my kids, their kids and the many people to inhabit this area for years to come. Send this plan back, restore the region so we can be proud of the land we live in. Harrison Olk 1921 East 3rd Street, Apt 2 Duluth, MN 55812

harry greenberg

41941

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, harry greenberg Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Harry Melander 18140

My name is Keith Hanson, H-A-N-S-O-N. And I'm ceding my time to Harry Melander.: Harry Melander, H-A-R-R-Y, M-E-L-A-N-D-E-R. Mahtomedi, Minnesota. Thanks for the chance to comment on the Supplemental Draft EIS for the purpose of the NorthMet copper-nickel mining opportunity for our state. As indicated, my name is Harry and I work for the Minnesota Building and Construction Trades Council. This council represents over 55,000 skilled construction workers throughout our state. Tonight we are here as a group to comment on this document, and we will only do that. We believe that the applicant has provided to our state and our national agencies all that has been asked for and more. We believe that the agencies, the DNR, are state agencies and others that we all support and trust addressed all that Minnesota wants, which is a safe and clean mining process for minerals that everyone in this room depends upon. We believe that the applicant was required and provided concerns brought forward by the state and federal agencies. And those issues are addressed in this document. Minnesotans, today we come together as a state to discuss a process that was required and followed. We are here commenting on what can be the future of clean copper-nickel mining not only in our state but our nation. We know that there are no individuals in this room that want to do damage to our pristine Northwestern Minnesota landscape. Our organization supports and believes that. We do see the benefit of clean and safe copper-nickel mining and what it will do for our state. Let's not blow a chance to establish globally what good, clean copper mining looks like. Minnesota, we have an opportunity to produce safe and clean copper-nickel mining. And to say that it needs to and it's okay to be somewhere else is globally irresponsible. In closing, this document has all and more than what was asked for. We cannot look in the mirror and say anything different. Mining in Minnesota has been a tradition for over 100 years. Our members benefit from it, the region benefits from it, and everyone in this room depends upon it. Clean, safe protected policy is what this document is about and provides. We ask our state and federal agencies to make sure that happens. And this time it does just that. We asked them, they delivered it, and now let's move on. Jobs in the traditional of mining clean, safe, and greatly regulated. Thank you.

Harvey Hyatt 54551

Please reject the polymet mine. I heard just today, Jan 22 2014, that the model is based on a drought year. This severely underestimates the amount of sulfides that will enter the environment.

Heather Day 15754

See attachment

Heather Dunlop 41860

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Heather Dunlop Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Friedli

7163

To whom this may concern; I am a former resident of Ely, and I am STRONGLY AGAINST the new proposed copper-nickel mines. I have worked several jobs there, in the outdoor tourism industry, retail and food. My husband and I married and had our first child in Ely. I have many friends who live there still, and we still live in Ely during the summer for our jobs. I feel that 500 years of potential pollution to our lakes and rivers is too much of a risk to take. For the outdoor tourism industry we do have, and for the health and lives of the people who live and work in the surrounding area. We need sustainable industry up there- not the slash and burn, boom town industry that mining has always been. There is not one copper-nickel mine in the world that has operated safely without serious pollution and harm to people who live around it. I don't want to live near a Superfund site which we just let happen in some of the most scenic and pure places in the world. Who will be paying for the perpetual clean up of these mines and tailing basins. While the mining companies say they will, 500 years of pollution is longer than we can expect those companies to stay in business, or stockpile enough money to take care of their mess. Polymet has yet to detail how they will financially pay for perpetual cleanup. Without that information it would be foolish for us to even consider letting the mining begin. In reality cleanup will fall on the backs of our children, and our children's children for many generations. Who gives us the right to do that. We should not pollute the water we all drink and play in. What about the heritage we leave to our children. I want them to have the same opportunities to fish clean waters and collect wild rice that we hAve I do not want them to live in fear of what the pollution is doing to their bodies and minds because they live up north. Is this the legacy we want to leave our children. This and other mining proposals are some of the reasons I hesitate to move my young family back to Ely, despite the fact that we love it there. Lack of jobs doesn't keep me away, I know I can create my own living there. The resulting boom town and pollution which will ruin many lives does keep us away. Thank you for listening. Heather Friedli-Ratzlaff 37135 Shady Lane Trail Cannon Falls, MN 55009

Heather Hartfiel

40200

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Miss Heather Hartfiel 122 W Fletcher St Apt 5 Crookston, MN 56716-1944

Heather Hundt

52315

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Heather Hundt 15686 141st Avenue Lake Park, MN 56554

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Lehtinen

39116

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. Cumulative Effects- Arsenic and Cancer *Arsenic is rated by the US Environmental Protection Agency as a Class A carcinogen. That means it causes cancer in human beings. Colby Lake provides drinking water for the city of Hoyt Lakes. It already has high arsenic levels. *The SDEIS says that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will increase arsenic in Colby Lake by 38-5% (SDEIS, p. 5-145) *The EPA has adopted rules calculating how much arsenic in water unacceptably increases the risk of cancer. (40 C.F.R. 131-36) PolyMet's increase in arsenic for Hoyt Lakes drinking water is above both the threshold set by the EPA and the cancer risk level in Minnesota. *In addition to arsenic in their drinking water, people in Hoyt Lakes would ingest arsenic by eating local fish or wild rice. Low income people who fish and rice for food would have the most cumulative risk. The Food and Drug Administration recently tested rice for arsenic and found Minnesota wild rice has 6 micrograms per liter of arsenic. *The SDEIS must be redone to make a cumulative assessment of arsenic exposure and cancer risks for people in Hoyt Lakes, including formula fed infants and people who rely on fish and wild rice for food. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Lehtinen

48647

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. Cumulative Effects- Arsenic and Cancer *Arsenic is rated by the US Environmental Protection Agency as a Class A carcinogen. That means it causes cancer in human beings. Colby Lake provides drinking water for the city of Hoyt Lakes. It already has high arsenic levels. *The SDEIS says that the PolyMet sulfide mine projet will increase arsenic in Colby Lake by 38-5% (SDEIS, p. 5-145) *The EPA has adopted rules calculating how much arsenic in water unacceptably increases the risk of cancer. (40 C.F.R. 131-36) PolyMet's increase in arsenic for Hoyt Lakes drinking water is above both the threshold set by the EPA and the cancer risk level in Minnesota. *In addition to arsenic in their drinking water, people in Hoyt Lakes would ingest arsenic by eating local fish or wild rice. Low income people who fish and rice for food would have the most cumulative risk. The Food and Drug Administration recently tested rice for arsenic and found Minnesota wild rice has 6 micrograms per liter of arsenic. *The SDEIS must be redone to make a cumulative assessment of arsenic exposure and cancer risks for people in Hoyt Lakes, including formula fed infants and people who rely on fish and wild rice for food. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of wat

Heather Macdonald

30924

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The proposed mining is a death knell.. Why would we create a by product that will pollute environment for 100s of years. Yes- they say they have safety standards and rules and laws in place to prevent pollution. That is no guarantee. Why can't we learn from our mistakes. A mistake will happen. Humans make mistakes. Then part of our world will be gone forever. All for money. Money and greed. They dangle before us that jobs will be created by this mining. Why would we want jobs that don;t even last as long as the pollution this mining will create. What are people thinking to allow this to happen to one of the world's pristine places. There WILL be pollution from this mining that will negatively impact this unique and precious environment. AND it will create a by product that will be toxic for hundreds of years. Are we insane that we would undertake this venture for short term goal and long term pollution and destruction This action is not in the interest of the many but of the interest of the few. Those that will make the most money want this. Money. The language of destruction. Why doesn't ethics , values and the beauty of nature ever trump profit. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Heather Macdonald 75 Vermillion St Carlton, MN 55718-9705 (218) 390-1929

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Meier

20234

Dear Ms Fay, Thank you for taking the time to hear comments and understand my position strongly opposing the proposed MN Sulfide Mine. I'm shocked and saddened that Sulfide Mining in one of our national treasures, the Lake Superior Basin, is even being considered. I am not fundamentally against mining; however, I am strongly against Sulfide Mining and this Proposal. Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reject this proposal and to not grant permits. With great power comes great responsibility. Don't allow the destruction of the Lake Superior Basin's environment and existing economy. The scientific facts are clear + Sulfide mining's current state and history are consistent and clear: This type of mining is destructive to the environment. There is nothing in this proposal to prove otherwise. It is both naïve and dangerous to think Sulfide Mining will just "fit right in" to Northern Minnesota and create jobs with no negative consequences to the environment and existing economy. I'm in favor of job creation but not at the expense of everything else (eg water, and existing jobs). Everything comes with a cost, and the true cost of sulfide mining is far too high. Don't allow Northern MN to be another failed sulfide mining "experiment". My strong opposition to this proposal has many bases~ · Environmental · Economic · Personal Environmental Impact: Have we really come to the point in the American Economy that we need to choose between clean water and jobs. This proposal risks our water, air, and the overall environmental health of the region. This is not equivalent to mining Iron Ore (which is a tradition of the region). The impact difference between Sulfide and Iron Ore mining is drastic, but this is not being discussed enough. There are many of us who are not fundamentally against mining, but have researched this, and are very against sulfide mining. However, I'm concerned most Minnesotans believe this is just the same as the Iron Ore mining done in Northern MN for generations. It is up to you, as leaders, to know the difference, stand strong, and protect this region. Iron ore mining doesn't trigger acid mine drainage and pollute the surrounding environment. There is mining and then there is MINING . Facts: · When Sulfide ore comes in to contact with air and water (keep in mind, these mines are almost always below the water line), sulfuric acid is generated. · This acidic run off mixes with other heavy metals and thus creates acid mine drainage. This leaches in to ground water, lakes, streams etc + pollutes the air.. This is dangerous for people (as well as wildlife). · The mine craters fill with water (rain + ground water) and mix with the mines acid drainage creating Acid Lakes-This kills the wildlife that unwittingly land in, or drink from, these "acid drainage lakes". · To date, no sulfide mine has been able to operate without causing pollution in the surrounding environment. o Many companies point to the Flambeau Mine as a model case; however, a 2012 federal ruling showed multiple violations of the Clean Water Act at the Flambeau site. · As a result of the Flambeau site, Wisconsin has issued a moratorium requiring sulfide mining companies to prove that sulfide mining has successfully been done elsewhere, without causing water pollution, before the allowance of mines there. There is no real life evidence PolyMet's plan will work. Their proposal is not fact based, but rather theory and speculation. We need real, practical application PROOF this has been done (in a similar climate and scale) without destruction. Not "theories on paper" or "controlled tests or models". Let's not just believe the Mining Companies (that have a long history of poor stewardship, integrity and accountability). No matter what measures they claim will be put in place, there will be issues/"events". Thinking we can "control" the spread of the acid mine drainage is supremely arrogant and obviously wrong. No matter how many pages the proposal is, we all know

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Meier

42502

Dear Mr Bruner, Thank you for taking the time to hear comments and understand my position strongly opposing the proposed MN Sulfide Mine. I'm shocked and saddened that Sulfide Mining in one of our national treasures, the Lake Superior Basin, is even being considered. I am not fundamentally against mining; however, I am strongly against Sulfide Mining and this Proposal. Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reject this proposal and to not grant permits. With great power comes great responsibility. Don't allow the destruction of the Lake Superior Basin's environment and existing economy. The scientific facts are clear + Sulfide mining's current state and history are consistent and clear: This type of mining is destructive to the environment. There is nothing in this proposal to prove otherwise. It is both naïve and dangerous to think Sulfide Mining will just "fit right in" to Northern Minnesota and create jobs with no negative consequences to the environment and existing economy. I'm in favor of job creation but not at the expense of everything else (eg water. and existing jobs). Everything comes with a cost, and the true cost of sulfide mining is far too high. Don't allow Northern MN to be another failed sulfide mining "experiment". My strong opposition to this proposal has many bases~ · Environmental · Economic · Personal Environmental Impact: Have we really come to the point in the American Economy that we need to choose between clean water and jobs. This proposal risks our water, air, and the overall environmental health of the region. This is not equivalent to mining Iron Ore (which is a tradition of the region). The impact difference between Sulfide and Iron Ore mining is drastic, but this is not being discussed enough. There are many of us who are not fundamentally against mining, but have researched this, and are very against sulfide mining. However, I'm concerned most Minnesotans believe this is just the same as the Iron Ore mining done in Northern MN for generations. It is up to you, as leaders, to know the difference, stand strong, and protect this region. Iron ore mining doesn't trigger acid mine drainage and pollute the surrounding environment. There is mining and then there is MINING . Facts: · When Sulfide ore comes in to contact with air and water (keep in mind, these mines are almost always below the water line), sulfuric acid is generated. · This acidic run off mixes with other heavy metals and thus creates acid mine drainage. This leaches in to ground water, lakes, streams etc + pollutes the air.. This is dangerous for people (as well as wildlife). · The mine craters fill with water (rain + ground water) and mix with the mines acid drainage creating Acid Lakes-This kills the wildlife that unwittingly land in, or drink from, these "acid drainage lakes". · To date, no sulfide mine has been able to operate without causing pollution in the surrounding environment. o Many companies point to the Flambeau Mine as a model case; however, a 2012 federal ruling showed multiple violations of the Clean Water Act at the Flambeau site. · As a result of the Flambeau site, Wisconsin has issued a moratorium requiring sulfide mining companies to prove that sulfide mining has successfully been done elsewhere, without causing water pollution, before the allowance of mines there. There is no real life evidence PolyMet's plan will work. Their proposal is not fact based, but rather theory and speculation. We need real, practical application PROOF this has been done (in a similar climate and scale) without destruction. Not "theories on paper" or "controlled tests or models". Let's not just believe the Mining Companies (that have a long history of poor stewardship, integrity and accountability). No matter what measures they claim will be put in place, there will be issues/"events". Thinki

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Meier

47797

From: Heather Meier [mailto:Heather.Meier@genmills-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 3:39 PM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: Sulfide Mining Comment: Strongly Opposed. Reject Proposal Dear Mr Periman, Thank you for taking the time to hear comments and understand my position strongly opposing the proposed MN Sulfide Mine. I'm shocked and saddened that Sulfide Mining in one of our national treasures, the Lake Superior Basin, is even being considered. I am not fundamentally against mining; however, I am strongly against Sulfide Mining and this Proposal. Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reject this proposal and to not grant permits. With great power comes great responsibility. Don't allow the destruction of the Lake Superior Basin's environment and existing economy. The scientific facts are clear + Sulfide mining's current state and history are consistent and clear: This type of mining is destructive to the environment. There is nothing in this proposal to prove otherwise. It is both naïve and dangerous to think Sulfide Mining will just "fit right in" to Northern Minnesota and create jobs with no negative consequences to the environment and existing economy. I'm in favor of job creation but not at the expense of everything else (eg water. and existing jobs). Everything comes with a cost, and the true cost of sulfide mining is far too high. Don't allow Northern MN to be another failed sulfide mining "experiment". My strong opposition to this proposal has many bases~ Environmental Economic Personal Environmental Impact: Have we really come to the point in the American Economy that we need to choose between clean water and jobs. This proposal risks our water, air, and the overall environmental health of the region. This is not equivalent to mining Iron Ore (which is a tradition of the region). The impact difference between Sulfide and Iron Ore mining is drastic, but this is not being discussed enough. There are many of us who are not fundamentally against mining, but have researched this, and are very against sulfide mining. However, I'm concerned most Minnesotans believe this is just the same as the Iron Ore mining done in Northern MN for generations. It is up to you, as leaders, to know the difference, stand strong, and protect this region. Iron ore mining doesn't trigger acid mine drainage and pollute the surrounding environment. There is mining and then there is MINING . Facts: When Sulfide ore comes in to contact with air and water (keep in mind, these mines are almost always below the water line), sulfuric acid is generated. This acidic run off mixes with other heavy metals and thus creates acid mine drainage. This leaches in to ground water, lakes, streams etc + pollutes the air.. This is dangerous for people (as well as wildlife). The mine craters fill with water (rain + ground water) and mix with the mines acid drainage creating Acid Lakes-This kills the wildlife that unwittingly land in, or drink from, these "acid drainage lakes". To date, no sulfide mine has been able to operate without causing pollution in the surrounding environment. Many companies point to the Flambeau Mine as a model case; however, a 2012 federal ruling showed multiple violations of the Clean Water Act at the Flambeau site. As a result of the Flambeau site, Wisconsin has issued a moratorium requiring sulfide mining companies to prove that sulfide mining has successfully been done elsewhere, without causing water pollution, before the allowance of mines there. There is no real life evidence PolyMet's plan will work. Their proposal is not fact based, but rather theory and speculation. We need real, practical application PROOF this has been done (in a similar climate and scale) without destruction. Not "theories on paper" or "controlled tests or models". Let's not just believe the Mining Companies (that have a long history of poor stewardship, integrity and accountabili

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Meier

49583

Dear Mr Dabney, Thank you for taking the time to hear comments and understand my position strongly opposing the proposed MN Sulfide Mine. I'm shocked and saddened that Sulfide Mining in one of our national treasures, the Lake Superior Basin, is even being considered. I am not fundamentally against mining; however, I am strongly against Sulfide Mining and this Proposal. Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reject this proposal and to not grant permits. With great power comes great responsibility. Don't allow the destruction of the Lake Superior Basin's environment and existing economy. The scientific facts are clear + Sulfide mining's current state and history are consistent and clear: This type of mining is destructive to the environment. There is nothing in this proposal to prove otherwise. It is both naïve and dangerous to think Sulfide Mining will just "fit right in" to Northern Minnesota and create jobs with no negative consequences to the environment and existing economy. I'm in favor of job creation but not at the expense of everything else (eg water, and existing jobs). Everything comes with a cost, and the true cost of sulfide mining is far too high. Don't allow Northern MN to be another failed sulfide mining "experiment". My strong opposition to this proposal has many bases~ · Environmental · Economic · Personal Environmental Impact: Have we really come to the point in the American Economy that we need to choose between clean water and jobs. This proposal risks our water, air, and the overall environmental health of the region. This is not equivalent to mining Iron Ore (which is a tradition of the region). The impact difference between Sulfide and Iron Ore mining is drastic, but this is not being discussed enough. There are many of us who are not fundamentally against mining, but have researched this, and are very against sulfide mining. However, I'm concerned most Minnesotans believe this is just the same as the Iron Ore mining done in Northern MN for generations. It is up to you, as leaders, to know the difference, stand strong, and protect this region. Iron ore mining doesn't trigger acid mine drainage and pollute the surrounding environment. There is mining and then there is MINING . Facts: · When Sulfide ore comes in to contact with air and water (keep in mind, these mines are almost always below the water line), sulfuric acid is generated. · This acidic run off mixes with other heavy metals and thus creates acid mine drainage. This leaches in to ground water, lakes, streams etc + pollutes the air.. This is dangerous for people (as well as wildlife). · The mine craters fill with water (rain + ground water) and mix with the mines acid drainage creating Acid Lakes-This kills the wildlife that unwittingly land in, or drink from, these "acid drainage lakes". · To date, no sulfide mine has been able to operate without causing pollution in the surrounding environment. o Many companies point to the Flambeau Mine as a model case; however, a 2012 federal ruling showed multiple violations of the Clean Water Act at the Flambeau site. · As a result of the Flambeau site, Wisconsin has issued a moratorium requiring sulfide mining companies to prove that sulfide mining has successfully been done elsewhere, without causing water pollution, before the allowance of mines there. There is no real life evidence PolyMet's plan will work. Their proposal is not fact based, but rather theory and speculation. We need real, practical application PROOF this has been done (in a similar climate and scale) without destruction. Not "theories on paper" or "controlled tests or models". Let's not just believe the Mining Companies (that have a long history of poor stewardship, integrity and accountability). No matter what measures they claim will be put in place, there will be issues/"events". Thinki

Heather Payne

22850

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Therefore, I request that you not approve any exchange. Sincerely, Heather Payne 1300 Mason Farm Rd Chapel Hill, NC 27514-4604 (919) 933-0229

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heather Phillips

42051

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Heather Phillips Eden Prairie, Minnesota

Heather Simso

54135

I realize it's all about \$ for Allete, but why they think this will be the one mine without environmental consequences--not good--is ridiculous. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

HeatherR Nord

41801

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, HeatherR Nord Benson, Minnesota

Hedman Bullivant

52286

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota Duluth. The natural beauty of the Great Lakes is what drew me to going to school here. I love Minnesota because it is a state that values and protects these natural spaces. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Hedman Bullivant 7518 130th Ave Milaca, MN 56353-4437 (763) 898-0268

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Heidi Jindrich

29233

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Because I currently live in an area code far removed from the proposed PolyMet mine, you may want to discount my concerns. But your decision will have a far-reaching effect on the rest of the country-whether democratic forces will have any effect in mine locations anywhere, including our own Cascade and Olympic mountain ranges. I grew up in West Virginia as well as Wisconsin, and I have seen the type of society that accompanies resource extraction economies: severe local poverty, extreme corruption in government, brutal ignorance and its militant defense. The time had come for a different vision, just to survive. Others see it and are willing to defend the land if you are not. We need water to live. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Heidi Jindrich 4159 47th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98116-4001

Heidi Lynn Ahlstrand

42007

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Heidi Lynn Ahlstrand 1580 State Ave NW Owatonna, MN 55060-5688

Heidi Takala

48639

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I grew up on the shores of Lake Superior and in the surrounding wooded areas. I still live in those areas. How dare you even think about setting forth with this business of such contamination process. I am very sure that you are able to find other area that are adequate for your needs. Please do so. This area is the very pure and should remain so. It is the one and only unpolluted natural waters left. What are you thinking. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. People in these areas rely on the natural wildlife and natural resources in this area, I am sure that do not want to see their lives and their childrens' lives threatened by the destruction that would impact the area. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Heidi Takala 1232 4th Ave SW Apt 13 Rochester, MN 55902-3815 (507) 358-0290

Alphabetical by sender's first name

heidi uppgaard

40477

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

heidi uppgaard

40479

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Heidi VanGuilder

44554

3/13/14 I have reviewed the SDEIS for the Polymet Project, and fully approve of the proposed processes and mitigation systems as well as the science used in designing them, and ultimately constructing them. I also believe from an economic standpoint, that expediting the current processes so Polymet could begin construction immediately would bring a desperately needed, immediate economic boost to the Iron Range, not to mention the added benefit of more public lands, through the land exchange. I fully support the SDEIS in its entirety. Heidi VanGuilder 7955 Waris Road Embarrass, Minnesota 55732

Heinecke

9576

Dear DNR, I am absolutely opposed to PolyMet's proposal for sulfide mining and am shocked that our state is even considering it. Allowing it would be shortsighted and unethical, as generation after generation will pay the price for our greed. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Thank you for your time, Elizabeth Lee Heinecke 4213 Branson St Edina, MN 55424 (952)928-9957

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helen Elizabeth Proechel 42803

See attachment

Helen Forsythe 3115

To whom it may concern, As a young person who has treasured the natural landscape on and around Lake Superior on many occasions, I am entirely disappointed that such a beautiful place in our state would be considered for the destructive and toxic process of mining. In addition, people living around this region would be detrimentally affected by any sulfuric acid released into watersheds as a byproduct of the proposed Polymet mine. To endanger the health of this sacred ecosystem for the benefit of corporate interests is to devalue the health of the people and other creatures that inhabit this region. To put corporate profits before this health is entirely immoral. I recognize that this mine will create over 300 jobs for 20 years, which is a social benefit of the mines that I do not want to discredit. However, a job can only get you so far if the water coming out of your sink is contaminated by sulfuric acid or other mining byproducts. For these reasons, I am in favor of the rejection of the proposed Polymet mine. I hope the DNR will take into account the health of the people and the land when making this decision. Thank you for your time. Helen Forsythe

57188

In the interest of protecting human and environmental health, I am in opposition of the proposed Polymet mine project. I believe the perceived economic benefits of these mines will be short-lived and will benefit only a few people so the dangers posed by these mines are entirely more significant than the benefits. Helen Forsyth 25361
County 7 Blvd Welch, MN 55089

58096

I am in opposition of the proposed Polimet mine. I understand the significant economic opportunities offered by these new sulfide mining operations, but I believe the consequences to be for too dangerous for the economic argument to be valid. The potential water, soil, and air pollution effects from these mines pose major threats to the health of people in Minnesota. Our citizen's health will be compromised by this mine, and even those who receive the economic benefits will either be living away from the wastes created, or they will be experiencing the toxic qualities of mining for the period of time that they are employed in the mines. The use of the products received from those mines are not worth compromising our health in the form of our water, soil, air, co2 levels, etc. It is simply not a logical tradeoff, and the proposed Polymet mine should not be approved.

helen frigo 17665

Feb 15, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for- information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, helen frigo 9650 S Ocean Dr Jensen Beach, FL 34957-2354

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helen Gilbert

38825

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Helen Gilbert 3540 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406-2943

HELEN J SPRY

6128

We are property owners on the White Iron Chain of lakes. We are GRAVELY concerned about the potential water quality damage that could result from the proposed mining efforts in the area. We do not believe the mining company premise that this process is "safe". All mines of this type in the US and outside have water issues. There are other locations that have these minerals, why do this next to Watersheds critical to MN and US. Why would or should the state risk this next to one of the most pristine and valuable water sheds in the state: BWCA and Lake Superior. I encourage the deciders to consider the risk of doing this to the future generations Can it really ever be repaired if a problem occurs. If mining is allowed, and if correction is needed it should be funded as a HUGE (multiple BILLIONS) bond or escrow. When your document shows mitigation needs to allow 500 years on the Mining companies, make sure it's the mining pocket books NOT the MN or US taxpayers on the hook. Thank You Helen Spry 2639 Humboldt Ave So MPLS, MN 55408 612 747 0640 Sent from my iPad

Helen Johnson

41698

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helen Matekunas

40410

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Helen Matekunas 1570 West 96th Street Indianapolis, IN 46260 US

Helen Mercer-Taylor

57193

I do not support the Polymet mine project because it goes against the things I value most about my state. I've grown up spending time in our beautiful, pristine natural areas like the waters threatened by this project. I also believe in a Minnesota that shows respect toward the Native Americans living here, whose wild rice resources would be threatened. Helen Mercer-Taylor 2231 Folwell Ave. St. Paul, MN 55108

Helen Paul

42787

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helen Sievers

43350

To all that it may concern Having heard a representative from PolyMet speak earlier in the year, I thought perhaps this might be an ethical company. Attending the public meeting in St Paul convinced me otherwise. One of the first things I observed was what appeared to be bus loads of unprofessional people arriving in overalls and hard hats, apparently representing the miners. One had to wonder if they thought the ceiling was going to fall down, thus the hard hats. Then, there was the activity of “stuffing” the barrel with names of people who then “ceded” to people who had interests that would bring themselves monetary rewards. Why didn’t the people who put their names in speak for themselves. Any company that stoops to those tactics is not likely to care about what damages they do while extracting what will probably be great monetary profits for the company, PolyMet. I left the meeting being even more concerned about the damage that will be done to the environment than when I came. Not only are many valuable resources such as forests, wetlands, bogs, lakes and rivers be physically and permanently damaged but the seepages of toxic chemicals such as mercury and all of the sulfides into the watershed will cause big problems for generations to come. There already is significant damage from previous mining activities. This will only exacerbate the problems. My concerns were increased through a conversation with a representative of PolyMet situated at their booth during the meeting. When I asked what the company was going to do about the metals that would inevitably escape their reclamation system, he indicated none would because the whole purpose was to acquire those metals to sell. Clearly he did not understand, or perhaps acknowledge not only the known pollutant, mercury, is a metal but more importantly some of the copper and nickel would inevitably escape and that these elements were toxic to plant and animal life alike, even in very low concentrations. One could also add, once in the environment these metals could be converted to organometallic compounds which are extremely toxic at even lower concentrations than the inorganic form, the sulfides for example. Methylation of such compounds, which can occur in natural environments, increases their capacity to cross the blood/brain barrier causing all types of neurological problems as well as genetic anomalies. Take for example the methylation of mercury by sulfate-reducing and iron-reducing bacteria (<http://www.intechopen.com/books/methylation-from-dna-rna-and-histones-to-diseases-and-treatment/the-methylation-of-metals-and-metalloids-in-aquatic-systems>). An acute example of the health hazards brought on by methyl mercury is occurring right now in the Grassy Narrows in Ontario, Canada (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontario_Minamata_disease). If PolyMet is truly concerned about the environment and what problems they leave behind, I wonder what is they willing to do in order to obtain the right to mine the copper, nickel and other valuable metals located at the proposed mining site. Are they willing to pay a “carbon tax” on all of the carbon dioxide it releases. Are they willing to put a cap on their profits and invest the rest into the community from which they are taking the minerals. Are they willing to invest a significant portion of the monetary gains towards researching methods of preventing and/or reversing the effects of the pollution caused by their mining techniques. I asked a PolyMet representative at the public meeting if they would install solar cells on the roofs of the buildings only to find an unwillingness to even entertain the idea. Photovoltaic cells could also be installed over the tailing ponds. Oregon has what they refer to as solar highways ([HYPERLINK "http://www.oregonsolarhighway-com/"www.oregonsolarhighway-com](http://www.oregonsolarhighway-com/)). Would PolyMet be willing to install solar power or wind power along the roads to the mining site. Would th

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helena Mestenhauser

41898

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Helena Pohlandt-McCormick

47694

Do not permit sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. We must hold this land in trust for the future. Helena Pohlandt-McCormick 1128 Portland Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helene Vion

40378

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Helene Vion 1903 commonwealth houston, TX 77006 US

Helmut Maier

10239

Dear Ms Fay, Thank you for letting me comment on the proposed leaching mine in Northern Minnesota. I am a retired PhD in Chemistry who has worked for many years for Henkel/Henkel Corporation, a company involved in providing chemicals to the mining business in the US and worldwide. This company has developed the LIX (liquid ion exchange) process to remove valuable metals from ore. As part of my employment, I have learned much about the opportunities and challenges in mining low grade ores. As you are certainly aware, the leaching technologies used to extract metals from low grade ore use a number of very dangerous and/or toxic chemicals, like cyanides or sulfuric acid, depending on the metals that are extracted. In all cases, protecting the water below and around the leaching fields is a major technical challenge that continues long after the leaching operations are discontinued. While it is technically feasible to do this, the long duration of all protective measures have generally exceeded the commitment or financial resources of the operating companies and the clean-up of problems falls onto the public sector. While this may not have resulted in major disasters (yet) in North America, the very large operations in Africa that used leaching processes, are an example of the environmental disasters that can result in the aftermath of abandoned leaching operations. Unless PolyMet is forced to fully finance the long-term clean-up of the proposed leaching sites while they operate the mine, the long-term protection of the ground water and environmental water sources will eventually fall to the public sector, either through bankruptcy or off-shoring of the operating company. In any case, major negative environmental impact of the mine after the leaching operation ends is, in my opinion, a certainty, due to the long clean-up process. I am strongly opposed to the PolyMet proposal and urge the DNR not to approve it. Best regards, Helmut Maier 1201 Yale Place Apt. 702 Minneapolis, MN 55403 maierhk@outlook-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Helmut Maier 17286

Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to you regarding the planned Polymet Mine in Northern Minnesota. After reading that Glencore is a 25% owner of the intended mine and a likely operator, I was concerned about ethical issues reported about Glencore in the news and on the internet (see quotes from Wikipedia below). My big concern is the protection of the environment in the area around the proposed mine. Considering the heavy metals as well as sulfur containing ores in the tailings of the mine, water and air contamination are serious concerns. To assure that any contamination is caught in real time rather than upon inspection by the authorities after the fact, effluent and off-gases should be controlled in real time with data sent immediately on-line and automatically to a government authority as soon as the allowed discharge limits are exceeded. The technology for such real time tests as well as on-line reporting is readily available and would protect the environment much better than cleaning-up after a spill has been discovered. As you are well aware, cleaning up a heavy metal spill is very difficult, time consuming and costly and does major damage to the environment. Prevention is the only option here. Finally, considering the information listed below, the PolyMet mine has to fund verifiably ongoing insurance that will pay for any longterm clean-up of water from the mine operation. It has to be assured that the owner or operator of the mine cannot declare bankruptcy or go off-shore and walk away from their long-term obligations without leaving enough funding/insurance behind for the long-term operation of the clean-up and monitoring operation. The tax payer should not have to pay for any of the long-term consequences of this mine operation. Best regards, Helmut Maier 1201 Yale Place, 702 MPLS, MN 55403

Controversies[HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/w/index.php.title=Glencore_Xstrataandaction=editandsection=11"edit] Financial and accounting manipulations[HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/w/index.php.title=Glencore_Xstrataandaction=editandsection=12"edit] Five non-government organisations have filed a complaint to the HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Organisation_for_Economic_Co-operation_and_Development"OECD against a subsidiary of Glencore over allegations that a mine it owns in HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Zambia"Zambia may not be paying enough tax on its profits. The cause for the complaint lies in the financial and accounting manipulations performed by the two companies' subsidiary, Mopani Copper Mines Plc (MCM), in order to evade taxation in Zambia.HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Glencore_Xstrata#cite_note-corporatejustice-org-41"[41]HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Glencore_Xstrata#cite_note-guardian-42"[42] In 2011, HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Grant_Thornton_International"Grant Thornton found that tax avoidance by Glencore in Zambia cost the Zambian Government hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue. The avoidance was facilitated through mechanisms such as HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Transfer_pricing"transfer pricing and inflating costs at Glencore's HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Mopani_Copper_Mine"Mopani Copper Mine. The Mopani mines are controlled through the HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/British_Virgin_Islands"British Virgin Islands, a recognised tax haven.HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Glencore_Xstrata#cite_note-43"[43] Dealings with "rogue states"[HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/w/index.php.title=Glencore_Xstrataandaction=editandsection=13"edit] ABC Radio reported that Glencore "has been accused of illegal dealings with HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Rogue_state"rogue states: HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Apartheid"apartheid HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/South_Africa"South Africa, HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Soviet_Union"USSR, HYPERLINK "http://en.wiki

58122

Concern about control of discharge from mine. It is not sufficient to control discharge level of pollutants on an infrequent basis. Instead, there has to be real fine control for metals and pollutant gases to assure no inadvertent pollution happens due to mechanical failures or human error. The technology for this exists. It is essential to prevent such pollution accidents since cleanup of spills in this sensitive environment is very difficult or impossible and, for sure, expensive.

Henry Illegible 42622

See attachment

Henry J. Sandri 42919

Please see the attached letter. Thank you. Henry J. Sandri President and COO Vermillion Gold Inc.

Henry Koski 42638

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Henry Moore

7496

Dear Ms Fay, The proposed PolyMet mine for northeastern Minnesota is a disaster on a number of fronts just waiting to happen. Reading the SDEISI am opposed to the mine for several reasons. First, it will destroy nearly 1000 acres of wetlands and probably nearly 8,000 additional acres, all in violation the EPA which requires that a project that destroys wetlands not be approved if pollution would violate the Clean Water Act. This applies to the "Section 404 Permit" as well as the SDEIS. Poly-Met admits water pollution at the site. How does Poly-Met respond to this concern, and will the EPA rule be enforced. Second, will Minnesota's own Department of Health regulations regarding limits for manganese be upheld. The current limit set by Poly-Met of 1506 micrograms per liter for manganese is fifteen times higher than the health limit set by the Health Department. Why. How will this be corrected since it induces brain damage in humans of all ages. Third, what will be the effect of the toxicity of the plant on the workers. Will Poly- Met cover their health liabilities or leave it to Minnesota and the federal government to cover the long term costs. Why is nothing regarding worker health liabilities addressed in the SDEIS statement. Why is this glaring omission allowed. Fourth, why is a project potentially allowed which will pollute the agricultural, fishing, wildlife, and drinking water for thousands of people in the northeastern Minnesota area and in the Lake Superior basin into perpetuity. If clean drinkable water is one of the absolute necessities of life why is it being considered for toxic pollution for the next 500 years or longer. What happens when the systems designed to stop the seepage, drainage, and discharge fail to operate as described in the SDEIS. How is Poly-Met (or whoever might buy them out during the 20 year mining period) going to be held responsible. How will the water seepage from rock fractured by blasting into underground sources which will eventually reach the wetlands, rivers, streams and lakes be prevented. I live in the Lake Superior region, have a cabin on Island Lake and love the beauty of the land, the woods and the forests. I moved here from Chicago about 25 years ago so that our daughters might learn to love this beautiful place also. I do not fish, hunt, or ride snowmobiles but I respect the rights of those who do and the vendors who service their pursuits. Why should a most valuable tourist and vacation land for much of the Midwest be sacrificed for a few short lived high-tech jobs, a valuable product to be shipped overseas, and profits be provided to corporations located elsewhere around. Respectfully, Henry O Moore Henry Moore 502 Madison Abve Duluth, MN 55811 218-727-5319

Henry Mott

28605

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, To whom it may concern: I understand the desire for jobs in Minnesota's iron range and the desire to develop the vast deposits of copper and other valuable metals lying beneath the Earth's surface in NE Minnesota. However, I am aghast that those charged with the protection of Minnesota's environment, especially Lake Superior, would accept a "reclamation" plan from PolyMet that would require treatment of mining-contaminated water for hundreds of years post mine closure - perhaps in perpetuity. We the people will be paying for the extracted copper long after PolyMet's CEO and other top executives have built their trophy homes and purchased their yachts and the workers from the area have purchased their new pickup trucks, snowmobiles and camper trailers. I would hope that the officials in command of this permit application would stand firm that mining should leave no legacy environmental problems with which to deal post closure. Those wishing to profit from the mining operations undoubtedly claim that such a guarantee cannot be made - that such a remediation plan cannot be set in place. I would vehemently disagree. I am an environmental engineer (holding a PhD) and strongly believe that such a design surely can be devised. It may be expensive, but in order to partake in Minnesota's subsurface mineral natural resources, PolyMet (or any other mining company wishing to do so) must be prepared to shoulder the true cost of extracting the minerals from the Earth. Do not say "NO" to mining itself; say "NO" to mining when associated reclamation plans will leave legacy environmental problems Please don't concentrate on the amount of the bond that PolyMet will set forth - whatever is decided, it will not be sufficient. Rather, concentrate on a requirement that the mining operations will leave no new legacy environmental problems Sincerely, Henry V Mott, PE, PhD Sincerely, Henry Mott 1489 Clarmar Ln Saint Paul, MN 55113-1652 (605) 484-8140

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Henry Mott

43681

Mar 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. March 13, 2014 To the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: Re:Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement NorthMet Mining Project I have reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, with specific focus upon the proposed reclamation plan. I find this reclamation plan to provide grossly inadequate assurance of long-term protection of critical ecosystems and surface waters. The proposed necessity to maintain monitoring and treatment systems for seepage from the tailings basin and category 1 waste rock storage pile for 200 to 500 years post mine closure is preposterous. Further, the proposed necessity, in perpetuity, to maintain the vegetative covers to prevent growth of trees and woody plants on the tailings basin, hydrometallurgical pit and category 1 waste rock pile caps is unthinkable. The proposed plan would simply allow the West Pit to fill without measures to isolate the reactive walls from oxygen. The pit would subsequently overflow requiring treatment (perhaps in perpetuity) of emanating water. This portion of the plan is unconscionable. Hereinafter, I offer some specific comments relative to proposed plans for tailings, hydrometallurgical pit, category 1 waste rock, category 2-4 waste rock, and East/Central and West mine pit reclamation. 1-0Tailings basin: PolyMet proposes to cap the unlined tailings basin with bentonite layers. This action is intended to limit the entry of oxygen into the materials contained therein. The inevitable oxidation of sulfide to sulfate would merely be delayed beyond the time frame of mining operations. Then, post-closure, over time the sulfide to sulfate reaction would occur, creating acid seepage containing leached metals. Then, the acidic seepage water from the un-lined basin would necessarily be collected and treated well after active mining operations cease, until the entire quantity of sulfide contained in the tailings would be converted to sulfate. PolyMet's predictions suggest a period of up to 500 years during which mechanical treatment of tailings seepage would likely be necessary. PolyMet would not be around to perform this treatment, which if discontinued for any reason, would put sensitive ecosystems and water resources at significant risk. Generations well beyond ours would bear the ultimate brunt of these un-reclaimed tailings as would the ecosystems which undoubtedly would be adversely affected by this activity. This portion of the reclamation plan should be rejected as it provides wholly insufficient protection of water resources and the environment. It would seem prudent to devise a methodology, alternate to PolyMet's proposed "mining business as usual" approach for the tailings basin. PolyMet should be directed to devise a means to accelerate the sulfide to sulfate reaction of the tailings during active mining and a short, well-defined, period thereafter, thus eliminating the reactivity of the tailings and providing the potential for alternative uses. A large body of existing scientific literature addresses the characteristics and behavior of sulfide-oxidizing bacteria. Means to contact tailings with oxygen and other reactants in the presence of sulfide oxidizing bacteria to produce the acid and release metals prior to placement in the tailings pile should be devised. Bench- and pilot-scale testing should be initiated if the literature does not yield sufficient information for system design. Since acids will inevitably be created and metals thereby leached from tailings, the best time for this to occur is during active mining when human and plant resources to deal with this side stream are present and abundant. Additionally, the tailings already existing in the tailings basin, if reactive, co

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Henry Mott

48491

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. March 13, 2014 To the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: Re: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement NorthMet Mining Project I have reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, with specific focus upon the proposed reclamation plan. I find this reclamation plan to provide grossly inadequate assurance of long-term protection of critical ecosystems and surface waters. The proposed necessity to maintain monitoring and treatment systems for seepage from the tailings basin and category 1 waste rock storage pile for 200 to 500 years post mine closure is preposterous. Further, the proposed necessity, in perpetuity, to maintain the vegetative covers to prevent growth of trees and woody plants on the tailings basin, hydrometallurgical pit and category 1 waste rock pile caps is unthinkable. The proposed plan would simply allow the West Pit to fill without measures to isolate the reactive walls from oxygen. The pit would subsequently overflow requiring treatment (perhaps in perpetuity) of emanating water. This portion of the plan is unconscionable. Hereinafter, I offer some specific comments relative to proposed plans for tailings, hydrometallurgical pit, category 1 waste rock, category 2-4 waste rock, and East/Central and West mine pit reclamation. 1-0 Tailings basin: PolyMet proposes to cap the unlined tailings basin with bentonite layers. This action is intended to limit the entry of oxygen into the materials contained therein. The inevitable oxidation of sulfide to sulfate would merely be delayed beyond the time frame of mining operations. Then, post-closure, over time the sulfide to sulfate reaction would occur, creating acid seepage containing leached metals. Then, the acidic seepage water from the un-lined basin would necessarily be collected and treated well after active mining operations cease, until the entire quantity of sulfide contained in the tailings would be converted to sulfate. PolyMet's predictions suggest a period of up to 500 years during which mechanical treatment of tailings seepage would likely be necessary. PolyMet would not be around to perform this treatment, which if discontinued for any reason, would put sensitive ecosystems and water resources at significant risk. Generations well beyond ours would bear the ultimate brunt of these un-reclaimed tailings as would the ecosystems which undoubtedly would be adversely affected by this activity. This portion of the reclamation plan should be rejected as it provides wholly insufficient protection of water resources and the environment. It would seem prudent to devise a methodology, alternate to PolyMet's proposed "mining business as usual" approach for the tailings basin. PolyMet should be directed to devise a means to accelerate the sulfide to sulfate reaction of the tailings during active mining and a short, well-defined, period thereafter, thus eliminating the reactivity of the tailings and providing the potential for alternative uses. A large body of existing scientific literature addresses the characteristics and behavior of sulfide-oxidizing bacteria. Means to contact tailings with oxygen and other reactants in the presence of sulfide oxidizing bacteria to produce the acid and release metals prior to placement in the tailings pile should be devised. Bench- and pilot-scale testing should be initiated if the literature does not yield sufficient information for system design. Since acids will inevitably be created and metals thereby leached from tailings, the best time for this to occur is during active mining when human and plant resources to deal with this side stream are present and abundant. Additionally, the tailings already existing in the tailings basin, if reactive

Henry O Moore

42756

See attachment

Henry Reich

10226

Dear Minnesota DNR, I'm writing out of concern for the possible development of a new Sulfide Mining industry in northern Minnesota, in particular the PolyMet mine currently under consideration. I am worried that the environmental impacts of such a mine are far too great and risky to be worth permitting the mine - in particular, the mine has great potential to seriously pollute the water in the Lake Superior watershed, especially in the long term, which has downstream effects on countless other states, provinces, and ultimately the Atlantic ocean. In addition, development of such a mine sets a dangerous precedent that could open the doors to other mines that could further pollute both the Lake Superior watershed as well as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The DNR should take a hippocratic oath to "FIRST, DO NO HARM" when managing Minnesota's natural resources, the most valuable of which are our clean air and water. I URGE YOU to protect our water and DO NOT ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SULFIDE MINING INDUSTRY in Minnesota. Sincerely, Henry Reich Creator of the Youtube Channels MinutePhysics and MinuteEarth with 2-7 million subscribers PO Box 145 Marine on St Croix, MN 55047

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Herb Smith

18383

My name is Herb Smith. I'm from Red Lake, Minnesota. It's great to be here. And what I have to say is I'm not really for mining because I've seen what it's done to other lands and other bands. And they don't really clean up their site. They have never really cleaned up their sites. Take a look at the southwest corner of our United States. Take a look at Oakland. There's radioactive (inaudible) all over. Our water -- we got the greatest waters here in Minnesota, and we want to let somebody pollute it for a few minor jobs. Your kids and grandkids and your great-grandkids are going to drink that water. Are you going to stay in that area and drink that water? I don't think so. You guys will be buying water. But that water eventually reaches us. All the water in the land -- take a look at water -- I was told we live on a big sponge. You take a look at your own body. You prick it here, that blood is going around. I saw some of your pictures out there. It says it just runs away. It does not run away. It runs all over the earth. If you consider us a like the earth. So when you contaminate the water over here, you contaminate my water in Red Lake. I'm not for this. Few jobs. You know, you guys want to pollute the water -- these guys that want to use these chemicals, drink a gallon of that water in front of us and see how safe it is. Is it that safe? Are you guaranteeing that water is safe once they mix it in with that other water? It doesn't run one way. This is the greatest watershed in the whole world. A couple weeks ago on the news they said we've got the greatest watershed, and we're going to let somebody pollute our water. Water gives life. It sustains us. I appreciate the time for letting me speak. Appreciate it.

Heyward Nash

2665

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Heyward Nash 2625 Park Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-1016

52204

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, HEYWARD NASH 2625 park avenue MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55407

Hillary Peterson

18318

I'm Hillary Peterson. I am from Sturgeon Lake. The proposed PolyMet mine is not a good deal for Minnesota. Trading 500 years' worth of water pollution for 20 years' worth of jobs is irresponsible. Water from open mines and processing plants will be contaminated with heavy levels of sulfide. PolyMet initially stated they would capture all the contaminated water on site and treat it before it was released. However, their own plan now shows that millions of gallons of polluted water will seep off the site before any treatment can be done. Minnesota law requires that sulfide mines be maintenance free at closure. This means a mine site cannot be ongoing with pollution when it is closed. The wastewater generated by sulfide mining is the source of dangerous pollution that by at least one mining company's own acknowledgement will be toxic for thousands of years. Pollution at sulfide mines will certainly require some sort of maintenance into perpetuity. The SDEIS is insufficient. There are still far too many unanswered crucial questions. We should not be willing to gamble the future of Northern Minnesota and condemn ourselves to 500 years of water pollution for 20 years' worth of jobs. I ask that the DNR reject the SDEIS and protect the future of Northern Minnesota.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hillary Peterson

44261

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The proposed PolyMet mine project is not a good deal for Minnesota. Trading 500 years of water pollution and immeasurable damage to the pristine environment of Northeastern Minnesota for a mere 20 years of mediocre jobs is desperately irresponsible. There are far, far too many unanswered questions about this project that need solid, scientifically based answers before this project is considered any further. We cannot continue to pretend this project is somehow special or different from all the other sulfide mining projects. PolyMet has absolutely no motivation to protect our environment. They are a company in a capitalist society. Therefore, their solitary goal is to make the largest profit possible, regardless of the cost to people or the environment. Many who support this project have often said our society needs these minerals if we want to sustain our highly technical way of life; so we should mine them here, in Minnesota, where we have strict environmental laws. I am not doubting the high demand for these minerals or saying that I do not utilize gadgets that are made from these minerals. However, I do have many objections to these statements. First, Minnesota does not have a perfect track record, by any means, for regulating now existing taconite mines. Many of these mines have been granted variances from environmental laws and have paid thousands and thousands of dollars in fines for violations. Sulfide mining poses far more opportunities for environmental harm than taconite mining. If we are not able to fully regulate lower risk taconite mining, why should Minnesotans believe our governing agencies will be able to regular sulfide mining any more effectively. I am not accusing the governing agencies of not trying to regulate the mining indust

hiyala indiga

28438

oh yes, now i remember that i did sign a petition. On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 8:16 AM, hiyala indiga wrote: i did not make any comments On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 7:02 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd - Hiyala Indiga owner, Body Prayers Yoga and Massage housed within Body Mind Circle Holistic Healing Center 301 Village Parkway (on SE quadrant of Lex/Lake dr) Circle Pines, Mn. 55014 - Hiyala Indiga owner, Body Prayers Yoga and Massage housed within Body Mind Circle Holistic Healing Center 301 Village Parkway (on SE quadrant of Lex/Lake dr) Circle Pines, Mn. 55014

28673

i did not make any comments On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 7:02 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd - Hiyala Indiga owner, Body Prayers Yoga and Massage housed within Body Mind Circle Holistic Healing Center 301 Village Parkway (on SE quadrant of Lex/Lake dr) Circle Pines, Mn. 55014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Holle Brian 7146

I'm very concerned about what will happen after 20 years of mining. I'm amazed that anyone could seriously consider this proposed mining operation knowing that the water will have to be monitored for up to "500 years". -- Rich Smith Minneapolis, MN 612-822-6593 holleb@aol-com

Holliskim 1535

Thank you for your hard work on behalf of concerned Minnesotans Sent from my Galaxy S@III ---- Original message ---- From: "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)"
Date:12/09/2013 12:24 PM (GMT-06:00) To: Hollis Kim Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Holly Check 44596

Good Morning, After hearing that the treatment and clean-up efforts could and most likely will last up to 500 years, I am too worried about our environmental future as it is to condone this decision. Despite PolyMet's claim that they'll be around in that time to continuously fund the treatment, if we're being honest, how many companies alive and well 500 years ago are still here today. I can't think of a single one. This leads me to believe that PolyMet will not stay true to their promise and our environment (one that has been protected for good reason) will be left in worse shape and without much hope for effective treatment. Thank you for your time. Holly Check Senior at Prior Lake High School

Holly Hubing 39591

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Holly Hubing dominick dr Hopkins, MN 55343

Holly Jenkins 38892

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Holly Jenkins 1130 Tiffany Pt Eagan, MN 55123-1876

Alphabetical by sender's first name

holly marcotte

41978

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, holly marcotte spring lake park, Minnesota

Holly Nelson

58030

The proposal is short sighted and will put the natural resources of our state at undue risk of harm. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Holly Villa

40328

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Holly Villa 729 McPherson Dr Nashville, TN 37221 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hope C'Dealva-Lenik 22805

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, It is my understanding that sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota, and that in all other places where it has been allowed, acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted nearby rivers, lakes, streams, groundwaters, etc In addition to risks concerning water quality, there would also be danger for local wildlife such as declining moose populations and the threatened lynx, not to mention the obvious health risks to the local human population due all forms of pollution from the mine. I ask you, who would benefit from the mine, other than the mine owners themselves. Are the risks to human and animal health, plus the egregious despoiling of one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world worth it. These are National Forest lands: public lands that are set aside for ALL American citizens. Sincerely, Hope C'Dealva-Lenik 7462 Sale Ave West Hills, CA 91307-1640

Hope Flanagan 18160

(Spoke foreign language). What I'm saying in Ojibwe is, "Hello, relatives. My name is Little Wind Woman." I'm a teacher. I don't have money to hire a whole van of people to cede my time to. It is about our children and the health of our children. Our prophecies talk about seven generations. We got to think about every action that we take affects seven generations of our actions right now. And I wanted to speak as a native woman. Native women we have known -- it was part of our prophecies that we would have to watch out over the water, because we carry our children in sacks of water. All of you women out there, this is our job. We got to make sure our kids aren't sick. The water is the health. When I say "we're relatives," we're relatives to those plants. We're relatives to the food that we eat. I also work in Dream a Lot Health. We're looking at the food sources. We got to have clean water, clean food, clean places to go to get ourselves clean or we're going to have sickness. And I think we've seen that in birth defects and challenges in our children. So let's start thinking about our children. It's not worth a little bit of money. The fellow talked about a risk walking across the street. Well, if nobody ever successfully walked across the street, don't walk across the street. No one has ever successfully had one of these mines. And I would suggest, like the last fellow did, go to a copper mine, see what it looks like. Nothing grows there. It's like a moonscape. I remember when they were trying to grow little plants there. It's so sad. For me, I get people asking me to gather medicines. Right there at Babbitt this year I went fishing, I went gathering plants that they asked me to go for healing. We can get healings from those places, spiritual; the healing from those plants, we don't know all those gifts that those plants have yet. And I know that's part of our ways. Look through those healings. There is different ways of looking for growth. This doesn't have to be a way that pollutes us for infinity. As the rest of the world is looking for freshwater and we're ready to throw ours away. Don't throw this precious, precious gift away. As human beings you'll see in my community we've had women walking from the four directions, from the Arctic Circle, from the Gulf of Mexico, from the two coasts to say "Water is precious. We are running out of freshwater." So please support this clean water movement. Remember, that's what we are, we are water. We are walking skin with water.

Horovitz 54891

See attachment

Howard Frame 42765

See attachment

Howard Heath 54792

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Howard Lambert

40216

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Howard Lambert 35495 Riverwood Ct Unit 1623 Crosslake, MN 56442-4069 (218) 692-5521

Howard Markus

18367

Good evening. My name is Howard Markus, H-O-W-A-R-D, M-A-R-K-U-S. I am a volunteer with Audubon Minnesota. I just retired after working over 22 years for the Minnesota Department of (inaudible) in the area of water quality. And I have a few points to make. Many points have been made on all sides. So I appreciate the fullness of that. But I do have a few things to talk about from my own experience. Taconite mining does not use sulfuric acid. This mine will. So everybody's experience up here I appreciate how good taconite mining has been to everybody. You have no idea how ugly acid mine drainage is. I was a grad student at Iowa State. I saw acid mine drainage in abandoned coal mines in Oskaloosa, southeast of Des Moines. It is not pretty. It is not something you want up here. It sounds great now and there won't be any of this, there won't be any of that. It is ugly. It kills things. It is not what you want up here. It is going to seriously degrade the water resources up here. I read so far about two-thirds of the 2,200 pages. So I'll probably have more comments at another time once I have read the rest of it. But what I have so far is I was looking at the land trade. Right now the land proposed to be traded comes with the surface rights but not mineral rights. This is going to happen all over again. The EIS says all of these things are invaluable. Well, they're not valuable until they become valuable. I believe the Forest Service should reject the land trade and do it right by demanding both the surface rights and the mineral rights for all the lands traded or we're going to be in this circle where we have to go through all this again. So the land trade to me does not work until everything is traded, both surface and mineral. Really soon after the mine starts there is going to be discharges to impaired waters. It is going to be a mess for the agencies. It is going to be a mess for the mine. This is going to be in ecosystems forever. It's going start out with no drainage and no pollution, and really soon there's going to be pollution, there's going permanent problems. There's going to be all sorts of problems with this. It is – you just have no idea of the mess that's going to be in courts from this forever once this thing starts going into waters. These waters are too good. There is just not enough limestone. It's all taconite. My last point is that we are trading upland valuable forest land and they are going to be traded for shrub forest wetlands. Not a fair trade.

54809

See attachment

Howard Miller

21974

Dear Sir/Madam: I wish to convey my wholehearted support for the Polymet Mining effort to establish a copper/nickel precious metal mine in Minnesota. This project will provide thousands of well-paid jobs and will help to provide North America with an inexpensive supply of copper and nickel plus ancillary precious metals. Polymet management will ensure that the mine is operated in an environmentally sound fashion. They will leave the area in at least as good a condition as it is now. Thank you for considering my comments in your deliberations. Howard Miller 12 Colgate Dr Camp Hill, PA 17011 (717) 982-0263 email address: HYPERLINK "mailto:html@aol-com"html@aol-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hser Hoo 54189

I'm against the mine because mining will destroy the wilderness. There will be water pollution. The sulfuric acid will reduce the pH level and kill all the fishes. We won't get to fish in the river anymore. Even though we need copper and gold, we want to save the environment. The economy and environment will have to live through the pollution for 20 years. That's a long time to have to live through those loud machines. The river is a sanctuary for all lands of animals and for some people. Please don't destroy our peace and an environment.

Hudson Mohawk Bird Club 20761

See attachment

Hugh Curtler III 17605

Feb 15, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. There are serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for -- information that is necessary for you to make a fully informed decision. I urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining threatens to result in hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive wildlife and habitat. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter. Sincerely, Mr Hugh Curtler III 4516 89th Cres N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-3936 (763) 315-8749

30110

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. In short, I feel that the federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate a destructive open-pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. Sincerely, Hugh Curtler III 4516 89th Cres N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-3936 (612) 111-1111

Humphrey Kearns 3703

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Until it can be demonstrated that no contaminated water can leave the site, either in run-off or under ground, I can't support this type of mining in an area like the Arrowhead. Once you mess up a place it is pretty much messed up forever. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Humphrey Kearns 6282 State 26 La Crescent, MN 55947-8763 (507) 894-1000

51784

Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Until it can be demonstrated that no contaminated water can leave the site, either in run-off or under ground, I can't support this type of mining in an area like the Arrowhead. Once you mess up a place it is pretty much messed up forever. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Humphrey Kearns 6282 State 26 La Crescent, MN 55947-8763 (507) 894-1000

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Hunter Maughan

46034

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Also because there are ecosystems, and this mining could endanger them. Or possibly destroy them for good. Imagine if you were a animal in the Boundary Waters, you wouldn't like it if one day miner just came near your Waters and polluted your water that you live in. You'd probably die from it. So please, SAVE OUR ANIMALS. And one of our National Treasures. Sincerely, Mr Hunter Maughan 2123 Ivy Ave E Saint Paul, MN 55119-3222

i care

40267

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, i care manila manila, ot 1000 PH

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

18320

First of all, thank you for holding this hearing and taking the time and effort to listen to people's concern. Very much appreciate all the work that has gone into that. I want to invite our friends from Northeastern Minnesota, particularly the Iron Range, to overwhelm our friends from Duluth here tonight and eat at those establishments. Those bartenders will love their tips at the end of the night. My first request, respectful request, of the co-lead agencies is that at over 2100 pages this document is an overwhelming conglomeration of information. And a lot of it is very difficult for a layperson or even many experts to understand. I first of all respect your request that we extend it from 90 days to 180 days for people to take in that information and review and provide comments. Second of all, I would like to see a more complete delineation of how we are going to pay for the water treatment facility that will be required to run perpetually in order to make sure that the water discharged from the site is not polluting our Northern Minnesota rivers, lakes, groundwater included. As it has been explained to me often, the financial assurances all happens during the permitting stage. However, just because we've done something wrong before doesn't mean we should continue to do it. So I respectfully request that we have the financial assurance piece, how we're going to pay for the long-term water treatment at the facility, included in the SDEIS process so that the public can participate, see how it's going to be paid for and come away with a reasonable assurance that if we are going to do this project that at some point the taxpayers are not going to liable for hundreds of years of water treatment. Additionally, there is some confusion in the SDEIS over the tax numbers. As it is right now there doesn't appear to be any analysis behind the tax figures that are presented. In the original draft it was something in the neighborhood of 1.5 million. It is now 16 million. And as far as I understand it, the DNR did not do a tax analysis of the project. And I would like to see the State of Minnesota -- having gone throughout the pull-tab debacle -- understand a little bit more of what we are going to be seeing for actual tax occurrence from this site. Because if we are going to pay for it, I want to see what's coming in. Finally, there seemed to be some current conditions that are in the EIS that do not match what the actual monitoring stations read. And I would like to see that resolved. Because as we were looking at the future modeling, the models have never been accurate; however, they are good guidances and some of the current conditions anticipated by the model conflict with what we see at actual monitoring stations in the field. Thank you so much.

47155

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Dear Lead Agencies, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47156

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Metals and Teck American projects are listed as "speculative" in Section 6-2-2-1-21 and are not analyzed for their cumulative effects. No evidence or rationale for excluding these projects from the cumulative effects analysis is offered. In Section 6-2-3-6-4, the Gray Wolf is the only "Special Status Species" for which even limited analysis of cumulative effects is conducted, despite the Canada Lynx's status as a federally threatened species. Please take the following actions: 1) Include the Twin Metals and Teck American projects as reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative effects analysis in section 6-2-2, since the disposition of the NorthMet SDEIS and subsequent permitting decisions could make these projects more likely to be built. 2) Include the Canada Lynx as a "Special Status Species" in Section 6-2-3-6-4 and conduct a cumulative effects analysis of the impact on Canada Lynx. 3) Analyze and include mitigations such as tunnels and fencing to limit the possibility of incidental take of Canada Lynx by increased road traffic associated with the NorthMet proposed action. 4) Remove contradictory language in SDEIS about Canada Lynx utilization of roads as travel corridors. For example, on p. 5-628 the SDEIS states "Lynx utilize snow packed trails and roads as travel corridors," while on p. 5-366 it says "this species does not rely on roads for travel." 5) Analyze and include mitigation such as accelerated re-vegetation of the mine site after closure to decrease the amount of time the mine site would be inhospitable to Canada Lynx. Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Me

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47182

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or expl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47183

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47185

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Dear Lead Agencies, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47186

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47188

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Dear Lead Agencies, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47189

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Dear Lead Agencies, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

47190

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Ian Kimmer 4102 Gilliat St Duluth, MN 55804-2140 (218) 750-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47191

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Dear Lead Agencies, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Kimmer

47192

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Dear Lead Agencies, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you

Ian Wunder

19514

My name is Ian Wunder, my spelling I-A-N, W-U-N-D-E-R, address 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. The claim in the SDEIS is that PolyMet will decrease mercury and sulfate pollution in nearby waterways and will do this by operating water treatment systems that have not been detailed. The treatment plant designs have not been outlined in detail in this document, and this industry has a zero percent success record at containing waste toxins. Because of this detail, the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. It does not provide this important information.

19515

My name is Ian Wunder, I-A-N, W-U-N-D-E-R, 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. Five centuries of water treatment will need to be paid for either by the mining company or by Minnesota taxpayers. These individuals in either case will be the future generations of Minnesotans and US citizens. They will be left with a legacy of pollution and wastewater that will need to be cleaned continually for more than half a millennium. The mining industry as a whole is responsible for the largest and most costly environmental cleanups in our nation, and a large percentage of Superfund sites are the legacy of sulfide ore mining specifically. We do not need this legacy added to our Minnesota tax burden for so many future generations.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ian Wunder

19516

My name is Ian Wunder, I-A-N, W-U-N-D-E-R, 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved based on missing information. The economic consideration for developing an underground mine to access the mineral ore beneath the US Forest Service land has not been sufficiently explored. Many tribal governments in the State of Minnesota have brought concerns forward through the SDEIS and other avenues that the economic possibility of extracting the ore in an underground mine has not been fully explored and that the SDEIS should not be approved based on the fact that this method of mitigating and avoiding environmental degradation has not been explored.

19517

My name is Ian Wunder, I-A-N, W-U-N-D-E-R, 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. Based on the following information, the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. The entire 3,014-acre mine site is classified as high biodiversity significance and houses endangered, threatened and special-concern plant species, as well as used habitat by many rare and important bird species, as well as other rare and important Minnesota wildlife. There is not sufficient action outlined in the SDEIS to mitigate the disturbance of this specific, very important ecosystem habitat.

19518

My name is Ian Wunder, I-A-N, W-U-N-D-E-R, 3515 Columbus Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407. The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved on the basis that the proposed wetland mitigation will only cover 912 and a half acres of wetland impact by the PolyMet operation. Ten additional square miles or more of wetlands as well as surrounding area are projected to be indirectly impacted by drainage, decrease in water level and the addition of toxic materials in the form of blown dust. There is absolutely no monitoring plan that will be able to mitigate damage immediately. Additionally, any damage that does occur will be occurring on bogs and coniferous swamps that are extremely difficult to restore and are ecologically sensitive and very important.

Iana Studelska

57272

Absolutely against the licensing and pursuit of this project and similar projects. I am unwilling to trade 20 years of "jobs" for a future of sulfide pollution and the compromise of the Lake Superior Basin. This project does not have the science, nor crystal ball to meet its stated goals. No sulfide Mining. Iana Studelska 2318 Roslyn Ave Duluth, MN 55803

IBEW294

7607

DNR The PolyMet project is an Important part of northeastern Minnesota's economic future. As an Iron Ranger I am confident that this project will provide us with long term jobs. That is good paying jobs not minimum wage jobs. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough. The supplemental draft EIS addresses the potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. I trust the DNR to do their job to protect us and the environment. I also think that by letting PolyMet mine with the controls that have been put in place will clean up a brown area the old LTV mining site. This will make the site cleaner than it is today. After all these are metals that we use every day. We can control the pollution here but we have no control in other countries. So if we don't mine here, there will just be more uncontrolled pollution in other parts of the world which still affects us here. We should be using our resources and controlling the environment. Thank You Greg Topel IBEW LU 294 503 E 16th street Hibbing, Mn 55746 [HYPERLINK "mailto:busmgr294@mchsi-com"](mailto:busmgr294@mchsi-com) busmgr294@mchsi-com 218-363-6895

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ida DeLisi

10088

To Whom It May Concern: As a resort owner in Cook County, I have been keeping informed on the mining debate. I am completely against this mining project - or any other that poses such a risk to the environment in general, and the Boundary Waters in particular. No mining has been proven to be safe, all mining destroys at least some part of the environment, and water is a resource we can't waste. The risk to human health is too high. The jobs claim is a false one, and the cost associated with any cleanup is unacceptable. In fact I question the estimate, because I don't believe it takes everything into consideration, particularly when it will be us, the taxpayers of Minnesota footing the bill for the cleanup, and trying to live with the destruction of not only our business but the loss of a pristine national public area for at least 500 years. We've seen too much to believe any corporation - the oil spills in Alaska are still not cleaned up even decades later. The small fines payed by companies responsible for the oil spill in the Gulf is criminal. Corporations get away with far too much in this age of greed when a handful of people own half of the globe's wealth - trust in our system of checks and balances is gone, and there seems to be a deep lack of fairness and simple honesty in the race to the bottom to achieve profit at any coSt This cost is too high. Far too many of the disasters we've seen over the years have been due to human failure and disregard for others, but mostly the motive of profit. Until more regulation and stricter controls and rules are put in place, and until we are guaranteed a criminal conviction and jail time for any and all persons responsible for damage, including the death of the corporation itself, I say NO. to sulfide or other destructive mining in Minnesota or anywhere in this country. We need to look more to the sun for our sources of energy, and the challenge of coming up with new materials for manufacturing that are not harmful is one many are waiting on. Thank you, Ida DeLisi 13732 Wellington Crescent Burnsville, MN 55337

17220

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ida DeLisi 13732 Wellington Cres Burnsville, MN 55337

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ida DeLisi

40807

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ida DeLisi 50486

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ida DeLisi 13732 Wellington Cres Burnsville, MN 55337

Igra Jamari 54191

I think you should not mine there because you can find or make copper and nickel at other places. Also it will harm and destroy animals, environment and also other state near MN.

Illegible 42838

See attachment

54861

See attachment

Illegible Marroquin 58123

The NorthMet/PolyMet mining project should be REJECTED. This project is not worth the potential environmental impacts and risks. I love this earth and this is not the way to treat it. Our environment should be protected and respected for generations to come. If you pass this sulfide mine you will not only not be protecting the environment but you will be inadvertently destroying it. This mine will poison our drinking water, negatively affect wildlife and raise greenhouse gases as well as ruin our beautiful boundary waters. What we decide, what you decide will affect your children, my children and our grandchildren. Reject the proposed PolyMet/NorthMet sulfide mine.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ilse Mortensen

40984

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Ilse Mortensen 1425 w. 28th street # T 10 Minneapolis, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ilze Mueller

16278

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Ingrid Baudler

40662

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ingrid Baudler 700 College Dr Decorah, IA 52101-1041

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Iraida Capaccio

40438

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Iraida Capaccio 337 Hudson Rd Sudbury, MA 01776 US

Irene O'Connell

1819

I think northern MN needs the new jobs. Irene Oconnell 12158 197 CT N W Elk River MN 55330

Iris Sinai

14184

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Iris Sinai 36 W 47th St New York, NY 10036-8601

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Iris Young

41829

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Iris Young St Paul, Minnesota

Irling Itzen

54166

I am opposed to Polymet mining due to environmental concerns. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Iron Range Bar Association

42972

Greetings. I am the President of the Iron Range Bar Association, which has over 100 member-lawyers. The attached resolution passed and it is forwarded on here. If there are any questions or comments, please let me know. Thank you. Sincerely, Erik Erik J. Honkanen Honkanen Richards, S.C. Attorney License No. 387813 US Bank Plaza 230 1st St South, STE 101 Virginia, MN 55792 Office - 218-749-3047 Fax - 218-749-3048 HYPERLINK "<http://www.honkanenlaw-com>"www.honkanenlaw-com CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE This is a transmission from the Honkanen Richards, S.C. and may contain information which is privileged, confidential, and protected by the attorney-client or attorney work product privileges. The information is, or may be covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC.2510-2521- If you are not the addressee, note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please destroy it and notify this office immediately at the telephone number (218) 749-3047- CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE. Any advice expressed above as to tax matters was neither written nor intended by the sender or Honkanen Richards, S.C. to be used and cannot be used by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer. If any such tax advice is made to any person or party other than to our client to whom the advice is directed, then disregard and destroy this email. Each taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

Irv Berlin

30614

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, To my knowledge sulfide mining has never been done without polluting the environment. Doing it in an area that could contaminate Lake Superior and the famed Boundary Waters Canoe Area seems to be the height of folly. Risking Superiors waters, the recreational economy of the area, public health, and the environment in general is not worth the profits to the company that proposes this disaster. Clearly the Federal land exchange of Superior NF land to help Poylmet's polluting open pit mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Irv Berlin 16385 Frels Rd Cable, WI 54821-4525 (715) 798-4646

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Irv Smith 39335

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Irv Smith 3141 Dean Ct Minneapolis, MN 55416-5507

Isaac Anderson 42511

See attachment

Ivan Snajdar 40409

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Ivan Snajdar Kralja Zvonimira 27 Crikvenica, ot 51260 HR

Ivan Zenker 11271

Gentlemen: I grew up in the UP of Michigan and understand the desire of rural folks to develop potential jobs. However, as a child I also saw the bleak desolate terrain surrounding Sudbury, Ontario Canada. It was a site that I will never forget. It looked like eastern Wyoming or maybe even the moon. There was little live vegetation. Now I know that was caused by the very polluted water run off. I just don't feel some jobs in the short run justify the danger to the watershed areas that surround the site. And I believe that asking for a company to promise stewardship many, many years into the future to treat the water long after the profits are gone is just not something we should count on. Ivan Zenker 5698 King Arthur Road NW Rochester, MN 55901

Ivy Wright 54555

There is nothing more important to every person in our world than clean air and water. Sulfide mining has been shown to be toxic to the environment. Financial gain for foreign or American companies is a shameful reason to destroy our world.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Izaak Walton League 54712

See attachment

J Beverly 52235

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, J Beverly 803 Shurts Street Urbana, IL 61801

J Brophy 39412

Dear DNR, I am writing to express my opposition to the PolyMet mining project in MN. Jobs v. Environment Risk The supposed short term gain via jobs would be a small scale, short term boost at best And the jobs would be grossly outweighed by the risk of water pollution and contamination that will continue for centuries after the mining is completed. This is a short-sighted project that endangers our natural resources needlessly. Financial Assurances of Clean Up: PolyMet may sign on to promise clean up, but companies go bankrupt all the time, so what financial guarantees will there be to make sure the clean ups actually occur. For that matter, insurance companies go bankrupt, as do major financial institutions. We can't be left holding the clean up bag if PolyMet's finances evaporate. Thank you for your consideration, J. Brophy Victoria, MN

J Cherveney 16517

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to share my concerns with you about the proposed Poly-Met copper-nickel mining project. I live in Duluth, and we draw our drinking water from the beautiful Lake Superior. In fact, our water was voted the best-tasting in the state. It is one of the largest fresh water bodies in the world, and many people would love to have our water. Just ask the folks in California and Nevada, among other places. Fresh, clean water is a very precious commodity. The people in West Virginia who live on the Elk River can vouch for that. Yet people in our state are willing to risk our fresh water for a generation of jobs with the promise of a clean up if the inevitable contamination occurs. I can hardly believe that anyone would want to risk our precious clean water for any job or promise of money. You can't drink money. Please deny the permits they are requesting. It's not just for me that I am asking this. It's for my children and grandchildren as well. They deserve the same clean water that we have enjoyed and have a right to--yes, a right to. This is my world, my state, my community, my water, and I don't want it polluted by Poly-Met or anyone else. Thanks for "listening." Judith Cherveney Duluth, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

J Foster

41707

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

J Gravenson

16324

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, J Gravenson 1820 Ivan Way St Paul, MN 55116

49933

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, J Gravenson 1820 Ivan Way St Paul, MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

J Olfe

42265

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

J Patrick Kegley

18171

Good evening, I'm Patrick Kegley from Minneapolis. K-E-G-L-E-Y. And I have lived in Minnesota all my life. I've been up to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area many years ago with Jim Klobuchar. And I am also on behalf a member of Ecology Democracy Network with Ken Pentel. And I think the spirit of Pete Seeger is here tonight. We have to protect the land, the water. The ecology must come first. We cannot restore the ecology. You cannot restore things once they're damaged. Native Americans have known this for years, centuries. We must also consider that. Yes, we need copper. Yes, we do need precious metals. But much of the metal is already here. We can reclaim and reuse copper. 24 percent of the copper of the world comes from reclaiming it. We don't have to continually mine it and rip apart the earth to do it. I wish there were a way to do it safely and responsibly, but I don't trust that there is. I've never seen it done in any way. From all I've heard about copper mines, it's destructive and it pollutes the environments. I don't know any way around that. I am hoping everyone here will consider making comments and strongly speaking for generations yet to come that we need to have the ecology and all of the environment protected as our first priority, not something as an afterthought later. That's all I have to say. Peace.

J Van Dyne

58162

Wonderful discourse. We, the public, needs more study and comment timePolymet has not or needs to respond to concerns brought up tonight.We need to think about the 7th generation and what we may be leaving behind. As a society, we tend to be shortsighted. Jobs for 20 years! Sure they worth the travesty, wrecked on our environment which will impact us economically, physical – both health wise and topographically.I have seen the devastation in Utah, and various places in AZ, IT it not pretty – nothing is growing.H2O is in shortage. We need to keep it clean.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

J. Alvey

41852

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

J. K. Fort-Strietzel

17857

Feb 15, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. This will ruin the entire St Louis River Watershed, which is home and habitat to many birds, animals and people. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Bald Eagles, Ospreys, Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons, Mallard Ducks and other ducks. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. Animals that live and depend on the St Louis River include River Otters (which live in/on the banks of the river or nearby), Fox, Coyote, Timber Wolves, Black Bears, River Otters (who make their home in or near the banks of the St Louis River), Deer, Moose, many small mammals and birds. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. The St Louis River is a beautiful and scenic river and from the source until it gets to and drains into Lake Superior, most all of it is a river that travels in quiet beauty through wild/wildernesslike lands. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds, animals, people and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Please do not allow this harmful mine to ever happen. Every company who has undertaken sulfide mining has promised to clean it up but they never do. They always have said that it would be okay for the environment but it has devastated the environment. Unlike the iron mining that has happened in Minnesota, this sulfide mine would be much more damaging to the environment and not just the local environment where it is located but much of Northeastern Minnesota where the St Louis River watershed and the Lake Superior watershed exists. So, please do everything in your power to stop this mine from ever starting or existing. Our lands, wildlife, human life, water that we drink are more important to most all of us than any gold, silver, copper, platinum, etc that we are told exists where Polymet wants to mine. Thank you for all your help and all that you will do to protect us and a beautiful and wild area of Minnesota. Sincerely, Ms J. K. Fort-Strietzel 10332 Bachelor Square Rd Meadowlands, MN 55765-8103 (218) 206-1788

Jace Carlson

57139

Sulfide mining in other states has been extremely detrimental to the water around the mines and in an area like the Superior National Forest with valuable peatlands, this kind of pollution would be unacceptable. The fact that there are no safeguards for when things go wrong makes this plan even scarier. Risking our valuable environment for this reckless mine is unacceptable. I urge you to stop this plan before Minnesota is seriously damaged by it. Jace Carlson 4238 LaVaque Rd Hermantown, MN 55811

Jaci Christenson

40833

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Jaci Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N White Bear Lake, MN 55110-1147 (651) 343-6340

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jaci Christenson

47458

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Tim Dabney US Forest Service Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Dear Ms Fay, Mr Dabney, and Mr Bruner I am writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes and does not take into account the true cost of the project. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to future surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of 6,026 acres of area with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest-replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest and 1,400 acres of floodplains. Secondly, PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swampland and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. This would result in the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres in total due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and water from wetlands. These comments are made from both the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit. In addition, the PolyMet sulfide mine would negatively impact 2 out of 13 remaining corridors for wildlife, including resident and migratory species, to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet mine plan would destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which has dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Eleven endangered or threatened species, including lynx, would be further impacted. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants including wild rice. PolyMet and the SDEIS do not acknowledge the true cost of the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. PolyMet is a lean deposit of copper-nickel, therefore, 99% of what is dug out of the ground will be waste. For that 1% gain in metal, the true cost will be unfathomable. The toxic extraction process will be energy and water intensive (releasing 200,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide). Even more water and energy (generating 707,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year) will be used in processing; leaving us with even more waste that will need to be managed for 500 years. This is in direct opposition to Minnesota's goal of reducing greenhouse gas emission by 30% by 2025- Lastly, it can no longer be ignored that fresh water is a precious resource and must be treated as such. By rejecting PolyMet's SDEIS and sulfide mining plan, you have the opportunity to pass on to future generations of humans and nature alike, the gift of irreplaceable wetlands, mature forests and fresh water resources of the Lake Superior Basin. You have the responsibility to do what is right and lead the way to a future that faces the fact that we live on a finite earth with finite natural resources. I respectfully ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project. Sincerely, Jaci Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N White Bear Lake MN 55110 [HYPERLINK "mailto:jacichristenson@gmail-com"jacichristenson@gmail-com](mailto:jacichristenson@gmail-com)

Jack and Rhoda Liebo

4146

I am a life long Minnesotan. My wife and I are both physicians, as are 2 of my three children. We adore this state, and mostly because this has been a state that cares more about health and family, and less about money than many of the other 50- I was shocked to hear about the exploration for minerals near the BWCA and the Superior National forest watershed, several years ago. I understand how blighted the region has been economically, since the iron mines have ceased. But the decision to move forward past this ridiculous review shows a sense of panic on the part of the officials in government to produce(in the short term), good economic growth. They have a blind eye to the real issues here. Externalizing toxic water soluble poisons, which are currently well insulated from doing us harm, into this glorious region of Minnesota, shows a complete absence of understanding. The multinational corporations that promise economic prosperity and jobs for Minnesotans are nothing more than rapists, telling us all the while that we will like it, and that it is for 'our' good. In fact, they will extract our wealth, freeing deadly polluting poisons that will contaminate our environment, kill the fish and the precious watershed, leaving us, some time within the next 500 years to cover the cost of cleanup. They will kill land values, resources, and the budding conservationists tourist industry. Just look at the hard rock sulfide mining track track recoRd No matter what the industry suggests, there are no big breakthroughs that will suddenly make this type of mining safe for the local watershed. Say no to these 'carpetbaggers'. Read their EIS for what it truly is, a fairy tale, told to eager and receptive ears. Do the right thing, deny these mines. Protect the state from evil during your watch. Have patience, and do not succumb to the financial enticements. Jack and Rhoda Liebo 5729 Kemrich Drive Mpls., MN 55439

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack Brunell 15964

Dear Lisa, I am in favor of letting Polymet mine in Northern Minnesota. In the past mining companies could do whatever they wanted with almost no regulation. That is not true today. I feel the current State regulations adequately safeguard the Northern Minnesota environment. I was raised in Northern Michigan in a copper mining area. I have seen the problems unregulated mining can cause. I also see that nature is very good at correcting mistakes that man has made. Thanks You, Jack F. Brunell 2133 10th ST NW New Brighton, MN 55112

Jack Carrick 15815

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jack carrick 2525 2nd ave E North St Paul, MN 55109

21543

Please see the attached document.

42810

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack Carrick 43050

Superior National Forest Service 8901 Grand Ave Place Duluth, MN 55808 Dear Tim Dabney, I am writing to ask you to not approve or even consider the PoliMet open pit mine. I attended the meeting last week and saw how important jobs are to the miners and the tax base of the area but please, think of the future. Please keep in mind that there has never been a sulfide type mining operation that has not polluted. PoliMet spent years and a ton of money on trying to get EPA approval and can't even get it correct on paper?! How in the world would they be able to do it for real? And take care of the upkeep? Some of the obvious possible failures of even a good plan are: 1. a 100 year weather event and the whole area overflows. 2. the area is mostly rock but there could be crevasses where contaminated water can slowly leach. 3. heavy equipment throws up dust, in the summer the wind is usually out of the south blowing toxins directly into the BWCA (the fish already have high mercury levels from coal plant dust hundreds of miles away). 4. a tornado hits and blows the waste all over the place. 5. a dam fails. 6. a containment membrane fails. 7. a reverse osmoses filter fails. 8. a pipe breaks. 9. a rail car or truck derails. 10. engineering miscalculation. 11. bankruptcy and bond to cover bankruptcy fails (500 years is a long time). 12. worker error. There are many others of course but I have to go to work. As you know most of these things have already happened in the past in other types of projects and I am sadly confident will happen with PoliMet site more than once over the years. Please do what is right. We're already limited to how much fish (probably the healthiest food known to man) we can eat from Minnesota lakes. Help clean the lakes and drinking water, don't make things worse. Jack Carrick 2525 2nd Ave E St Paul, MN 55109 651-704-0123

jack dunham 40393

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, jack dunham 3343 wilawana Rd sayre, PA 18840 UM

Jack Fulton 54790

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack Furry

11158

Polymet is a Canadian mine development company that wants to start copper mining in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. They want to build a mine in northern Minnesota in order to attain an abundance of metals and open up hundreds of jobs for unemployed Minnesotans. It is being launched by an unproven company, Polymet, and it could desecrate the beauty of northern Minnesota, but I think they should go for it. The reward far outweighs the risk. It would open up hundreds of new jobs and it would provide us with metals that we need in our everyday life. There are many reasons why Polymet should start copper mining. For one, based on an unbiased article I read, the estimated amount of ore underneath the northern regions of Minnesota totals out at well over one trillion dollars. That would really benefit the state financially. Another reason they should go forward with mining is because it would open up a multitude of new jobs for the unemployed residents of Minnesota, mainly those that live in northern Minnesota, where jobs are scarce. The third reason we should open this mine is because we need to take a leap of faith. Where would we be today if we had hesitated on opening mines in the past? We wouldn't have nearly as many of the materials needed to survive. Sometimes we need to take a chance. It could go horribly wrong, but it could also predominantly be right. Either way, we won't know until we try. There are, however, unignorable issues. Polymet is new to the scene and has no past experience with mining. The open pit mine they are hoping to construct would most likely pollute the area's watershed, which is all of the water under the ground, which in turn, could end up reaching the Boundary Waters. Once these toxins reach the lakes in the region the fish are sure to die. If this happens, this pristine national treasure will be destroyed forever. The company also hasn't assured us that they will leave the area in good condition when they are done. There are a lot of risks, but if the company can address these environmental issues before they were to begin mining I believe they will be able to pull it off. In conclusion, I support opening the copper mine in northern Minnesota. We need the resources and we need to open new jobs for Minnesotans struggling to get by. Sometimes you have to take a risk, and maybe, just maybe, that risk will pay off for Minnesota.

Jack Huhta

18081

I'm Jack. I'm Jack Huhta from Gilbert. My background is I've got about 32 years with the FAA, and about nine years with the St. Louis County Planning and Zoning. I was chair of the planning commission for three years, and I was involved a lot -- or we were involved a lot with the clean water and sewer systems and we were very concerned about it, but having said that, I'm still just a layman like you people are in the audience here. We have to depend on the Corps of Engineers, the DNR and the US Forest Service for our information. We're paying them. They're all experts and they did all the research on this -- for this EIS and we have to depend on the information that they're providing us. Opinions are fine. We heard a lot of opinions in Duluth the other night and we're going to hear opinions here tonight. Opinions are fine as long as they're based on facts, but a lot of times you have opinions that are based on emotions and they are not valid in the cases that are confronting us tonight with this EIS and the mining in -- up at the -- at PolyMet. World War II probably would have turned out a lot different had we not had the mining here on the range for the iron ore. As we all know, a lot of the iron ore for fighting World War II was provided by the Iron Range. Who would have ever thought that we would have been finding trout, probably the most sensitive species of fish in the Iron -- in the pits where we had extracted all the iron ore. Who knows what's going to happen; what we can do? Who knows what they can do with the -- with the -- with the area that has been extracted -- that PolyMet's going to do. We put PolyMet through a lot of hoops. We've made them -- we put them through a lot more than the average corporation would ever think of going through. The cost, the frustrations and the delays are unbelievable. I can't imagine nine years what they've gone through trying to get this process forward. Our schools, our streets, our roads, we need something. We need a tax base so we can provide an education for our kids. How are we going to provide an education for our kids with schools if we're going to depend on the canoeists in the boundary waters, picking rice and shooting ducks. It isn't going to happen. We have to have a tax base, and that's money. We can't build schools with money that we get from rice and canoeing. So I just wanted to tell you people that -- listen to the facts. Forget about the opinions and let's move forward. I'm a full supporter of PolyMet's project.

Jack Hwinta

58109

The Polymet Project will not only benefit northern Minnesota. It will provide resources and raw materials for manufacturing which will benefit the entire state of Minnesota made in USA sounds a lot better made in China or Beijing.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack Parker

38108

<http://www.icmm-com/members/member-companies> Good morning Lori: Will you please bring this organization to the attention of your mining people. It is important. They control your future. In London they now acknowledge the fact that nations with mineral resources are beginning to resist offshore pirates and would-be colonists. In our neck of the woods it is they who seek out the decision-makers and adopt them for as long as they are useful. It is they who decide whether we should be bought, not with beads today, but with t-shirts and baseball hats with corporate logos. It is they who will decide when to pull out with maximum loot, leaving second-tier mining companies to deal with the left overs and perhaps the cleanups. Please remember Kennecott/Rio Tinto Flambeau and Eagle and Pebble projects more clearly than we "Remember Pearl Harbor.". So soon we forget the wasted millions. You will probably recognize some of the corporate logos already. Keep in mind their multi-billion dollar reasons for being and trust them as far as you can throw them. Check their social and environmental records. Begin by demanding all the facts concerning the mineral resources they seek - NOT only those items they choose to divulge to serve their reason for being. Demand too financial assurance that all damage will be remediated. If, for example, they cannot give us absolute assurance that Lake Superior will not be harmed - then there should be no mining. For an antidote to ICMM go to "London Mining Network" an honorable non-profit organization in London keeping tabs on big miners. Thank you Lori, Sincerely, Jack Parker, Mining Engineer/Geologist, Baltic.MI 49963, 3/7/2014

38261

One more comment please - to support my earlier comments concerning the integrity of the PolyMet principals, if any. They are not dumb. They have led the opposition up paths where they have little to worry about, and they withhold most of the information which they would rather not bring to light. For that reason we must insist on seeing all of the basic information, not what they want the public to see. Fail to do that and we give them freedom to do whatever they want to do, regardless. Example 1- Remediation. Show the terrain as it is now, summer and winter. Show it again when the mining is finished.. Show it again after remediation. All photographs and "artist's concepts" clear enough for viewing on a large screen, i.e not thumbnails. eg 2- Provide all the geological information needed for an independent evaluation of underground mining. Thank you, Jack Parker, Mining Engineer/Geologist, Baltic MI 49963, March 6th 2014 On Thu, Mar 6, 2014 at 12:30 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack Parker

38445

Hello MDNR. Lyman being out of office until 3-17-14 I figure I should fwd this directly to you for prompt action - please. It is vitally urgent Thank you, Jack Parker --- Forwarded message --- From: Jack Parker Date: Thu, Mar 6, 2014 at 11:24 AM Subject: THE MID-MARCH HEARINGS RE POLYMET To: "HYPERLINK "mailto:lwelch@greatlakes-org"lwelch@greatlakes-org" , Lori Andresen , jack parker Am not a chemist but find your comments OK, except that Superior is the biggest by surface area but not by volume. Baikal is. Time is short and my octog. fingers not supple so I must be brief. A resume is available on ne. 1- You do not know your opponent. He is not a benign businessman. I have been working, unpaid, on the Kennecott/Rio Tinto/ Lundin Eagle project since 2006, not giving up because very soon after receiving the application for permits we recommended that it be rejected - the document was indeed unacceptable. The basic design data had been faked. When corrected the design approach indicated that the factor of safety was lower than one - UNSTABLE. There were many other mistakes and mis-statements, lies. In short they got away with it because they were in cahoots with MDEQ and the courts. I took the case all the way up the ladder from local cops to US Atty Gen and all declined to prosecute because "jurisdiction over mining matters had been delegated by the Feds to Michigan DEQ." \$4,700,000,000 can do that. Michigan Mining Law, Part 632 recognizes their approach as felonious and prescribes stiff penalties for principals, including jail time. 2- So what is that to you in Minnesota. Hear this: The prime movers at PolyMet, Messrs Cherry, Foth and now Ware, were at the helm of the Eagle project. The truth is not in them. With another potential bonanza in the Duluth gabbro they can be expected to lie and to cheat and to hand out t-shirts to get the money. Foth boasts that he knows how to get permits. You might learn something about tactics by Googling "The Silver Fox Fable" at the "Woods Person" site. You'd better believe it. You will recognize the progression. 3- Am not familiar with the machinations in Minnesota but know this: That the big miners do not follow established rules and politicians look the other way. In days of yore, for example, the miner seeking a permit would have to submit all basic data = diamond drill cores and logs and assays and evaluations in detail. How else can the project be evaluated. I was not surprised, for example, when Eagle "discovered" recently that there is uranium in the system. I saw it in the very first core logs, but they quit testing for it and declared it absent. 4- I suspect that the MN ore could be mined selectively underground, so ameliorating many problems with the environment, but I see that PolyMet dismisses the possibility, essentially "Because I say so". We cannot correct them because they will not disclose details of geology. Part of their plan. 5- I submit that we, the people, cannot and should not accept PolyMet statements unless we can confirm them via original data. 6- As a demonstration of good faith how about them submitting all known facts about the "orebody" (which it is NOT until factors including environment are satisfied) to a worthy mining group for evaluation. There they have you by the scrotum. The Big Miners already have their Club, the ICMM in London. QV. Hanging on eagerly to their coat tails are most of the international mining consultants - as we saw at the Eagle. Their experts too lied freely under oath - with one notable exception - David Sainsbury of your Itasca group. He was quickly shipped off to Australia. We knew about his promotion before he did. Not many old-timers are left. Maybe some associated with universities. Maybe Ralph Marsden is still kicking in Duluth, he's a good man. You might look up Wilson Blake - his reputation is good. 7- Divide and Conquer is a good weapon for them. If you put on blinders to concentrate on chemistry and get no support from tree hug

Jack S Sneve

57237

I am voicing my concern for the destruction of 913 acres of irreplaceable wetlands along with another 7,350 acres in the St. Louis River watershed that would be affected (SDEIS, p 5-224). This mine and its water if allowed to proceed, will effect all living things "down stream" in the Lake Superior basin. This area of northern Minnesota that is so very water rich could very quickly be polluted. All ecosystems are interconnected. Mining harm to this area will effect the whole environment, such as the nuclear meltdown in Japan iif effecting all of the Pacific Ocean basins. I ask that you please reject the Polymet SDEIS as inadequate. I ask that you reject the proposed Polymet mining - it is a grand experiment - that will leave northern Minnesota with pollution; the money (billions) going to Canada's Glencore Xstrata Corp. The company and its chair, Tony Hayward, now famous for his part in the BP deepwater oil spill have a notorious record for environmental and labor abuses. Thank you. Jack S. Sneve PO Box 3501 Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jack S Sneve 57238

The precautionary principle “states that if an action (PolyMet Mine (My View J.S.S.)) or policy has a suspected risk of causing harm to the public or the environment” and that when “extensive scientific knowledge on the matter is lacking” (Polymet’s recent (MY view J.S.S.) science must be re-examined because it is based on computer modeled simulations and prediction. They must do the numbers on red field evidence!) or scientific evidence is insufficient to prove that such harm will not occur, the prudent thing to do is to say NO. I am saying NO and I ask you to say NO to granting the permit to mine until evidence can prove otherwise. The principle implies that there is a social responsibility to protect the public and the environment from exposure to harm when scientific investigation has been found to have plausible risk. Source: Wikipedia) [ILLEGIBLE] every sulfide mine has had a 100% failure rate. Untreated seepage forever for all living beings. Jack S. Sneve PO Box 3501 Duluth, MN 55803

Jack Sikora 39364

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jack Sikora 1600 N Jefferson St New Ulm, MN 56073-1417

Jack Treher 42690

See attachment

Jack Van meter 41626

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jack Van meter Hugo, Minnesota

Jacki Fisher 54497

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jackie Falk

3276

16 South 25th Avenue East Duluth, MN 55812-2227 Lisa Fay, Public comment Manager, DNR DNR Ecological and Water Resources 500 Lafayette Rd Suite 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4032 Dear Ms Fay: I have lived all of my adult life in Minnesota. I love its beautiful natural resources and have raised three children to do likewise. As a citizen and taxpayer, I write to express my opposition to the reported conclusions in the SDEIS draft for the PolyMet proposed for Northern Minnesota. (To be frank, the document is too complex and lengthy for me to make an informed analysis based on my own knowledge.) As it has been repeatedly pointed out, correctly, any jobs for Minnesotans are temporary, the bulk of the profits will flow out of the local economy, and the “toxic legacy of damaged waterways” will remain permanently here in Minnesota. To date, “Mining without harm” and “environmentally safe mining” have been promised, but there is zero evidence to back up the claim that sulfide mining can be done without causing devastating watershed pollution. In fact, mining of sulfide-metal ore has never been accomplished without causing eventual acid-metal leachate pollution of ground and surface waters. As a result, Wisconsin wisely placed a moratorium on sulfide mining operations in 1997, until it could be demonstrated that such a mine would not pollute the water. The construction of a mine such as the one PolyMet proposes violates the Precautionary Principle: “if an action or policy has a suspected risk of causing harm to the public or to the environment, in the absence of scientific consensus that the action or policy is harmful, the burden of proof that it is not harmful falls on those taking an action.” Only if and until, the mining industry has a demonstrated track record that it has the means and the willingness to invest the effort and the capital necessary to mitigate all present and future environmental costs, the benefits of the mine cannot possibly outweigh the damages to Minnesota’s water resources, resources that may require treatment for more years into the future than can be accurately predicted. Thank you for your attention to my concern. Jackie Falk

_____ "I go down to the shore" I go down to the shore in the morning and depending on the hour the waves are rolling in or moving out, and I say, oh, I am miserable, what shall what should I do. And the sea says in its lovely voice: Excuse me, I have work to do. - - Mary Oliver Jacqueline H. Falk 16 South 25th Ave East Duluth, MN 55812-2227 ground line: (218) 724-7407

jackie hartleben

6010

I support you and the mining, I know you can do it that will not harm the environment and create jobs. Love technology. Jackie Hartleben Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jackie Midthun

16313

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jacob Conway

57960

I am very much against the mining issue. I am a land owner near Babbitt and I cannot tell you how fearful I am that this will ruin this land. I am also infuriated that these companies have eventual mineral rights underneath my land (State owns this and can sell it to the companies). Stop these products. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jacob Crawford

9604

Minnesota DNR: My name is Jacob CrawfoRd I am not a Minnesota resident yet, but I will be in a few months. I'm distressed to hear about the potential for Polymet Mining's proposed Copper-Nickel mine to become reality. I may not live in your state yet, but I've been doing a lot of research on all the great things Minnesota has to offer for outdoor enthusiasts such as myself - not least among them being the Boundary Waters Wilderness, which this mine will almost undoubtedly affect adversely. Long has this been a dream destination for me. Speaking as an out-of-stater, I can say that it holds a somewhat mythical status among Americans across the nation and even to foreigners abroad. To think of what damage this mine could reap upon such a place (such as the leaching of acid drainage and harmful heavy metals into the surrounding environment) makes me very sad for the future we're leaving for future generations. My brother and his wife are Minnesota residents and this April they'll be bringing into the world their first son (my first nephew). I want places like the Boundary Waters to be untouched by industrial havoc for his generation to enjoy, explore and be proud of. Beyond my sentimental attitude and selfish hopes as future Boundary Waters visitor, I believe this mine can not be practically considered. I'm told the previous EIS on the project received an "F" from the EPA for all its many dangers, which is not something that should be brushed aside lightly. Approving such a project would put wildlife and human health at risk as well as the good reputation of the state of Minnesota. Thank you for your time, Jacob Crawford 2208 E. 17th Ave #2 Denver, CO 80206

Jacob E Davis

47064

I am commenting today due to my concerns of the geological analysis of the mine site. The environmental impact survey is based on the iron range and its geology, where as the actual mine site is entering into the Duluth Complex. This misrepresentation of the geological implications of the proposed mining site is misleading to the public. Further, it is flawed science. Give the people truth. Stop squandering what could be a lifelong resource (our waters) for 20 years of jobs. Stop letting corporations extract wealth from our lands only to leave us with pools of toxic waters for 500 years. Recreation is far more important to northeastern Minnesota than mining. Jacob Davis, MLS (ASCP)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jacob Kjome

17036

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The PolyMet project is not just risky, it is all but guaranteed that this project would decimate Minnesota's fresh water for hundreds of years. Also, how many companies do you know that are till around for cleanup after even 100 years, let alone 50, 25 or 10- If it'll be cheaper for them to go bust, then that's what they'll do and you know it. They'll take their short-term money and run leaving us with a long term costly, disastrous, mess. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Jacob Kjome 10761 100th Ave N Maple Grove, MN 55369

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jacob Kjome

50308

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The PolyMet project is not just risky, it is all but guaranteed that this project would decimate Minnesota's fresh water for hundreds of years. Also, how many companies do you know that are till around for cleanup after even 100 years, let alone 50, 25 or 10- If it'll be cheaper for them to go bust, then that's what they'll do and you know it. They'll take their short-term money and run leaving us with a long term costly, disastrous, mess. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Jacob Kjome 10761 100th Ave N Maple Grove, MN 55369

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jacque Lively

39700

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PROTECT THE PEOPLE OVER CORPORATE GREED AND FINANCIAL TERRORIST, please~ The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jacque Lively 4976 390th Ave Curlew, MN 55027

Jacquelyn Morano

16135

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jairo Molina 39784

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jairo Molina 651 Humboldt Ave Saint Paul, MN 55107-2920

Jake Giefers 54183

I believe the mine that is desired to be built is not a good idea. Building this mine will pollute the beautiful waters and put people in danger. Sure it may create jobs, but the negative impacts such as waste and pollution will weight those out.

Jake H 11362

Dear DNR, I am worried about the perpetual clean-up costs associated with the North Met project. It is my opinion that Glencore, the European company that is backing Polymet, is trying to reap the economic benefits of our natural resources while avoiding liability for environmental impacts. I'd imagine that Glencore would own the North Met project outright, if it were not for the aforementioned perpetual costs. I believe that the responsibility for such costs should rest entirely on the company- a responsibility which cannot be realized given the indefinite nature of the environmental impact. In June 2012, the region I live in (Duluth area) experienced a historic flood, the likes of which I had not thought possible. The St Louis river saw peak flows of 56,000 cubic feet per second, 40% higher than the previous record. What would the consequences be if such an extreme precipitation event (10 in+) were to occur in the region of the proposed site, either during or after mining operations. Would the tailings basin overflow and contaminate flood waters. How would a situation like that be managed if the power went out, as would likely to be the case in such a scenario. Would the waste water pump and treatment facility still be operational. Also, I believe the increased demand for Coal-generated electricity, as a result of new mining operations such as this, would be a step backwards in the direction our state should be heading. We should instead be looking for ways to reduce our energy needs and diversifying our energy sources away from coal. Burning Coal and Mining Copper what year are we in, 1880- I'm sure President Ulysses Grant would approve of all this nonferrous nonsense, God rest his soul. Thank you for your consideration, Jake Hartley 418 Kelly Cir Duluth, MN 55811

Jake Hodie 23665

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So much of our wilderness has already been ruined by development, drilling, pollution, and logging. Enough is enough. The wilderness is supposed to be a place of peace and quiet for us, and the wildlife which live in it. The animals are running out of places to live and be safe. Our wildlife are under threat from so many angles. They desperately need to be protected, mainly from humans. Life is hard enough for people, let alone the animals. Can't we please offer them some much needed help.. PLEASE save the wilderness for all future generations before it is permanently ruined. Some damage cannot be undone. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jake Hodie 145 Starwood Aspen, CO 81611

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jake Jacobi

19105

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Jake Jacobi 861 19th Av SE Mpls, MN 55414 612 378 3954

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jalene Betts

47705

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service March 13, 2014 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney, I write today to ask you to please reject the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) as inadequate. You must not allow the PolyMet project to proceed for the following reasons: 1- The extensive environmental devastation at the core of the PolyMet project that will negatively impact our economy, 2- The severe lack of integrity and neutrality among the authors of the SDEIS when choosing what information and outcomes to include in the SDEIS and what information and outcomes to obfuscate or hide, and 3- The negligence of the authors of the SDEIS in their failure to include a cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine with specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. The only appropriate decision is to select the No-Action Alternative in the SDEIS. I am very familiar with the economic and environmental issues concerning the citizens of the Minnesota Arrowhead region. I have lived in the Arrowhead most of my life; I grew up in Grand Rapids and now live in Grand Marais. My brother is part of the Iron Workers Union and frequently works for the mining companies along the Iron Range. I work in the kindergarten classroom of a Grand Marais public school and at the Angry Trout Café during the summer. I understand that a responsible, clean mining operation could be a boon for this area. The SDEIS, despite its many attempts to hide or distort the truth, shows that PolyMet's proposed project will be environmentally and economically devastating for our area. The issues directly concerning the local people, the people who live in the Arrowhead, are strongly interconnected. What happens on the Iron Range does not stay on the Iron Range; the environmental and economic reverberations can be felt from Grand Rapids to Grand Marais. The health of our regional economy depends upon its diversity. What threatens our environment also threatens our economy. We, the people who live in the Arrowhead, greatly value the natural beauty of our wilderness. It is in our interest to preserve the attractiveness of our wilderness and parks not only for our own enjoyment, but also for the enjoyment of visitors to our area. Tourists as well as locals seek out our area as a haven a multitude of outdoor activities, including, (but not limited to), hunting, camping, canoeing, and fishing. Our robust and constantly expanding tourist economy depends upon these nature visitors to thrive, and survive. If the natural beauty of our region were compromised by bad land management practices, as would be the case if the PolyMet project was allowed to proceed, these visitors would lose interest in returning to our area. Then, the outdoor outfitters, hotels, state parks, restaurants, gas stations, and everything in between would suffer a significant loss of income. The economic impacts of losing the robust recreation and tourism industry we have so carefully constructed would be catastrophic. In this way, we depend upon the natural beauty healthy environment of the Arrowhead region for our jobs. Dependable jobs, (notably those supported by our tourism industry that have lasted and will continue to last for several generations), are of great concern for the Arrowhead's local people. It is not logical to jeopardize over 18,000 jobs in our recreation and tourism industry in order to provide a few hundred people jobs in a destructive sulfide mine that will only turn a profit for 30 years, and, PolyMet admits, will require cleanup of the pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals it causes to our water for over 500 years. According to Minnesota Rules 6132-3200, at the time of its closure the mine site must be maintenance-free. The PolyMet plan for 500 years of cleanup not only br

Jame Hall

42736

See attachment

James & Marilyn Keegan

24438

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, THIS IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF WHERE GREED IS THE AGENDA LIKE THE INFAMOUS KEYSTONE PIPELINE WE AGREE AND ACCEPT THE COMMENTS AGAINST SULFIDE MINING. MY GOD. YOU HAVE PROOF OF POLLUTION FROM PREVIOUS SULFIDE MINING. WHAT MORE DO YOU NEED. YOU ARE WILLING TO RISK THE POLLUTION OF LAKE SUPERIOR AND SURROUNDING AREAS. UNREAL AMAZING. PLEASE, LET COMMON SENSE PREVAIL.

***** Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, James and Marilyn Keegan 8895 SW 91st Pl Unit D Ocala, FL 34481-7409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James & Sara & Jae & Jaz Conway 43501

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, James and Sara and Jae and Jaz Conway
4620 Valley DR NW Rochester, MN 55901

48485

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, James and Sara and Jae and Jaz Conway
4620 Valley DR NW Rochester, MN 55901

James A Ahrens 41863

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. Those of us who love the boundary waters and the many species of wildlife and especially birds fear that proposals such as this will bring long term losses that cannot be justified by short term profits. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr James A Ahrens 529 Park St Grinnell, IA 50112-2421 (641) 236-4665

James A Seme 42561

See attachment

James Ahrlin 54884

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Alvey

39697

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr James Alvey 135 Stinson Blvd New Brighton, MN 55112-3101 (651) 746-0712

James Amato

36348

I wish to register my objection to the proposed PolyMet copper mine and processing center near Hoyt Lakes. Copper mining is very different from traditional taconite mining. It carries increased risks to the environment which in my opinion have not been adequately addressed. The waterways of northern Minnesota are a priceless asset. They have enriched our lives for countless generations and should be passed on unspoiled to future generations. A comparative handful of jobs for a few decades do not justify the immense risk involved. As a retired physicist and a concerned citizen I urge you to please take into account the serious danger to our environment posed by this project. James J. Amato, Phd 4004 London Rd, Apt. 1111 Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Amato

41661

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

James Amundsen

38826

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. My wife and I have recently bought property on the North Shore. From our point of view, the danger is so catastrophic that there is no way we would want this area's unique beauty to be risked for generations, much less for our generation. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr James Amundsen 3540 Edmund Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406-2943 (612) 721-3282

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James And Deborah Nicholson

34673

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The BWCA is particularly sensitive, and, its natural beauty aside, is a major contributor to the economy of northeast Minnesota and particularly Ely. We moved to Minnesota 35 years ago, drawn by the quality of life and the unspoiled woods, lakes and rivers, and the legacy of environmental stewardship. We want to see those qualities preserved for our children and grandchildren and future generations. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, James And Deborah Nicholson 7508 Hyde Park Dr Edina, MN 55439-1743 (952) 942-9639

james barnett

17221

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, james barnett 515 E WilsonSt ELY, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

james barnett

50492

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, james barnett 515 E WilsonSt ELY, MN 55731

James Barrett

38809

_____ From: jmichaelbarrett@hotmail-com To: jmichaelbarrett@hotmail-com Subject: Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2014 17:24:14 -0400

Alphabetical by sender's first name

james bates

46217

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, james bates 15 Vincent Ave S minneapolis, MN 55405

46218

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, james bates 15 Vincent Ave S minneapolis, MN 55405

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Beaty 38357

Dear Sir, I am an avid canoeist, CC skier and general all around outdoorsy 64 year old. I was born in Ely and moved back here +30 years ago. I 100% support responsible mining in this area. I want to see healthy young families grow and prosper here like I did. Tourism never did and especially with the creation of "Disney Woods" never will provide livable wage jobs. Like my Buddy Rick said " Jobs. There are plenty of jobs in Ely. Why my girlfriend moved here and within a week had 3 jobs. Of course their total pay barely covered her living expenses-but hey, she's living in Ely" We need to move forward with the mine project. James F. Beaty 921 E. Pattison St Ely MN. 55731

James Beaumont 57461

I believe the PolyMet Mining project should proceed. The PolyMet Mining water quality study, the Superior National Forests bio. assessment and evaluation as well as the United States Army Corp of Engineers have done an extensive review of the proposed project and long-term effects. Please help to see this project passes. Thank you for your help. James Beaumont 3290 68th Court East Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

James Beckstrom 31231

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The trend to pollute must be reversed - when is blatant greed going to be taken off its pedestal. Sincerely, James Beckstrom PO Box 436 Oscoda, MI 48750-0436

James Borden 3601

December 20, 2013 No Polymet Project Please. I am e-mailing you as part of the window of public response given to residents of Minnesota to say I do not feel that Polymet's proposed mining of Sulfide Ore is good for Minnesota from any way it is viewed. It will only go for 20 years, with a minimum of jobs, especially compared to the jobs we get from sustainable tourism in Ely area, and produce sulfuric acid in all the waters it drains to including Lake Superior, the largest supply of fresh water in the US. Thanks, James Borden 1963 Fairmount Ave St Paul, MN 55105 651-699-8957

9311

January 30, 2014 I am writing because I am against PolyMet or any other company mining for metals in sulfide bearing ore. The issue is very simple to me; the danger of harmful byproducts, such as sulfuric acid and mercury is too great in an environment like this. The mining for these copper and Nickel need to talk place in dry environments like Arizona, Utah and New Mexico, which are already the leading states for copper mining, not in a wet environment like Superior National Forest No this can't happen, here, especially not near the boundary waters, a protected as a National Wilderness Preservation System. With two major watersheds that could potentially spreading sulfuric acid into Lake Superior and the Hudson Bay. This mining deal doesn't really present viable, sustainable jobs and may only last 20 years whereas the potential for pollution may be up to 500 years. It would be a foolish trade-off for all involved. Thanks for letting me speak my mind. James Borden

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Bradley 40343

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, James Bradley 18448 Belle Alliance Prairieville, LA 70769 US

James Bussa 6316

Say no to mining in the BWCA. A handful of jobs is not worth 100's of years of pollution. Jim Bussa Shakopee

James Cunningham 33549

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. So, there's no need to start. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This mining activity will pollute one of our nation's largest bodies of fresh water. Not a good idea unless you want to poison Americans. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest in any way, shape, or form. We cannot allow corporate profits to trump public health. Please put a stop to this incredibly bad idea. Sincerely, James Cunningham 205 W Reindeer Dr Powell, OH 43065-5073 (614) 326-0730

James David Cole 57232

Too many decisions in the quest for greed ignore the consequences. When the land is destroyed, where will we live? The costs to clean up the problems left behind far exceed the profits taken! James David Cole 24553 Evergreen Drive Nevis, MN 56467

James Denman 43645

There needs to be more push back on the Polymet Proposal. The BWCA is so close and it is a treasure that we should not risk. 1- Polymet will emit 46 lbs of mercury/ year that will cause harm to visitors to the BWCA and local residents. 2- It will destroy Moose and lynx habitats 3- The risk of Sulfide pollution is high. 4- The project will affect over 1000 acres of valuable wet lands. The project does not seem to benefit the local residents nor the citizens of Minnesota. The risk to the area is high compared to the benefit of the project is low for Minnesota overall.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Dushane

39703

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr James Dushane 936 8th Ave SE Rochester, MN 55904-5006

James Ellis

38751

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms James Ellis 11051 Russell Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55431-3950 (952) 888-3340

38755

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms James Ellis 11051 Russell Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55431-3950 (952) 888-3340

James Everest

4885

Jan 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a lifelong resident of the state of Minnesota, one of the things I hold most dear is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and North Shore of Lake Superior. It's where I proposed to my wife. It's where I've had some of the most important moments in my life, moments of reflection and fellowship with friends and family. It's where we've taken many visiting friends from across the country and even overseas - as something rare and truly inspirational. And it never ceases to amaze these visitors, with its pristine waters and protected wild forests. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Please do not put short term profits ahead of invaluable, irreplaceable natural habitats that so many of us cherish and rely on to help define who we are as Minnesotans. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr James Everest PO Box 18262 Minneapolis, MN 55418-0262 (612) 879-8676

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Everest

51507

Jan 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a lifelong resident of the state of minnesota, one of the things I hold most dear is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and North Shore of Lake Superior. It's where I proposed to my wife. It's where I've had some of the most important moments in my life, moments of reflection and fellowship with friends and family. It's where we've taken many visiting friends from across the country and even overseas - as something rare and truly inspirational. And it never ceases to amaze these visitors, with it's pristine wanters and protected wild forests. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Please do not put short term profits ahead of invaluable, irreplaceable natural habitats that so many of us cherish and rely on to help define who we are as minnesotans. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr James Everest PO Box 18262 Minneapolis, MN 55418-0262 (612) 879-8676

James Farrells

42781

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Fournier

14988

Feb 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Grindeland

52516

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

James H Brutger

42792

See attachment

James H Juntti

42630

See attachment

James H. Stout

21542

Please see the attached document.

James Hacking

9551

This is a great project with huge economic impact for all of northern Minnesota. Tax revenues for the state, job creation, and much needed resource for all. Polymet has done their due diligence and complied with all environmental requests. I appreciate all environmental concerns. Please allow the permit to go through. If there are environment issues you can always shut them down as I am sure they will have ongoing testing and monitoring. Sincerely James R. Hacking, CPA Duluth, Mn

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Hall 15382

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr James Hall 1820 E 1st St Duluth, MN 55812-1721

James Hansen 57378

I think it's great idea to develop the area and create jobs for the iron range. Jim Hansen Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

James Hanske 11272

Hello, It was unclear on your website where you are receiving comments for the Northmet SDEIS. I will submit mine here. I feel that my rights as a Minnesota citizen would be violated by having the Northmet mine approved. This is Minnesota superior national forest land and it should be up to the people to decide its use and up to the DNR to protect this land and ensure its preservation. This mine would significantly degrade the water quality of the boundary waters lakes and lakes in the surrounding area. It is our job as Minnesotan citizens to protect arguably the most precious natural resource in Minnesota which is our lakes and more specifically the boundary waters. It would be an outright greed driven crime for SNF lands to be exchanged to a mining company. The way we regulate mining companies to make sure they follow environmental regulations is not enough. Furthermore surface mining is extraordinarily harmful to the environment. It would be the biggest betrayal of the people for the DNR, the very people who are supposed to preserve this land, to not only allow but knowingly aid in the permanent destruction of our beloved lake country. If this is approved and a mine is built I will have lost all faith in my representatives ability to listen to their citizens and the DNR's ability to protect our states wildlife and wilderness areas. I will no longer vote to approve any funding for DNR sponsored programs because of my lack of faith in their morality and ability to do their job. I urge you to please make the decision that will protect our nations fading wildlife and not allow this or any other mine in this area. Thank you, James Hanske

JAMES HENDERSON 38574

Dear DNR, I oppose the proposed PolyMet mine in northern Minnesota. It will pollute the land and water with little economy compensation to justify such a degradation of our precious environment. Thank you, James C. Henderson 104 Windsor Court New Brighton, MN 55112-3309 651-633-2297

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Hilgemann

39166

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The sulfide mining is yet another example of the root-hog-or-die mentality behind the smoke-and-mirrors of this country's resources/energy conundrum. I think it's time to leave the 19th century mindset behind. This is the 21st century. It's time to evolve. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, James Hilgemann 676 Ashland Ave Apt 12 Saint Paul, MN 55104-7168 (651) 298-1396

James Holden

16020

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James J Drost

58091

By way of background, I have BS & MS degrees in Mining and Metallurgical Engineering from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. I have worked at the U.S. Bureau of Mines, ALCOA, and other mining related industries. Over the years I have read many EIS documents and Conditional Use Permit applications; there is a common thread through all of them. That thread is that the mining companies are using them for hype and propaganda. Poly-Met hopes that by overdramatizing a few positives, namely jobs and the economy, the many flaws and omissions in this document will be missed by the many review boards. Let me briefly recount the history of the Flambeau Mine in Rusk County near Ladysmith, WI., a location similar to that which Poly-Met has chosen, but with far fewer complications. Flambeau said that they would be there for at least 20 years, supply 160 jobs to the locals, reclaim, and restore everything so that you could hardly tell that they had been there. In the end, Flambeau shut the mine down in less than 6 years, and exported an estimated \$750,000,000 of metal out of this country. From the few records that Flambeau made available it seems that less than half of the jobs went to locals and they were the low paying ones; Rusk County's jobless rate and economy made no improvements. Worst of all there was very significant pollution. Below is the website where this information can be found. <http://flambeaumineexposed.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/buzzards19.pdf> History Flambeau mine This project will deeply and adversely impact the lands of several Native American bands in the area. I thought that we as a nation and state had grown out of the phase in history where it was okay to cheat the Native Americans because someone wanted to make money with Their Land. They want the land that was returned to them by treaty, because it is sacred to them. This land is their "green grass of home", and yet this company wants to destroy it forevermore by polluting it with toxic waste water. When will we as a Nation and a State be honorable enough to keep our agreements? This document has been studied and been found to be misleading, missing information, and fails to speak to many issues including health. It is not an acceptable document on which to base public trust for the future of Minnesota's people, especially the unborn. I ask you to reject this facade of due diligence.

James Kayfes

77

Let's get this done. We need the jobs in that part of the State. These people know what they are doing when it comes to mining, give them the opportunity. If we fail to support this part of the State I will no longer commit any more resources/donations, etc. to the State of Minnesota. Everything is for the Twin Cities, I am fed up with this. James Kayfes Accounts Payable Manager PeopleNet_LogoLres 4400 Baker Road, Minnetonka, MN 55343 DIRECT 952-908-6215 TOLL FREE 888-346-3486 x 215 | FAX 952-908-6129 HYPERLINK "<http://www.peoplenetonline-com/>"jkayfes@peoplenetonline-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James King

39802

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

james koenig

40867

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr james koenig 1584 Whitaker St White Bear Lake, MN 55110-3768 (651) 261-1798

James Korthals

57348

My name is James Korthals. K-O-R-T-H-A-L-S. I am a partner with Krecho Jard & Associates (phonetic), an engineering firm based in Duluth, Minnesota. I am here to talk for and in support of PolyMet and the project that they have going right now. K-R-E-C-H-O J-A-R-D. We are thoroughly convinced that through the collaborative efforts of all of the agencies and PolyMet that the EIS has brought forth everything that will be of benefit and/or detriment to the environment. And we firmly believe that PolyMet is a responsible mining company and they will be taking care of the environment for a very long time to come. My background, I am a mining engineer. I have been involved in the mining industry for the last 30 years. And I personally know a large number of people that work at PolyMet, and I am convinced that their ethical behavior is above reproach and the way they undertake business is also above reproach. So, therefore, we fully support the NorthMet project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

james koschak

43565

Lisa Fay, SDEIS Project Manager, MN DNR Kenneth Westlake, US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Michael Jimenez, US Forest Service-Superior National Forest March 13, 2014 Re: Public Comment submittal: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, PolyMet Mining, Inc.- NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange E-mail directed to: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) [HYPERLINK "mailto:Westlake.Kenneth@epa.gov"](mailto:Westlake.Kenneth@epa.gov) [HYPERLINK "mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil"](mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil) [HYPERLINK "mailto:Mjimenez@fs.fed.us"](mailto:Mjimenez@fs.fed.us)
From: James Koschak 1329 East Harvey Street. Ely, Minnesota 55731 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake, Mr Bruner, Mr Jimenez, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed NorthMetSDEIS mining and land exchange project. My Home is located in Ely and my two tourism recreational businesses are located at 12007 River Point Road in Stony River Township on Birch Lake and the South Kawishiwi River. I am a 3rd generation owner. I have reviewed the SDEIS and have interest in providing comments for the MN DNR, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the US Forest Service. Comments have also been sent to the EPA. General Comments: The PolyMet North Met Mine proposal SDEIS is filled with flawed data, inaccurate information, omissions of pertinent information and is overwhelming complex by design. It is inappropriately long at 2,169 pages, confusing to read, with many leading and unsubstantiated statements. Details of models used to project pollutant estimates are often lacking and the basic assumptions and data inputs for models inadequate. Lack of evidence-based explanations for key conclusions is problematic. One example is that there are no reasons given why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands were not analyzed. Why is that. Taking Our Lake Country and Minnesota's Most Valuable Wetland and Turning It into a Mining District: If approved the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine would be the first of many such mines looking to secure a permit in northeastern Minnesota. If permitted, PolyMet NorthMet Mine, along with Twin Metals Minnesota and other such toxic sulfide mines "waiting in the wings" would effectively turn our lakes recreational district into a mining district devoid of a beautiful wilderness landscape, solitude, wildlife, including the iconic moose, clean water, clean air, and peace and quiet. PolyMet's proposed mine is not on the Iron Range. PolyMet's SDEIS states: "The NorthMet Project area, including the Mine Site, Plant Site, and connecting infrastructure, would be in St Louis County, Minnesota, and situated at the eastern end of the Mesabi Iron Range." "That statement is false. The NorthMet Mine Pit would not be on the Iron Range. It would be on the Superior National Forest land approximately six miles from the Plant Site. It would be in the Duluth Complex, where the predominant mineral sulfide is copper-nickel, not iron. PolyMet's Mine Plant (LTV's old taconite plant) is on the Iron Range. The Iron Range is not the Duluth Complex." (Community Voices, February 26, 2014). Other misrepresentations, besides the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources SDEIS, as to where the NorthMet Mine Pit would be located were made in other instances, including the opening statements by DNR Director of Lands and Minerals, Jess Richards, at the February 11, 2014 Minnesota House Environmental, Natural Resources, and Agriculture Finance Committee hearing (financial assurances and PolyMet), and the investment firm, Edison, secured by PolyMet, put the Project on the Iron Range. Again, this is not correct. It is quite evident as to why the NorthMet Mine site has been resoundingly misrepresented as being on the Iron Range, instead on in the Superior National Forest in the dissemina

Alphabetical by sender's first name

james koschak

43572

Lisa Fay, SDEIS Project Manager, MN DNR Kenneth Westlake, US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Michael Jimenez, US Forest Service-Superior National Forest March 13, 2014 Re: Public Comment submittal: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, PolyMet Mining, Inc.- NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange E-mail directed to: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us HYPERLINK "mailto:Westlake.Kenneth@epa-gov"Westlake.Kenneth@epa-gov HYPERLINK "mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil"Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil HYPERLINK "mailto:Mjimenez@fs.fed.us" Mjimenez@fs.fed.us From: James Koschak 1329 East Harvey Street. Ely, Minnesota 55731 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake, Mr Bruner, Mr Jimenez, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed NorthMetSDEIS mining and land exchange project. My Home is located in Ely and my two tourism recreational businesses are located at 12007 River Point Road in Stony River Township on Birch Lake and the South Kawishiwi River. I am a 3rd generation owner. I have reviewed the SDEIS and have interest in providing comments for the MN DNR, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the US Forest Service. Comments have also been sent to the EPA. General Comments: The PolyMet North Met Mine proposal SDEIS is filled with flawed data, inaccurate information, omissions of pertinent information and is overwhelming complex by design. It is inappropriately long at 2,169 pages, confusing to read, with many leading and unsubstantiated statements. Details of models used to project pollutant estimates are often lacking and the basic assumptions and data inputs for models inadequate. Lack of evidence-based explanations for key conclusions is problematic. One example is that there are no reasons given why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands were not analyzed. Why is that. Taking Our Lake Country and Minnesota's Most Valuable Wetland and Turning It into a Mining District: If approved the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine would be the first of many such mines looking to secure a permit in northeastern Minnesota. If permitted, PolyMet NorthMet Mine, along with Twin Metals Minnesota and other such toxic sulfide mines "waiting in the wings" would effectively turn our lakes recreational district into a mining district devoid of a beautiful wilderness landscape, solitude, wildlife, including the iconic moose, clean water, clean air, and peace and quiet. PolyMet's proposed mine is not on the Iron Range. PolyMet's SDEIS states: "The NorthMet Project area, including the Mine Site, Plant Site, and connecting infrastructure, would be in St Louis County, Minnesota, and situated at the eastern end of the Mesabi Iron Range." "That statement is false. The NorthMet Mine Pit would not be on the Iron Range. It would be on the Superior National Forest land approximately six miles from the Plant Site. It would be in the Duluth Complex, where the predominant mineral sulfide is copper-nickel, not iron. PolyMet's Mine Plant (LTV's old taconite plant) is on the Iron Range. The Iron Range is not the Duluth Complex." (Community Voices, February 26, 2014). Other misrepresentations, besides the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources SDEIS, as to where the NorthMet Mine Pit would be located were made in other instances, including the opening statements by DNR Director of Lands and Minerals, Jess Richards, at the February 11, 2014 Minnesota House Environmental, Natural Resources, and Agriculture Finance Committee hearing (financial assurances and PolyMet), and the investment firm, Edison, secured by PolyMet, put the Project on the Iron Range. Again, this is not correct. It is quite evident as to why the NorthMet Mine site has been resoundingly misrepresented as being on the Iron Range, instead on in the Superior National Forest in the dissemina

james lindbeck

37326

you people are generally tools of the extraction and consumption industries and if you had any shame, you would recognize that your sad little dark souls are going to suffer in the end. you sicken me

James Lynskey

37290

My husband and I want to express our concern about the poly met operation being planned for northern Mn. Perhaps we should be leaving the minerals in the ground until a safer way of getting it out of the ground. Contaminating our ground water is a high price to pay for a relatively few local jobs. Also, we tax payers should not be the ones to pay for cleanup. thank you for consideration of our concerns. Jane Dietl and Jim Lynskey McGregor, Mn.

40527

We would like to be kept informed about NorthMet Mining Project. Our address is 41916 248th Place McGregor Min. 55760- Thank you. Jane Dietl and James Lynskey _____ From: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us To: jameslynskey@outlook-com Subject: RE: polymet Date: Sat, 1 Mar 2014 19:13:34 +0000 Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James M. Hagen

44976

Dear Reviewers: The EIS should state how the mine's production will be transported to customers. Whether by rail, ship, truck, or pipeline, the method and route of shipment is important as shipping corridors may be greatly impacted by an increase and concentration of shipping traffic along the corridors to be used. Thank you. James M. Hagen 3817 47th Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406 jamesmhagen@yahoo-com

james mccluskey

709

I understand the implications of a project like the new mining project. I live in Bigfork Minnesota and have for years. The DNR is not a very good steward of our natural resources and systematically is destroying our forests with logging and power sport trails, wildlife with the wolf hunt and now destruction of the ground itself with this purposed mining project. I guess giving the reigns to a entity that needs money from natural resources to grow and survive was our fault, but you have to live with it. I vote no on any new "management" of our natural resources. You should protect, not destroy. Jim McCluskey 55107 Owen lake road Bigfork, MN 56628 218 743 6720

19979

I want to go on record as opposing the mine operations as a citizen of this state. I will not go into detail, but as a Minnesotan and a person who loves our public lands, I think we should protect them at all costs and stop the progress of this mine. Think of our kids. lets not destroy another piece of this great land. Jim McCluskey 55107 Owen lake road Bigfork, MN 56628

James Mcveety

16271

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Melander 57165

Minnesota law required mined out areas to be left “maintenance free.” The EIS statement explains that the mined out area will required 500 years of maintenance and water treatment. It is obvious that we do not have the technology to do this project safely. James Melander 616 West 5th Street Duluth, MN 55806

James Moran 6083

Department of Natural Resources: I, James Moran, support PolyMet Mining and believe they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. I also trust the multiple State and Federal Agencies involved in preparing this document. Where can an Iron Ranger getting out of school get a job. Especially one that will support a family. I am a native of the iron range and would like the opportunity to stay, work and raise a family in Northern Minnesota. As a person who lives, works and plays in the area, I understand the need to balance use of resources like minerals and preservation of resources such as water and air. I feel this SDEIS lays the proper groundwork for developing an environmentally and economically sustainable project and I wholeheartedly support it. Sincerely James D. Moran P.E. James Moran 1107 NW 2nd Ave Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else’s views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

James Nessa 54770

See attachment

James Nygard 54509

See attachment

James P. Bremer 36682

To who it may concern: With respect to the PolMet project, as a citizen of Minnesota, I personally believe this project should be allowed to leave absolutely no pollution. Whatever is used in the process and whatever is a result of this process should leave no effect on the environment. Therefore to insure that this happens, if the project is approved, a fund should be created as the mining is done to reverse any harm to the environment. JPB James P. Bremer 16015 46th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55446 Phone: 612-750-2370 jim.jpbv@comcast.net Confidentiality Notice This e-mail document and any documents accompanying this transmission contain CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION belonging to the sender, which is legally privileged, and only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee/agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. You are requested to notify me immediately by telephone (612-750-2370) and to destroy this message and any attachments. Any unauthorized use of the information contained in this transmission is strictly prohibited. Thank you for your cooperation.

James Poole 57241

I believe that any mining company that is moved to Minnesota [ILLEGIBLE] should be faced to escrow any and all cleanup costs paying forward/or 500 years. This should be done in the forms of a 100 million dollar fund that advances by 10% each year starting with the first day of production. If they don’t need to do any damage, then after 500 years the company gets the money. This should be a sure thing for them if it really is as clean as they say. James Poole 10641 Hwy 37 Hibbing, MN 55746

James R Bester 57203

If this mine pollutes Birch Lake and the Kawishiwi River it flows right into the BWCA and up through Canada. If it pollutes the Cloquet and St. Louis River it flows into Lake Superior. Has anyone thought to ask the citizens of Canada and the Great Lakes states what they think of this acid mining? Let’s hear what their thoughts are. James R. Bester 6413 Petre St Duluth, MN 55807

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Rodriguez 44302

To the Department of Natural Resources, Please oppose the Polymet mining proposal. Sulfide mining produces toxic waste that could irreversibly damage Minnesota's fragile lakes, rivers and natural resources. This is not our grandparents' iron mining — sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. While iron mines have significant environmental challenges of their own, the sulfuric acid that is produced with sulfide mining makes it particularly difficult to avoid polluting nearby lakes, streams and ground water. Thank you, James Rodriguez 1919 5th St NE #1 Minneapolis, MN 55418

James Rolfe 57150

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I strongly oppose sulfide mining in Northeastern Minnesota. In my opinion, the long term consequences and the potential for irreversible damage far outweigh any short-term gain. It's an enormous risk to this area, the country and the planet. James Rolfe 6252 Heritage Road Duluth, MN 55804

James Russell 39698

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr James Russell 805 Hidden Ln Excelsior, MN 55331-1916 (952) 474-9052

James Schulzetenberg 36539

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Miss Fay, Federal and State Agency Leaders: Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny the section 404 permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet's sulfide mine will directly destroy over 900 acres of wetlands by blasting pits, and creating huge mounds of waste rock, along with other wetland destruction. The SDEIS also states that an additional 7,350 acres or more of wetlands could be destroyed because of air and water pollution resulting from taking water from the mine site to the tailings pile and changing the water patterns at the existing old LTV tailings site. However, according to the SDEIS, PolyMet will only have to replace about 27 acres, not the full amount of 7,350 acres. Given the history of the indirect effects of mining on wetlands, PolyMet should be required to come up with wetlands replacement in advance for all likely wetlands losses. Again, please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny the section 404 permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water. Thank you. Sincerely, James Schulzetenberg 4117 W 8th Street Duluth MN 55807 James Schulzetenberg 4117 West 8th Street Duluth, MN 55807

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Stout

43053

Feb.4, 2014 Dear Mr. Dabney, My name is James Stout. I am a recently retired professor of Earth Sciences at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities campus. In addition to teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses for over 41 years, several of my PhD students have gone on to work in the mining industry. One of them, Drummond Earley (PhD 1991) is a specialist in sulfide mining remediation and now is employed as a regional hydrogeochemist with Barrack Gold Corporation. I have maintained close contact with him over the years, and along with input from dozens of colleagues elsewhere in the profession, I believe I have a well-informed opinion regarding both sides of the Polymet sulfide mining debate in northern Minnesota. First and foremost sulfide mining is a dirty activity. It's just inherent to the business. In every operation I am aware of, there is or has been significant environmental pollution. The negative impacts of sulfide mining on the quality of water, air, soil and plant life are exceptionally well documented in the literature. All 14 of the currently active sulfide mines in the U.S. have suffered some level of environmental damage with remediation costs in some cases amounting to many millions of dollars (Gestring, B., 2012, www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/Porphyry_Copper_Mines_Track-Record.pdf). Last Wednesday evening I attended the third Public Hearing in St. Paul on the Polymet proposal. Speaker after speaker on the pro-mining side spoke about how clean the proposed mining operation will be. That promise flies in the face of a very large body of data that shows otherwise. It is noteworthy that all of the currently operating sulfide mines in the U.S. went through an EIS process where "promises" of no pollution were made. All have failed to some degree. In my view, it not a matter of "if" we are going to see environmental pollution in the proposed Polymet operation, but rather "when" it will be. The second and final point I would like to make has to do with a parallel debate concerning the Pebble Mine proposal in Alaska. If developed, the Pebble Mine will easily become the largest open-pit sulfide mine in North America. At risk is the inevitable negative impact the mine and its auxiliary components will have on the native salmon fishery that is so unique to the area and so vital to commercial and sport fishing. The parallel risk in Minnesota will be to the flourishing recreation industry centered on the BWCA and Superior National Forest. The economic benefits of this use of our resource is guaranteed in perpetuity in contrast to proposed mining operations in that area. I believe strongly that mining is not the best use of our resources in N. Minnesota. Thank you for your attention James H. Stout

James Thompson

52440

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, James Thompson 8905 Little Horse Ave Las Vegas, NV 89143

Alphabetical by sender's first name

James Vental 39743

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Why do you want to do sulfide mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, James Vental 13 Spring Farm Ln Saint Paul, MN 55127-2145 (612) 916-1654

48885

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Why do you want to do sulfide mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, James Vental 13 Spring Farm Ln Saint Paul, MN 55127-2145 (612) 916-1654

James Vigliotti 38983

Hello. I would like to comment that a federal-level review should be done of the proposed PolyMet mine's SDEIS particularly regarding the incorrect maps as seen on <http://www.bwcasulfideminig-org/mine-site-drainage-to-bwca/> . My name is James Robert Vigliotti. My mailing address is 999 Smith Ave S. Apartment 1 West Saint Paul, MN 55118

James Voita 58186

My name is James D. Voita, V-O-I-T-A, Afton, Minnesota and Finland, Minnesota. We use the North Shore for cabin, recreation and fishing, swimming and we're very concerned about the long-term water quality and the fact that this process has never been done anywhere in the world, successfully, and that there's still visible damage from copper mines that King Solomon used centuries ago. We're also on the Sierra -- Sierra Club board.

James W Larson 54867

See attachment

James Watson 18113

My name is James Watson. First off, I would like to thank everybody for showing up here. I'm just a grunt who worked at the mines like so many other people here. Friends that I worked with, friends that I haven't worked with. And I've seen firsthand some of the work that PolyMet does. Maybe not firsthand but second, third, fourth hand. They're pretty diligent in their research. Rightfully so, because I suppose they're told they have to do it that way. But they seem sincere in the way they go about it. I would also like to thank the whole team of PolyMet for taking part in this, giving us the opportunity to push it along. Also at the same time I would like to thank all the people here taking a part of this to make sure that it is done right. And it sure looks to me like it's done right. There's no reason in my opinion as why we can't get along with all our environmentalists. We have seen tonight so far the wild rice thing. Sort of a homemade expert on wild rice. Doesn't sound like it's a big problem. (Inaudible) something bad shows up for wild rice, it's going to show up quick. All the experimentation that PolyMet has done in the last eight, nine, ten years you have to see it to believe it is actually done. It is a good thing we have some investors that are willing to take a chance on a venture like this. I am 100 percent for PolyMet in that we need jobs. We have so many of our young people that have left the area. Young families have left because there's no livelihood for them here. There's no one with family that I can think of that is capable of supporting a family on \$10-an-hour wage. It looks like PolyMet is going to be one good payer of good wages and benefits. They already have a facility that is pretty much already built. There's modifications to do, of course. But that is all laying out already what they're going to do if this is approved. So I think PolyMet needs to go forward so we don't wind up with a whole bunch of ghost towns on the Iron Range.

Jami Halder 42613

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jami Halder 57352

My concern is the pollution spreading much farther than the localized area and, you know, affecting more people than it is saying it is going to. With the quality of water and its going down the seeded area, the watershed, the St. Louis watershed, my concern is that we will all be affected and that watershed will come down and affect my gardening, and all of that stuff. So, I don't know. That's my comment. That's my concern. It is the polluted water spreading further than they are saying it is going to. That is my concern. Thank you so much.

Jamie Bartzen 38038

DNR representatives This a NO vote for the PolyMet mining proposed for northern Minnesota. Please do not give approval to them, too much is 'unknown'. Our resources must be protected at all costs. Thank you Jamie Bartzen Sent from my iPhone

Jamie Fillmore 40278

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jamie Fillmore 18770 SW Lisa Court Beaverton, OR 97006 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jamie Greer

40370

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jamie Greer 10 Highland place West Orange, NJ 07052 US

Jamie Ireland

39367

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jamie Ireland 317 Victory Ave Sartell, MN 56377-4625 (320) 420-4670

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jamie LeDent

40316

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jamie LeDent 2185 Chatsworth San Diego, CA 92107 US

Jamison Tessneer

43744

To whom it may concern: I raise several concerns with the proposed project, but most of the concerns have been raised at public hearings. One concern that has not been addressed is the adequacy of Minnesota law to protect landowners that could potentially have their land polluted by sulfide mines. The Minnesota Environmental Rights Act exempts permitted projects like the Northmet project from private causes of action from landowners whose groundwater or surface water may become contaminated. Will causes of action under public/private nuisance laws give landowners adequate recourse if their property is damaged. Will causes of action couched in theories of negligence or trespass give landowners adequate recourse if their property is damaged.? If we do not know, then what do we tell landowners whose property is contaminated. What recourse will they have against a multinational company that is profiting off the destruction of a private landowner in Minnesota. What if that land is a resort or business and the owner loses business. What recourse will they have. These are all issues that must be considered. Respectfully, Jamison Jamison Tessneer Student | William Mitchell College of Law jamison.tessneer@wmitchell-edu 218-831-4118

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan and Jim Porter

18911

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Jan and Jim Porter 26334 Indigo Dr n/a Park Rapids, MN 56470

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan and Jim Porter

40075

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Jan Greenfield

43965

Dear DNR, Please support "green" jobs for the unemployed in the Ely area. Give some governmental support to MORE solar energy; more wind energy; these jobs pay better and they look to the future, not the paSt The days of digging up the earth for quick-term gain should be OVER. There's NO CONTEST between a few short-term jobs and the 500-year-predicted clean-up schedule for Minnesota's blessed natural resources. DO NOT ALLOW POLYMET to destroy Minnesota's fabulous, beauteous environment. Sincerely, Jan Greenfield 1793 Rome Ave St Paul, MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan Kaeter

43694

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Lisa Fay I'm writing in regards to the PolyMet SDEIS. It appears that the study is flawed. It does not make any sense to allow a mine that will only be open for 20 years that will require 500 years of clean up. PolyMet is only a shell company and will file bankruptcy as soon as the minerals are extracted, then it will be up to the tax payer to pay for the clean up costs. They say reverse osmosis is their plan to clean up the waste, they estimate it will cost 6 million dollars per year: If the clean up lasts 500 years we are looking at 3 billion and that is not including inflation, PolyMet must agree to put up 3 billion dollars + inflation up front to protect us the tax payers. I also do not agree with the wetland swaps the current wetland, draining wetland in one part of the state and digging a pothole in another does not replace a wetland and it's value to a watershed and the wildlife that depends on it. And speaking of wildlife our moose population has been stressed and been in decline in the last decade, we can ill afford to remove any more habitat from it's range. There is no way I can see that they can totally seal off the waste in our water rich environment when sulfide based mining in the drier western states have all ended up being environment disasters requiring us the tax payer to clean up the mess. The potential cost to Minnesota tax payers and the natural environment is just too high and the SDEIS doesn't address the problems adequately. From what I understand the Minnesota rule 6132-3200 requires all mines to be maintenance free upon closure, and PolyMet doesn't even come close to meeting that rule. Every thing I see PolyMet has a long way to go before we even consider this type of mining in Minnesota and should be turned down. Thankyou for considering my comments. Sincerely Jan Kaeter 28585 Co Rd 2 St Joseph MN 56374 Jan Kaeter 28585 Co Rd 2 St Joseph, MN 56374

Jan Karon

18384

My name is Jan Karon. I'm going on to cede my time to Dean Erickson.

20031

Hello, I have a number of concerns that lead me to question the wisdom of granting Polymet a permit to mine in northern Minnesota. The length of time Polymet itself says the toxic waste will have to be monitored - 200-500 years, violates current Minnesota law requiring such waste to be permanently disposed of before an operation closes. It is simply impossible for Polymet to meet the letter of this law. Is making an exception a wise precedent. Second, the logic of the safety of monitoring for such an unheard of long time eludes me. Mining companies simply do not last that long; most companies do not last that long. Who will monitor the toxic waste when Polymet no longer exists. The State of Minnesota at taxpayer expense. Furthermore, how could Polymet possibly give financial assurance for such a long-term operation. The duration of the toxic waste is an amazingly difficult environmental threat. I hope that you will deny the permit and protect our waters, one of Minnesota's greatest treasures. Thank you for considering my concerns. Jan Karon 218-722-7200

Jan Korby

34508

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I'm a lifelong Minnesotan and hope my grandchildren will be able to enjoy Minnesota. I've studied this issue and have not gotten involved yet, knowing the importance of development and increasing jobs for our local economy. However, in my research, I've come to the conclusion we must not allow this mining. Our water will be all that's left because of draught everywhere. Please please do not allow this until there's a more ecologically safe way to mine it. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jan Korby 609 Pearl St Cloquet, MN 55720-1257

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan Mezzenga

15786

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jan Myers

41838

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jan Myers Saint Paul, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan Myslajek

38734

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jan Myslajek 14665 -78th Ave N. Maple Grove, MN 55311 (763) 420-7339

38735

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jan Myslajek 14665 -78th Ave N. Maple Grove, MN 55311 (763) 420-7339

Jan Saecker

7057

Dear Friends, Years ago, I was touring the Peloponnese area of Greece, a mountainous region where it was still possible to experience the sound of silence. But one vast scar cut away an entire section of one mountain, and the tour guide explained that it was caused by an American company mining bauxite for aluminum production. When I returned to the states, everyone was drinking sodas from aluminum cans and throwing the cans away. Very little recycling was happening. If we recycled, there would be no need to tear up pristine landscapes any longer. Recycling is cheaper, brings us more jobs, and logically should be a true conservative's first choice. We really have very little need now for copper and nickel, especially since those metals are available through recycling. What we need is not more mining of copper and nickel, but more clean water preservation. Every life form requires water. There is no life form that requires copper or nickel mining. We also need more natural land preservation. As Mark Twain observed, they're not making land any more. Once a mountain is destroyed, once a great lake is contaminated, once a river is toxic, it is difficult if not impossible to bring it back. Sincerely, Jan Saecker W2771 Circle Drive Markesan WI 53946

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jan Swart

39537

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. We have seen these promises from mining companies before. There is no way they can avoid damage to our pristine environment in the Lake Superior basin. Period. We ask for our rights, as citizens, to reject these mining proposals. It has no foresight for down the road pollution of the entire basin. Having copper/mineral mining in this area is absolutely ridiculous Sincerely Jan Swart Jan Swart 214 1st Ave Two Harbors, MN 55616 218-834-4051

jan Weber

17048

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: We are proud of our land and water quality in MN and want to keep it great. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I’m also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet’s own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won’t end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won’t allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jan Weber 1878 ROBLYN AVE ST PAUL, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

jan Weber

50321

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: We are proud of our land and water quality in MN and want to keep it great. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jan Weber 1878 ROBLYN AVE ST PAUL, MN 55104

Janarose Savit

40368

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Janarose Savit 148A Daly Road East Northport, NY 11731 US

Jane A Dolter

54525

PolyMet needs to be responsible for all clean-up operations—from day one of their operations to eternity plus.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Ahlf 54142

I do NOT agree with the above statement. Enough!! Do no more harm. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Jane Ament 18281

Jane Ament. My name is Jane Ament, A-M-E-N-T. I live in the Two Harbors/Silver Creek area of Lake County. My home and property is located in the Lake Superior watershed district. This is approximately 45 miles southeast of the proposed PolyMet mining site. As a home and property owner from this area, I have serious concerns about both water and air quality should this mining proceed. Each summer I feed approximately 250 hummingbirds who nest in and around my property. I arrived at this population estimate because they consume 60 ounces of nectar daily from mid-August to early September in preparation for migration. I equate these little birds to the canaries sent into mines in days of yore. They are environmental barometers. If they die from bad drinking water, so will we. It would translate into the loss of many species. My interpretation of this open-pit mining process is that sulfuric acid will then be introduced into the air. These airborne toxins will then travel whichever way the wind blows. Not only will it blow my way, it will also blow to a huge portion, if not all, of the Superior hiking trail. This will poison our air, our earth (topography) and our surface water. This will pose tremendously hazardous health risks to all inhabitants and visitors to the Arrowhead region. It should be noted here that the Arrowhead already suffers from high levels of acid air and rain from industries, both past and present. In summary, I ask two questions. No. 1, can the DNR/PolyMet unequivocally promise me that our drinking water (from underground aquifers) will remain completely safe? No. 2, that our air quality (which also impacts our topography and surface water) will remain safe and not deteriorate if this mining goes forward?

19086

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, JANE AMENT 3000 East Alger Grade Two Harbors, MN 55616 218 834-6055

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Amundson 18292

My name is Jane Amundson, A-M-U-N-D-S-O-N. I am from Northfield, Minnesota. I believe that the mining company needs to prove that this process of cleanup will be safe and effective. They need to put the money upfront for the cleanup, so that we are not expecting that they can have the money for 500 years. So, I just want to say, "Prove it first, that it is safe." That's all.

Jane Armstrong 45105

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am a concerned citizen, a regular visitor to the BWCA, and the Community Board Chair of one of the YMCA Camps in the Ely area. I am a Professor at the University of Minnesota and regularly read grant proposals and feasibility studies. I have major concerns about the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I have particular concerns about the unsubstantiated assumptions like the percent of seepage collection at the tailings basin. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science and there has been insufficient time for adequate independent evaluation. One has to look no farther than West Virginia to see the results of industry assurances of "safety". The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. I am very concerned about the potential impact of these threats on the BWCA. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. A number of critical failures have been pointed out in letters from WaterLegacy. I share these concerns. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jane Armstrong 11550 Irish Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082

45106

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am a concerned citizen, a regular visitor to the BWCA, and the Community Board Chair of one of the YMCA Camps in the Ely area. I am a Professor at the University of Minnesota and regularly read grant proposals and feasibility studies. I have major concerns about the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I have particular concerns about the unsubstantiated assumptions like the percent of seepage collection at the tailings basin. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science and there has been insufficient time for adequate independent evaluation. One has to look no farther than West Virginia to see the results of industry assurances of "safety". The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. I am very concerned about the potential impact of these threats on the BWCA. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. A number of critical failures have been pointed out in letters from WaterLegacy. I share these concerns. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jane Armstrong 11550 Irish Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082

Jane B Livingston 54764

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Ball 4134

Please do not approve PolyMet's mining project. The gains are temporary; the damage is forever. -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. -Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -Annually, 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater without being treated. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site.

Jane C 39896

March 8, 2014 Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I have attended two of the meetings regarding the NorthMet copper-nickel-precious metals mining project, and I am deeply concerned about the possibility of a permit to mine being granted to PolyMet. Our only guarantee in this project is that our water will be polluted. There are many questions yet to be answered about this project, and it is unwise to move forward when some extremely important questions and concerns remained unanswered. Some of these are: It is not known what path the toxic seepage will take. Who and what will it affect. Holes in the models. Many of the questions asked of the MDNR at the hearing on February 11, 2014 received a response of "We don't know" or "The model doesn't account for that". It is not enough to only require PolyMet to answer questions that they pose. The MDNR must think through this project and demand answers to every eventuality. Samples of some of these questions are: "What financial assurance has been guaranteed for industrial accidents, such as a waste water line break, rail car derailment and waste spill" It is not possible to make a realistic financial guarantee reaching out 500 years. We know the pollution will last 500 years, but we don't know that PolyMet or any of the financial agents will exist in 500 years. It is easy to promise to do something, and easy to not follow through. Do you think they would take the deal if the terms were "You put the money down now, and we promise that in 500 years, PolyMet will be granted a permit to mine". Is there a safer way to mine. The hurry here is of financial nature only. There will likely be a demand for those metals in future years. If we wait for a safer mining practice to be developed, we could have our cake and eat it too - by getting the metals, and keeping clean water. Remember we may want the metals, but we need clean water. Since the only benefit of this project for Minnesotans is jobs - is there a better way to create 350 jobs that will last 20 years (or how about 350 jobs that will last many more years, or, perhaps 14 jobs that will last 500 years), rather than accept this project that has extremely limited gains for enormous risks. Is this the company you want to go into business with. PolyMet seems disingenuous. One example of this attitude is from the financial assurance hearing on February 11, 2014- PolyMet sent Brad Moore, Executive Vice President to speak for the company at the financial assurance hearing. When asked simple questions about the company's financial statement, Mr Moore claimed he didn't know about the financial statement, but would be happy to bring the committee's questions back to the company and get back to them. This was his response to nearly every question from the committee. He also elected not to read his prepared statement for the committee. Mr Moore's refusal to answer the committee's questions made a mockery of the committee and the proceedings. He offered no answers, and no statement from PolyMet. PolyMet hid from the questions, and offered no answers or assurances of their own. There is no guarantee on how many years the mine will operate. All the benefit analysis for jobs is based on a 20 year operation of the mine, but that is the maximum number of years of operation. There is nothing to say that the mine won't shut down earlier. Would you be considering this proposal at all if the projected jobs were only for 5, 10 or 15 years. We are guaranteed, however, of at least 500 years of pollution from the first day of mining. Wetlands cannot be created to be the same diversity of conditions or organisms of the original wetland. A land swap is ill-advised, as the precious wetland cannot be recreated. The water models are flawed and in dispute. They need to be redone. Much of the information I heard at the meetings was alarming, and if the copper/nickel mining project is allowed, our precious natural re

Jane Christensen 43068

My name is Jane Christensen and I live at 1876 Eleanor Ave, St Paul, MN 55116 I disagree with how the current (Supplemental) Draft EIS disregards the concerns of the Fond du Lac and Grand Portage Tribal Governments, the 1854 Treaty Authority, and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (the four formal representatives of tribal interests) relegating those concerns to Appendix C and responding to each concern as a MDO "Major Difference of Opinion." I also ask that the map/ boundaries of the One Hundred Mile Swamp be clarified. Thank you. Jane Christensen

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Clements 40994

I am writing to express my concern over the North Met DEIS, particularly the lack of information concerning the monitoring of the effluent. Minnesota water is going to be more valuable than gold, copper and nickel. We have no assurance that this mining operation will contain their run off in safe and long term, non polluting ways. What a terrible legacy you will leave to your community and the state should this be approved.

Jane Eloise Whitledge 57151

PolyMet should not be allowed to get their mine just because they've already spent millions of dollars, any more than a robber should be allowed to ransack your house because he's spent time and money casing the property, and seeing the best way into it. Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St, Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57156

Someday there is going to be commodity worth more than all the gold on earth: clean water. PolyMet's - and the public's - short-sighted vision on profits overlook our long-term needs. Life cannot survive without water. We can live without gold, copper, nickel. We must look to recycling for our metal needs. Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St, Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57157

With clean water sources dwindling the world over, it is very foolish to destroy one of the last remaining large areas of unpolluted water. Scientists predict future wars will be fought over drinking water. Do we really want to destroy a commodity that will be - and I believe really is now - more valuable than gold. Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St, Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57158

We can't afford to sell tomorrow for today. We have no right to sell our children's future. PolyMet is about to commit a crime against nature and humanity. They have admitted their mine will leave contaminated water for 500 years! Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St., Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57159

If an individual caused our water supply to have to be treated for 200 years, polluting it willfully, we would call him a terrorist and imprison him. PolyMet will be doing exactly the same, and yet will be rewarded with enormous gain, at the public's expense and detriment to health. Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St., Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57160

If this mine - God forbid - should be approved, it should not come without a strict "damage deposit" required of PolyMet, to insure that taxpayers will not be burdened with the (very likely - the admitted) clean-up, which will cost in the millions and millions of dollars over centuries!

57161

PolyMet has not clearly stated how they would great our waters to ensure drinkability, safety for fish, wild rice, etc. Or how they will keep treatment facilities in place for 200 years or more, or how they will for them. Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E. Superior St., Apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

57162

This mine is unconstitutional. Minnesota law clearly states that a mine must be left maintenance-free when closed. PolyMet, meanwhile, says the water, after mining, will have to be treated for at least 200 years! How could anything be less "maintenance-free"? Jane Eloise Whitledge 1801 E Superior St, apt 1 Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Eloise Whitledge 57163

We can't afford to sell tomorrow for today. We have no right to sell our children's future. PolyMet is about to commit a crime against nature and humanity. They have admitted their mine will leave contaminated water for 500 years!Jane Eloise Whitledge1801 E. Superior St., Apt 1Duluth, MN 55812

57167

Before the state approves any mining project – such as this sulfide mine proposed by PolyMet – it should be able to point to a mine somewhere in the world where its safety and maintenance-free closure are an example. It cannot.Jane Eloise Whitledge1801 E. Superior St., Apt 1Duluth, MN 55812

Jane Gilbert-Howard 9615

Dear People at the DNR, US Army Corp, and the US Forest Service. Thank you for taking my comments. I do NOT believe the EIS addresses the long-term environment effects of this proposed copper/nickel mine. I have spent time at Killarney, a Canadian provincial park. I have seen first-hand the damage the mine and smelter at Sudbury has done to the environment. The lakes at Killarney are sterile—nothing grows, no fish, the land looks like you are on a planet—only white rocks with no vegetation. This is an area that should look just like Duluth—lots of healthy trees, wonderful lakes full of fish, and lots of vegetation. Sudbury isn't very far away from Lake Superior and Lake Huron—it should look like northern Canada and it doesn't. What a tragedy for PolyMet to put a mining operation so close to the BWCAW—the only remaining wilderness of its type on the planet—especially when the forecast for “handling contaminated water” is estimated to be 200-500 years—OMG how can the permitting agencies even consider such an insult to the environment. I have much faith and trust in the DNR, the US Army Corp and the US Forest Service to make the right decisions to protect our environment for generations to come—by not accepting the EIS and not allowing PolyMet to build this mine. Thank you, Jane C. Gilbert-Howard 8717 Congdon Blvd. Duluth, MN 55804 This St Lukes communication is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify sender immediately.

Jane H Kulas 54805

See attachment

jane johnson 39232

To whom it may concern: As a resident of Tofte,MN I want to express my grave concern over the possibility of Polymet mining. I do not believe that they will ever be able to prove that there will not be pollution of the waters that are so important to this area. In our current time of climate change, clean water is at a premium and must be preserved at all costs. Jobs are important but cannot take precedence over preserving our clean water resources. There are so many endangered species in this area. So many times in the past we have allowed industry to take priority over preservation. This time lets make a different decision - lets learn from the paSt PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE POLYMETS APPLICATION TO MINE IN THIS AREA.. Jane Johnson PO Box 2303 Tofte,MN 55615

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak 18060

PolyMet's NorthMet project plan is harmful to the Arrowhead, the Superior National Forest, and the Lake Superior Watershed. The SDEIS is inadequate.

There are numerous fallacies in this plan. One being that mining would totally occur on the Iron Range where typically iron and taconite mining have occurred. However, the copper and nickel deposits, which are proposed to be mined, are located within the Duluth Complex, which is not on the Iron Range. Only PolyMet's plant is on The Range, not its proposed NorthMet Mine. The proposed mine site is in the Superior National Forest.

Birch Lake is part of the Duluth Complex Areas and is located in the Superior National forest. Birch Lake would be negatively impacted by this mine plan.

My home and my resort and canoe outfitting businesses that I have owned for 38 years, and which have been in my family since 1944, are located on the north end of Birch Lake, which is a multi-use recreational 20-mile Long Lake. There are resorts, house boat businesses, campgrounds, cabins and homes dotting the shoreline of Birch Lake. There are vast areas of forest, wildlife habitat, treaty-protected resources within the 1854 ceded territory and cultural sites, one being an archeological cultural site of the Laurel people located on my property dating to 500 years before Christ.

Noise and air pollution. Most, if not all, will be impacted and permanently degraded by noise pollution and air pollution from the proposed sulfide mine. I have 1500 plus resort guests each season. And when they boat, fish, canoe, kayak, picnic, and swim on Birch Lake, they do so with the expectation of listening to the loons and watching eagles, fishing in peaceful coves, and picnicking on islands studded with pine trees and a canopy of clean air. Instead with this plan my guests and most who live and recreate on Birch Lake will be receptors for mine noise and air pollution. This is unacceptable.

Why should my businesses and my way of life and the lives and homes of others on Birch Lake be impacted negatively by this sulfide mine plan?

Perception of noise, air, water pollution and degradation of the wilderness land in the minds of the travelers will negatively impact their decision to recreate in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota; therefore, economic loss for tourism.

Figure 5.2-8.2 of the SDEIS illustrates air blast contours from the blasting at the mine site. This documentation is flawed and inaccurate. It does not take into account impacts to residents that do live on Birch Lake near the proposed mine site, to recreational sites to the Birch Lake pine forest just outside of Babbitt with biking and hiking trails, and to the 14 federal camp sites on Birch Lake.

Furthermore there is no mention of the privately owned recreational tourism businesses based on Birch Lake for decades.

There are three resorts, a canoe outfitter, two houseboat businesses, and one campground that will be sound and air receptors of the proposed NorthMet Mine. It only mentions the federal camp area.

It is important to remember that noise and air pollution have no barriers no matter how many charts and tables may be drawn up to state otherwise. Why was documentation related to the aforementioned items not included in the SDEIS?

Wind blown dust particles containing sulfite compounds that are emitted from mining and beneficiation activities could contaminate wetlands, lakes, and streams near the project site and could cause harm to the species of concern that have been found in this area and to animals that depend on these foods or these plants for foods. This comes from the Tribal Cooperating Agency Supporting Intertribal Agency. These wind blown dust particles could be hazardous to human health of those living in the region of the proposed NorthMet. How is the SDEIS going to address this concern?

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Minnesota Environmental Rights Act. The Minnesota Environmental Rights Act 116B.01 says, "The legislature finds and declares that each person is entitled by right to the protection, preservation, and enhancement of air, water, land, and other natural resources located within the state, and that each person has the responsibility to contribute to the protection, preservation, and enhancement thereof."

This environmental rights act gives its citizens to right to protection of our land, our water, our air, and our natural resources.

The SDEIS states that it will not pollute our environment. How can this proposed mine plan move forward when it will degrade and destroy air, water, land, and other resources that are natural resources within our state.

Open-pit mining, heavy metal leaching, and human health. Under the Weeks Act, open-pit mining is not allowed on federal land. But instead of rejecting this proposed mine the United States Forest Service is proposing a land exchange so that their consideration of the surface land is eliminated. These lands and these waters that are proposed to be exchanged to PolyMet by the USFS belong to all the citizens of this country. This is wrong. This is our land, our wetlands, our water. This should not be allowed. Why is the Weeks Act not being enforced?

In return for this possible land exchange with the federal government, PolyMet's proposal would take a portion of our Arrowhead Lake District and the Superior National Forest and turn them into a mining district with the tradeoff of destroying the forested land that belongs to us, perpetual water pollution, and increased human health risks, including increased neurological damage to our children from mercury pollution.

Heavy metal leaching is one of the greatest environmental liabilities associated with mining, especially in pristine environments like the project mine site that have economically and ecologically available natural resources. And that comes from Reclamation Research Group Bozeman, Montana, for USFWS, Anchorage, Alaska. The article is "Acid Mine Drainage and Effects on Fish Health and Ecology," a review 2004.EX.G. how is the SDEIS going to address this environmental liability?

Metal, such as manganese, at the tailings pile will have 15 times more manganese per liter than the limit set by the Minnesota Department of Health to prevent brain damage in infants, children, and adults. There will be an increase of arsenic at the tailings pile by up to 417 percent. An increase in arsenic in Colby Lake drinking water by 38.5 percent, which would increase the risk of cancer for Hoyt Lake residents above the level of concern in Minnesota's cancer risk rule.

How is the SDEIS going to prevent this dire situation to our waters from occurring to preventing human health risks of cancer and other diseases and ailments?

There are no hard-rock surface mines that exist today that can demonstrate that heavy metal leaching can be stopped once it occurs on a large scale. And that documentation comes from EARTHWORKS fact sheet, "Hard Rock Mining Acid Mine Drainage," which is available online at www.earthworksaction.org/PUBS/FS_underscoreAMD.PDF.

Mining cannot be permitted if it causes destruction of our natural resources. PolyMet's proposed sulfide mine not only Minnesota's clean water but it threatens public health.

Minnesota Environmental Policy Act. Under the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act 116D.04 subdivision 6. "No state action significantly affecting the quality of the environment shall be allowed nor shall any permit and natural resources management and development be granted where such action or permit has caused or is likely to cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the air, water, land or other natural resources located within the state so long as there is a feasible and prudent alternative consistent with the reasonable requirements of the public health, safety, and welfare, and the state's paramount concern for the protection of its air, water, land, and other natural resources from pollution, impairment, or destruction. Economic considerations alone shall not justify this conduct."

The proposed PolyMet plan would seriously degrade the quality of our environment. How will the SDEIS address this?

Perpetual treatment. Minnesota rule 6132.3200 does not allow perpetual treatment. "To receive a permit to mine the permittee must be able to close the mine in such a way

Alphabetical by sender's first name

that is stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impact and release of substances, and is maintenance free."

A, the PolyMet SDEIS states that long-term -- meaning greater than 500 years at plant site and greater than 200 years at the mine site -- treatment of wastewater is needed, which means the site will not be maintenance free at closure.

B, 526 acres of lands covered by more than 167 million tons of waste rock would be covered by a plastic sheet and surrounded by a system that would supposedly collect contaminated seepage. All would require monitoring and maintenance constantly for hundreds of years to fix leaks, repair perforations, and remove deep rooted plants.

C, a mining pit lake would require pumping to prevent the toxic brew of acid and heavy metals from spilling into the nearby Partridge River and the tailings basin pond would require pumping to prevent spillage into the tributary of the Embarrass River.

And finally D, the polluted water collection system, which includes miles of pipes, would require monitoring and maintenance for centuries. This proposed sulfide mine project features requiring perpetual maintenance and monitoring, which is in violation of Minnesota rule 6132.3200 is absurd and unachievable as it requires this to go on for centuries. It should not be allowed. How will the SDEIS attempt to counteract this?

This SDEIS proposal is not in the public's best interest. It is inadequate, contains falsehoods, and omissions related to moose, mercury, and other concerns. The word "moose" does not appear at all in the SDEIS cumulative effects analysis. What is the reason that important concerns related to moose and their habitat and mercury as related to aquatic species and human health were not fully addressed in the SDEIS?

Lastly, nothing in this SDEIS demonstrates that we need the copper or the jobs, which are the big reasons it is being pushed for by the mining boosters. This is totally a bad plan for Minnesota. Therefore, I endorse the no action alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak

42544

PolyMet's NorthMet project plan is harmful to the Arrowhead, the Superior National Forest, and the Lake Superior Watershed. The SDEIS is inadequate. There are numerous fallacies in this plan, one being that mining would totally occur on the Iron Range, where typically iron and taconite mining have occurred. However, the copper and nickel deposits, which are proposed to be mined, are located within the Duluth Complex, which is not on the Iron Range. Only PolyMet's plant is on the Range, not its proposed NorthMet Mine. The proposed mine site is in the Superior National Forest. Birch Lake is part of the Duluth Complex area and is located in the Superior National Forest. Birch Lake would be negatively impacted by this mine plan. My home, and my resort and canoe outfitting businesses that I have owned for 38 years, and which have been in my family since 1944, are located on the north end of Birch Lake which is a multi-use recreational 20 mile long lake. There are resorts, houseboat businesses, campgrounds; cabins and homes dotting the shoreline of Birch Lake. There are vast areas of forest, wildlife habitat, treaty-protected resources within the 1854 Ceded Territory, and cultural sites, one being an archaeological cultural site of the Laurel people located on my property, dating to 500 years before Christ. Noise and Air Pollution Most if not all, will be impacted and permanently degraded by noise pollution and air pollution from the proposed sulfide mine. I have 1500+ resort guests each season, and when they boat, fish, canoe, kayak, picnic, and swim on Birch Lake, they do so with the expectation of listening to the loons and watching eagles, fishing in peaceful coves, and picnicking on islands studded with pine trees and a canopy of clean air. Instead, with this plan, my guests, and most who live and recreate on Birch Lake, will be receptors for mine noise and air pollution. This is unacceptable. Why should my businesses and my way of life, and the lives and homes of others on Birch Lake be impacted negatively by this sulfide mine plan? Perception of noise, air, water pollution and degradation of the wilderness lands in the minds of the traveler will negatively impact their decision to recreate in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota. Figure 5.2-8.2 of the SDEIS illustrates air blast contours from the blasting at the mine site. This documentation is flawed and inaccurate. It does not take into account impacts to residents that DO live on Birch Lake near the proposed mine site, to recreational sites, to the Birch Lake Pine Forest, just outside of Babbitt, with biking and hiking trails, and the 14 federal campsites on Birch Lake. Furthermore, there is no mention of the privately owned recreational tourism businesses based on Birch Lake for decades (3 resorts, a canoe outfitter, two houseboat businesses, and one campground) that will be sound and air receptors of the proposed NorthMet Mine. It only mentions the federal campground area. It is important to remember, that noise and air pollution have no barriers, not matter how many charts and tables may be drawn up to state otherwise. Why was documentation related to the aforementioned items not included in the SDEIS? Wind-blown dust particles containing sulfate compounds that are emitted from mining and beneficiation activities could contaminate wetlands, lakes, and streams near the project site and could cause harm to the Species of Concern that have been found in this area and to animals that depend on these plants for food. (Tribal cooperating agencies and supporting intertribal agencies). These wind-blown dust particles could be hazardous to human health of those living in the region of the proposed NorthMet Mine. How is the SDEIS going to address this concern? Minnesota Environmental Rights Act MN Environmental Rights Act 116B.01 says: The legislature finds and declares that each person is entitled by right to the protection, preservation, and enhancement of air, water, land, and ot

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak

44049

Mar 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is a toxic threat to Minnesota's Lake District. This type of mining has never been done anywhere in the US without horrific water pollution results. The EPA calls hard rock mining the most toxic polluter. Where is the common sense in thinking that this type of destructive mining could be done in the water-rich environment of northeastern Minnesota. 1- Permanent Water Pollution. Not only will there be 500 years, or basically into perpetuity, of water pollution from sulfuric acid and heavy metals, as indicated by PMet's own DEIS, but in addition, not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. This is what PolyMet calls "minimizing the water pollution" in their marketing rhetoric. Some 11 million gallons, annually, of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter our groundwater without treatment. And, further some 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater without being treated. Think of it this way .Flush your toilet 9 times, and the waste goes where it is supposed to, but for the 10th flush, the polluted and toxic waste flows directly into the ground by your home, or into the water in a nearby lake, or into your neighbor's yaRd What would be the long-term effects of the release of this untreated water to your health, your neighbor's health, and the health of the land and nearby lake. What kind of plan is this. PolyMet's computer model may actually understate the actual pollution impacts, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality by the mine site. Irresponsible and inadequate. 2- No Plan for Accidents and Failures. PolyMet's water treatment system provides no details for what happens in the event of catastrophic accidents or failure of the system to operate over the 500+ years during which polluted water is being discharged. Daily operations are planned to treat some 6-2 million gallons of polluted water daily. Broken pipes, tailings basins failures, human error causing accidents, and more are inevitable. Just look at the recent news for West Virginia, for North Dakota. There is always some type of accident whereby pollutants run off into the ground and waters. This mine plan is designed for a 100 year storm and given climate change this design is lacking, at beSt Scientific studies suggest that this facility must be designed for the 500-year storm, because the 1980's 500-year storm is now occurring almost as often as the 100-year storm. The SDEIS provides no assurance or details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife or human health if the treatment system fails or if there is a breakdown, which is inevitable. Irresponsible and inadequate. 3- Lack of information regarding mercury contamination of fish and ultimately methymercury in humans. This area, home to 6 operating taconite mines, already has an alarming concentration of mercury and other pollutants far exceeding the regulatory standards. Every one of our taconite plants is presently operating under variances with basically a "permit to pollute." Minntac's, which is operating on a wastewater discharge permit that was issued in 1987, despite the Clean Water Act requirement that permits be reviewed and renewed with updates every five years. Minntac's pollution of nearby water with sulfate concentrations are up to 60 times higher than state limits, are linked to mercury contamination and are toxic in fish and wild rice. In the 2011 MN Dept of Health's study, 10% of our newborns tested in the Lake Superior Basin had toxic levels of mercury in their blood, from pregnant mother's eating mercury-laden fish. The answer: eat less fish, rather than enforcement of standards for mercury, sulfates, and water hardness. I have no level of confidence that our so-called st

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak

44201

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, PolyMet would also destroy thousands of acres of very high-quality, irreplaceable wetlands, (the largest destruction of wetlands in the state of Minnesota). To create the Mine Site, our public lands within the Superior National Forest of Minnesota would be traded by the US Forest Service for lands in Cook, St Louis, and Lake County that are non-contiguous with a fraction of the value of the lands we, the people, would be virtually giving away to PolyMet Corporation for their Mine Site. These wetlands are in an area identified by Minnesota as having "high biodiversity significance," the highest state ranking. The US Environmental Protection Agency agrees, calling these wetlands, "aquatic resources of national importance." These are large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of waste water. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for multiple sulfide mining companies, "waiting in the wings", that would endanger the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). My family and I have lived on Birch Lake and the South Kawishiwi River for the past 38 years, adjacent to the the BWCAW. We have two tourism recreational businesses (resort and canoe outfitting). We are threatened by the advent of turning our Lake District into a Mining District .from turning a vibrant Wilderness area into a dead and barren Minefield of toxic destruction, not only to the landscape, but to our most valuable resource .our WATER. For all these reasons, and many others, I urge you to reject the PolyMet SDEIS. It is inadequate and is harmful to the Arrowhead Region, the Superior National Forest, and the Lake Superior Watershed. It is not in the Public Interest to allow this plan to proceed. The No Action Alternative should be used. Sincerely, Mrs Jane Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731-0397

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak

45295

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Forty six doctors, nurses, and other health-care professionals sent a letter on March 11, 2014, asking the MN DNR to declare that the environmental review of the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine as inadequate, and justly so. There simply is not enough information about possible human health effects of air and water pollution, particularly sulfate, manganese and mercury. Methyl mercury is linked to mental-health problems, lowered intelligence, behavior and memory problems Ten percent of babies born in the Lake Superior Basin are born with mercury in their bloodstreams, according to the MN Department of Health report of 2012- (Analysis of PloyMet impacts is inadequate, letter to DNR says, By Stephanie Hemphill, MinnPost, March 11, 2014-) Pregnant mothers eating fish is linked to the high levels of mercury in newborns. After the alarming MDH study, did our agencies hold any Minnesota industry in any way accountable for contaminating our waters. Did any industry scramble to fix its toxic releases to help protect Minnesota's children. No. Industry claims it is not "economically feasible" or "cost effective." Women are told they should make better decisions about the fish they eat, ironically told they can "choose." I presented this same information, along with other facts related to health issues and mining, as outlined in the paragraph below, to the St Louis County Board in the fall of 2012- Not only was the Board present, but so were Representative Dill and Rukavina. Health concerns released by the MDH in 2012, and reported in the Hometown Focus: According to the MDH, compared to all rural regions of the state, northeastern Minnesota has the highest rate for "asthma hospitalization and emergency department visits, the highest Alzheimer's rate over age 65, the highest mortality rates for cancer, heart disease, and diabetes; and the highest overall mortality rate." The fact that there are six operating taconite mines on Minnesota's Iron Range surely has something to do with these serious health risks for those of us who live here. But, the pro-mining St Louis County Board and the Representatives, who only wanted to postulate upon jobs that the new era of sulfide mining would provide, and promote their agenda regarding the school trust fund had no comments regarding workers or public health on the Range. In 2007, the mayor of Hoyt Lakes reportedly testified at a hearing, "We're used to mercury here." Really. Acceptance of whatever a corporation does to our children, just the cost of doing business. Unacceptable. Since 2004 all modern taconite mines have violations and fines, not adherence. The long closed Dunka Mine on Birch Lake may have qualified as a Superfund site. Instead it was given variances allowing it to be non-compliant for decades; releasing high levels of sulfates and heavy metals particularly nickel, to our waters. Nickel is a genotoxin, carcin

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Koschak

48498

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is a toxic threat to Minnesota's Lake District. This type of mining has never been done anywhere in the US without horrific water pollution results. The EPA calls hard rock mining the most toxic polluter. Where is the common sense in thinking that this type of destructive mining could be done in the water-rich environment of northeastern Minnesota. 1- Permanent Water Pollution. Not only will there be 500 years, or basically into perpetuity, of water pollution from sulfuric acid and heavy metals, as indicated by PMet's own DEIS, but in addition, not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. This is what PolyMet calls "minimizing the water pollution" in their marketing rhetoric. Some 11 million gallons, annually, of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter our groundwater without treatment. And, further some 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater without being treated. Think of it this way .Flush your toilet 9 times, and the waste goes where it is supposed to, but for the 10th flush, the polluted and toxic waste flows directly into the ground by your home, or into the water in a nearby lake, or into your neighbor's yaRd What would be the long-term effects of the release of this untreated water to your health, your neighbor's health, and the health of the land and nearby lake. What kind of plan is this. PolyMet's computer model may actually understate the actual pollution impacts, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality by the mine site. Irresponsible and inadequate. 2- No Plan for Accidents and Failures. PolyMet's water treatment system provides no details for what happens in the event of catastrophic accidents or failure of the system to operate over the 500+ years during which polluted water is being discharged. Daily operations are planned to treat some 6-2 million gallons of polluted water daily. Broken pipes, tailings basins failures, human error causing accidents, and more are inevitable. Just look at the recent news for West Virginia, for North Dakota. There is always some type of accident whereby pollutants run off into the ground and waters. This mine plan is designed for a 100 year storm and given climate change this design is lacking, at beSt Scientific studies suggest that this facility must be designed for the 500-year storm, because the 1980's 500-year storm is now occurring almost as often as the 100-year storm. The SDEIS provides no assurance or details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife or human health if the treatment system fails or if there is a breakdown, which is inevitable. Irresponsible and inadequate. 3- Lack of information regarding mercury contamination of fish and ultimately methymercury in humans. This area, home to 6 operating taconite mines, already has an alarming concentration of mercury and other pollutants far exceeding the regulatory standards. Every one of our taconite plants is presently operating under variances with basically a "permit to pollute." Minntac's, which is operating on a wastewater discharge permit that was issued in 1987, despite the Clean Water Act requirement that permits be reviewed and renewed with updates every five years. Minntac's pollution of nearby water with sulfate concentrations are up to 60 times higher than state limits, are linked to mercury contamination and are toxic in fish and wild rice. In the 2011 MN Dept of Health's study, 10% of our newborns tested in the Lake Superior Basin had toxic levels of mercury in their blood, from pregnant mother's eating mercury-laden fish. The answer: eat less fish, rather than enforcement of standards for mercury, sulfates, and water hardness. I have no level of confidence that our so-calle

Jane L Soukup

54834

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Livingston

43044

Members of my church's Caring for Creation Committee at Macalester-Plymouth United Church have discussed the proposal for a large scale copper-nickel sulfide mine near the BWCA, to be conducted by PolyMet. We have shared our concerns about the long-term and destructive impacts on this special area of Minnesota. We are concerned about: 1. The major loss of wetlands, primarily bogs, that cannot be replaced. The SEIS already makes it clear that wetland "restorations" will not take place in the Lake Superior watershed and are highly unlikely to replace bogs. The wetlands at the site have been rated as "having high wetland quality." How can they possibly be "replaced?" 2. Predictions of chemical pollution, not just from sulfate and its acceleration of toxic mercury conversions, but also heavy metals like nickel and aluminum, that kills fish. 3. The long term need to clean up water from pollutants, possibly for 200 years. How can that be assured, especially with more mines ready to ask for permits in that area? 4. The questionable suggestion that a company, that plans to mine the proposed site for 20 years, could possibly provide "financial assurance" to cover the expensive costs of water treatment for 200 years or more into the future. And can such treatment truly control all the sorts of pollutants that will come from the mine site? The SEIS predicts the company will excavate 307 million tons of bedrock in 20 years, at 70,000 tons per day. 5. We are concerned that a lot of the proposed PolyMet site area has been designated by MN DNR as "Sites of High Biodiversity Significance" and support eleven state-listed species of plants. Destruction of such an area cannot be rectified, nor justified. We urge our government officials to take courage and SAY NO to this mine and to others waiting in the cue for permits. There are other ways to secure jobs in this fragile and unique area of Minnesota than this. One suggestion is to create metal recycling facilities and hire people to work on recovering the metals we need. Please reject the PolyMet mine. It's a short term venture with long term harm to MN.

Jane Maltby

41960

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jane Maltby Chanhassen, Minnesota

Jane Norling

39883

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Jane Norling 5450 Ridgewood Cv Mound, MN 55364-8238 (952) 472-7155

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Norling 40988

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Jane Norman 54162

Shame on you, representing our water resources and siding with themining companies. Its time you be visionary and care about everyone's future. Water is fast becoming our most important resource. Soon it will be more important than oil or anything else--yes even money. Don't sell your soul! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

jane piegras 47417

To Whom it mayconcern: We are property owners near Ely,Mnnesota and enjoy the beautiful waters and serene environs year round at our home there. We write to express out concern regarding the PolyMet Sulfide mine near Babbitt and urge that this project as outlined in the SDEIS not be allowed to proceed. We have read the proposal carefully yet are left with the genuine concern that long term environmental protection expecially for the area waters, can not be assured. Our fears are substantiated by the fact that there is no existing sulfide mine, even the most contemporary such as Flambeau in Wisconsin, which have not ultimately caused leakage of toxic metals and sulfuric acid into the water table and surrounding earth. Northeastern Minnesota's precious natural resources must not be jeopardized for future generations by approval of mining which is based on unproven technology, false premises and self serving promises from an industry with such a terrible track record worldwide. Sinderely, Jane and David G. Piegras

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Sullivan

43215

Good Day, Please do not let this project move forwaRd The long lasting impact on our beautiful state's environment is NOT worth 300 jobs. Rather, lets create jobs by putting those folks to work on our infrastructure roads; bridges etc I think it is highly unfair for our children to allow this project any ground what so ever. I heard a Woman from WI speak about how just the testing for that site ruined their crops of Wild Rice. I do not trust that they will be able to keep the percentages of sulfite low enough to be dismissed. These are people's lives we are talking about destroying, along with our ground water, if this project is allowed to continue. Hoping you all will make the intelligent decision to tell Poly Met "NO" Yours in solidarity with Clean Water Action. Best, Jane Marie Sullivan 3022 East 35th St Mpls MN 55406 Sr. Interpreter Specialist HYPERLINK "mailto:patty@kisasl-com"jane@kisasl-com 612-840-7600 Trusted Access. Anywhere. Anytime. HYPERLINK "http://www.kisasl-com/"www.kisasl-com

Jane Townsend

16176

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jane Whitledge

18313

Jane Whiteledge, Duluth. W-H-I-T-L-E-D-G-E. All we need to know about this mining proposal is what PolyMet itself has said, that once the mining is done the water will have to be treated for at least 200 years. The lack of common sense and the stupidity of it all is breathtaking that we even consider following our own water forever. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jane Whitledge 42695
See attachment

Janet Ackerman 16269

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Janet Anderson 35147

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have serious and real concerns about the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental DEIS. PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is NOT good for the public health - also there is loss of wetlands, risks to water quality, harm to wildlife, and cumulative NEGATIVE IMPACTS FROM MINING. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Janet Anderson 2130 N 85th St Wauwatosa, WI 53226-2848 (414) 258-5624

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Bennett 40418

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Janet Bennett 201-w Park Row #207 St Peter, MN 56082 US

Janet Brown 38837

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As an avid user of the BWCA and the beautiful natural areas of Northern Minnesota, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. I do not believe that PolyMet has proven that they will not contaminate this area forever. Only that they have a lot of money to spend on PR. Too often we see they companies claim that they have taken every precaution, only to find out later that they have cut every corner and we are left with millions or billions in clean up efforts that not only become the burden of the taxpayer, but leave us with a destroyed ecosystem. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Janet Brown 5100 Portland Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-1748 (612) 750-7210

Janet C Hubbell 54795

See attachment

Janet Deming 47591

Do not let polymet mines happen. Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Diehl

40386

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. Do Not allow this The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. Water is needed for Life and is therefore of far more value than all the ore that can be mined. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. No, this should Not be allowed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. This makes me sick. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Janet Diehl 75 N. Oak Street #312 Platteville, WI 53818 US

Janet Dieterich

10725

We opposed the Poly Met Mining proposal in northern Minnesota. Janet Dieterich

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Donovan Moran

16969

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Janet Draper

42821

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Frigstad

16888

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janet Frigstad 111 Riveness rd Duluth, MN 55811

50202

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janet Frigstad 111 Riveness rd Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Green 42885

Attached are my comments on the SDEIS for the PolyMet project. Janet C. Green

Janet Jacobson 15789

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Janet Johnson 44768

I may not be as eloquent as some writers, but I have attended hearings, read much of the Polymet Report and would like to say, 500+ years of treating polluted water, Damages wild rice, Damage deposit details, Water Data errors, Mercury pollution, Destroys lynx habitat, Tony Hayward and Glencore, Destruction of wetlands, Dirty Energy, No health impact study, Failed to consider alternatives, Tax discrepancies. The first reason alone should be enough to open our eyes and say no. Water is our most precious resource and in a world where potable water is scarce and disappearing why are we endangering one of our last great supplies of clean water (this watershed goes into Lake Superior) for mining that has not proven to be safe and has never before been done in such a wet environment as Northern Minnesota. Sincerely, Janet Eileen Johnson 1823 15th Avenue S Minneapolis, MN 55404

Janet Magree 42646

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Neihart

41658

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

42465

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Janet Neihart 6751 Geneva Ave S Cottage Grove, MN 55016-1019 (651) 261-3579

Janet Neville

3745

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The health and beauty of our Earth are a priceless legacy that belongs not only to us but to all generations to come. It is our responsibility to see that it is protected. This means practicing the "precautionary principle" when making decisions that can irrevocably damage our planet. It must be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that sulfide mining will not degrade the environment or tip the ecological balance. It must be proven absolutely safe before any permits are release. Consider it through the eyes of our descendants. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Janet Neville 11742 Mount Curve Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55347-2927 (952) 903-9682

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Neville

51828

Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The health and beauty of our Earth are a priceless legacy that belongs not only to us but to all generations to come. It is our responsibility to see that it is protected. This means practicing the "precautionary principle" when making decisions that can irrevocably damage our planet. It must be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that sulfide mining will not degrade the environment or tip the ecological balance. It must be proven absolutely safe before any permits are release. Consider it through the eyes of our descendants. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Janet Neville 11742 Mount Curve Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55347-2927 (952) 903-9682

Janet Petri

43102

Dear Ms Fay: I understand the appeal of the mining jobs - that would last for only 20 years (.) - but i am very concerned about the effects of the sulfide runoff into the watershed. Northern Minnesota and the BWCA are VERY watery environments. The reverse osmosis water filtration seems pretty cool, but it has not been tested on this scale. What happens when (not if) there is a 10 inch rain on the site. Who will be maintaining the reverse osmosis system in 500 years - 480 years after the mine shuts down. A giant barrier is needed, down to bedrock, to keep the untreated, polluted water from flowing down stream. In 500 years, who will be maintaining this barrier. For that manner, who will be maintaining and funding the barrier in 50 years, or 100- Why not require an underground mine, which would present fewer risks to water resources. What happens when the former LTV Steel.s tailings basin, which was developed in the 1950's, fails after sulfide-bearing tailings are dumped on top of it. The company says that copper prices are not high enough to make underground mining pay. However, I think it is worth it to wait to mine until it can be done right. The copper will still be there. I have seen places polluted with mine tailings. I don't want northern minnesota to go that route. Clean water is essential for life. I oppose the Polymet mine as currently proposed. Sincerely, Janet Petri 209 Manitou St Northfield, MN 55057

Janet Spring

9987

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janet Spring 1676 Olive St, #6 Bloomington, IN 47401

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Spring

18730

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janet Spring 1676 Olive St, #6 Bloomington, IN 47401

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janet Spring

51496

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janet Spring 1676 Olive St, #6 Bloomington, IN 47401

Janet Werner

43687

Here we have a chance to stop an accident before it happens. Installing a copper-nickel mine near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt in northeastern Minnesota will result in environmental damage to the clean water in the area. If it doesn't happen in our lifetimes, it will eventually. There are no assurances that it won't. In fact, the people trying to convince us to put the mine in Minnesota are already including in their proposal the funds for a clean up. If that isn't an indictment of the situation, I don't know what is. We have to stop treating this planet that we live on as if we can use it up and move on to the next one. We already know that we have changed the climate with our actions. It's time to be the adults that our ages say we are, buckle down, make the hard decisions and save this planet we call home. Janet Lundquist Werner 7531 Douglas Drive Brooklyn Park, MN. 55443 Sent from my iPad

janets8340@comcast.net

16159

Please, please pay attention to what happened in Spain. You know very well that this will also happen here despite their assurances that it will not. These big companies don't give a darn about us, they just want their profits. Do NOT let them rape and spoil our state. We deserve better. [HYPERLINK](#)
"mailto:janets8340@comcast.net"janets8340@comcast.net From: "Cathy Gagliardi" <patcatgags@COMCASTNET> To: MOU-NET@LISTS.UMN-edu Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 1:05:13 AM Subject: [mou-net] Our Water and Copper Mining - GTAC Bill Williams, the man who heads a Hedgefund project to open an alleged open pit mine in the Penokee Range south of the Bad River Ojibwe Reservation in Northern Wisconsin has been indicted. <http://wcmcoop-com/2014/02/19/gtacs-bill-williams-indicted-in-spain/> I hope MN looks into this too with the proposed Polymet Mine in the BWCA. If you have comments and/or suggestions regarding MN's Polymet Mine, please send your emails to NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us The wetlands that will be completely wiped out at these proposed mining sites will most definitely affect our wildlife and birds. And what could happen to our aquifer (like Spain) will severely affect us. My apologies this is a bit off-topic - but I felt it newsworthy considering the proposed copper mining sites in both states. Cathy Gagliardi St Paul, MN -- Join or Leave mou-net: <http://lists.umn-edu/cgi-bin/wa.SUBED1=mou-net> Archives: <http://lists.umn-edu/archives/mou-net.html>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janice Beske

42024

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Janice Beske Minneapolis, Minnesota

Janice Conklin

10045

I am writing to state my strong opposition to proposed sulfide mining. I can't even comprehend that we are considering sulfide mining in this state of 10,000 lakes when the risk of polluting the environment is inevitable. No one has ever done sulfide mining "right". The technology to do so doesn't exist. Nowhere on the planet has copper-nickle mining been done without destroying water resources. As we all know mining companies tell untruths to get what they want. Do we actually believe that the mining company has detailed plans for clean up when pollution occurs. And do we actually believe that effective mitigation measures will remain in place for 200 to 500 years. OF COURSE NOT. Sincerely, Janice Conklin Mt Iron, mn

Janice Del Calzo

42049

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Janice Del Calzo Minneapolis, Minnesota

Janice Greenfield

14759

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, The current Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is missing some fundamental information - what will be the long-term damage to our water resources and who would pay for this damage The Superior National Forest was established for the purposeful protection of our fabulous Minnesota natural resources. We need to respect this visionary purpose and REJECT the PolyMet sulfide mine proposal. Sincerely, Ms Janice Greenfield Rome Ave St Paul, MN 55116 (651) 698-2400

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janice Hoeschler

9679

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janice Hoeschler 31018 Old Mill Road Dresbach, MN 55947

18541

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janice Hoeschler 31018 Old Mill Road Dresbach, MN 55947

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janice Hoeschler

50617

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janice Hoeschler 31018 Old Mill Road Dresbach, MN 55947

Janice M Koski

57175

If one looks at the mine and all the drawbacks, ruined lakes and rivers forever and short-term jobs. If what this (the mine) has ruined will never come back, and if we step back and really look at our planet and see what's happening we should be ashamed. Also, NO Keystone pipeline, we should have improved the rail line a long time ago! And prevent accidents. Janice M. Koski 214 South Blackman Ave Duluth, MN 55811

Janice M. Mickow

40749

Please count me as a Minnesota resident OPPOSED to Polymet's proposed abuse of our boundry waters. Thank you, Janice Mickow, 24 14th Avenue, NE, Rochester, MN, 55906 Janice Mickow Mayo Clinic Store Business Office 507-266-5321 FAX 507-266-2721

Janice Myers

58130

I came to this meeting because I am concerned that copper and sulfide nickel mining in MN will cause: 1. Polluted water 2. Loss of wetlands 3. Imports on wildlife 4. Climate change – more global warming 5. Legacy to our grandchildren will be overlooked 6. Loss of clean [ILLEGIBLE] in Boundary Waters Let us: 6 Spend our time and work on alternative energy like solar and wind 7 Give construction workers jobs in environmentally friendly job 8 Respect and protect the earth – not take everything we can from the earth.

Janice Peterson

45781

Recently there was a piece in the news about Minnesota water (GOOD water) shortages in the near future. (Not to mention the water disasters sure to occur in the not-too-distant future in the western and southwestern states.) We should not even have a discussion about messing around with the polymet mining proposals: a stable water future is not a sure thing. It is a mistake to think that mining should trump our Minnesota jewels: clear and pure water. LeRoy and Janice Peterson Slayton MN 55172

Alphabetical by sender's first name

janice tarnow

40172

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Janis Gerkenmeyer

23335

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janis Gerkenmeyer 72 Gull Lake Lane Grand Marais, MN 55604

49465

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Janis Gerkenmeyer 72 Gull Lake Lane Grand Marais, MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

janna piper

40331

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, janna piper po box 15072 portland, OR 97293 US

Jaquelyn Blanco

54175

Hello my name is Jacky. I'm writing this letter because I am AGINSST about the mining. It is really dangerous for the environment, economic and for the world. It has been in the history our history in MN I really love the wilderness that has not been destroyed by mankind. It will pollute our water were gonna have sulfuric acid are PH will go down and kill the animals and insect that actually help the envirement. The world don't need more that's why they invented recycling for we can' do no more harm in the world I gess people just don't get that we have to protect what grows in the world for that we can still be living there so many other places were you can get copper, metal and other minerals pleas don't destroy our home the land of 10 thousand lakes we need our lakes and we need animals. I am AGINSST of WHAT YOUR DOING.

Jared Gertzen

39630

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Jared Gertzen 1742 171st Ave NE Ham Lake, MN 55304-4917

Jared Yakk

54539

Please keep the BWCA as is. 20 years of job creation isn't worth the hundreds of years of disaster this will cause. Use your mind not your wallet.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jason Carr 43562

As the father of two young boys who love Minnesota's lakes, rivers, and woods, I encourage the MN DNR to carefully balance the short term benefits and localized economic impact of this mine against its potential long term harm to our state's citizens and brand. I believe that our most valuable natural resources are those that are internalized in our spirits and memories rather than extracted from the land. Thank you for your consideration. Jason Carr 301 Monroe Ave S. Edina, MN 55343

Jason Etten 10295

To Whom It May Concern, I am opposed to the proposed mine development near Babbitt, MN by PolyMet. I have read most of the executive summaries of the most recent study and find them to be smooth and glossy but they carry little serious consideration of the hundreds of years of future care the site will require. Most summary documents mention in a sentence or two about long term care and monitoring. Do we really have a concept of the length of time and the cost involved in this cleanup effort. This could be two to three times longer than this state has been in existence. I hope that there will be more serious consideration of the tremendous potential long-term negative impacts and not count on promises from a company that not only has polluted in other areas but has every reason to sell the State of Minnesota on the untested technologies they propose to corral pollution in our future. Humans have shown little ability to control nature over time. There is no reason to think that PolyMet has figured out how to conquer nature in Northern Minnesota. My grandmother and her family grew up in Tower, MN. I have spent significant time in northern Minnesota and visited several mine sites. I am not opposed to mining as much as mining that destroys the earth where the materials are removed and leaves potential environmental disaster for countless generations after mining ends. Those who argue about the positives this will bring to the economy are looking only at the short term. Twenty years of mine work doesn't even provide jobs for a career for a miner. That would be half a career and then we would be back to start with an environmental disaster waiting to happen. This is not a sustainable or wise way to provide jobs and a future for those living in the Iron Range. Please do not allow this mining project to proceed. Thank you, Jason Etten 2054 Cohansey Blvd Roseville, MN 55113

Jason Finley 5925

Jason Finley. 6670 Vernon Ave S. Unit 111- Edina, MN 55436- Clean water is the most valuable resource we can leave for future generations. Mining creates the possibility to poison a Minnesota water supply. Therefore, mining permits should not be issued. Sent from my iPad

Jason Fisher 7617

After reviewing the information provided by Minnesota's DNR and hearing the comments at the public hearing in Duluth on Thursday January 16th, I am convinced that PolyMet's NorthMet project can be done in an environmentally friendly manner. The SDEIS is a detailed, independent review; federal, state and tribal agencies shaped the development of the draft EIS, which was written by an independent, third party. I believe this is a sound process. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough; the supplemental draft EIS addresses potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. The public can be confident that the draft EIS offers regulators the information they need to issue permits so that PolyMet can operate in a way that protects natural resources. Since the closure of LTV the East Range is in need of livable wage jobs. Most people would love to have their children establish careers close to home and currently those opportunities are not available. I support PolyMet and ask for your support on this important economic development opportunity for the people of the Iron Range and all of our great State of Minnesota. Thank you for your consideration, Jason Jason Fisher 4165 Kerr Location Hibbing, Minnesota 55746 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jason George

18180

My name is Dustin Loosbrock. Just so everyone knows, I'm not being paid to be here either. And I'm ceding my time to Jason George. Good evening. My name is Jason George. J-A-S-O-N, G-E-O-R-G-E. I work for the Operating Engineers Local 49. We represent 13,000 heavy-equipment operators in the state of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. I'm going to talk for a second about the EIS, which I think we're supposed to kind of direct our comments to. Although I don't hear much of that going on. We support the process that is going on right now with the DNR. We feel like they're doing an excellent job of vetting this project. This public comment period is excellent. It's fantastic to see so many people here passionately advocating one way or the other for this issue. And just really believe in the process. And I think that the process needs to be followed. And when we come to the end of the process and there's a decision, we need to respect that. These folks know what they're doing. The people at the agencies know what they're doing. And I for one trust them to get this right. And I believe that we can get this right. And I believe that we can have these jobs and protect the environment. I know that because my members do that every day. Every day they're working on highway, pipeline. Any kind of industry that we work in these guys over here that build America do it the right way. They know what they're doing. That's right. It's hard for me to believe some of the people that come up here and talk about how there's no way we can do this. It can't be done. I mean I've never heard so much negativity. This is America. We can do anything. Right. We can protect the environment. So I want to dig deeper on jobs. I commented on the process. I think it's a good one. I think we need to dig deeper on jobs. I keep hearing about 300 jobs. Nobody is talking about 2 million construction hours, which is what it's going to take to build this project. That's the same amount of hours by the way that it took to build Target Field. So we're talking about a stadium-sized project in Northern Minnesota that is desperate for jobs. I want to talk about North Dakota. I want to talk about when I go to North Dakota, having union meetings in North Dakota, and everybody I ask to raise their hand who lives in Minnesota. The whole room raises their hand. There's 3,000 49'ers Minnesotans that live here, their family lives here, and they are working in North Dakota right now. My message to you and everybody in this room is: Let's bring them home. Thanks.

Jason Long

15413

Thank you. Look forward to hearing about important updates. Regards, Jason From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 2:13 PM To: Jason Long Subject: RE: Please analyze the impact of PolyMet's destruction of moose habitat. Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Jason Loos

21962

To whom it may concern: I fully support the PolyMet project. They have sufficiently addressed the environmental concerns and will provide much needed jobs to the area. Copper and nickel will only grow in demand with the increase in alternative fuel sources. I would rather have these minerals mined in Minnesota where it will be done with oversight than in a third world country with little to no oversight. Jason Loos Jason T. Loos Erik R. Johnson and Associates, Ltd. 505 N. Broadway Ste 206 Fargo, ND 58102 701-280-1901 Direct 701-476-6739 Fax 701-280-1902 This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized person. If you have received this email in error please reply to the sender then delete it from your system. The company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email or attachments.

Jason Rabuck

28860

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This proposed mine threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It is simply not worth the risk. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We need to be thinking about recycling, re-using, and reclaiming metals - not sulfide mining The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest This is the people's National Forest and we want to keep it that way. Sincerely, Jason Rabuck W3080 Hay Lake Rd Springbrook, WI 54875-7509 (715) 766-8220

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jason Wall

37232

Dear DNR Colleagues, Minnesota is an outstanding state for many reasons; the foremost being engaged and involved citizens. Minnesotans have a strong tradition of balancing and ultimately meeting the needs/wants of its diverse citizenry. We have a strong economy, outstanding parks both national and state, many institutions of higher learning and great health care. All of these factors make Minnesota stronger from an economic and environmental standpoint. Minnesota is thriving and there are many reasons why: educational opportunities, employment, quality of life, clean air, clean water and natural beauty. I have spent time time camping and fishing in northern Minnesota every year of my life. I moved to Duluth from Chicago over 10 years ago for graduate school and I have been here ever since. My family has been visiting Lake Vermilion for three generations now. Bottom line, this is a great state, how do we improve from here . Enough of a prologue; I want to express my strong opposition to the copper/nickel mine in Minnesota. My reasons are listed below. 1-) Economics: yes jobs will be created but sustainability will be loSt The preservation of clean water and wilderness will provide a greater economic stimulus to the state and local areas than mining. Mining companies have projected jobs and tax revenue on many occasions only to bow out when the market changes. People will always be drawn to wilderness and Minnesota is a prime example of that draw. Amidst the coldest winter in 139 years tourism in northern Minnesota is thriving because of snowmobile trails, ice fishing, nordic skiing, and the human desire to get outside. A prime example is the The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore sea caves. There has been over 10 million dollars spent by visitors in the darkest days of winter to come see an area that is clean and beautiful. Sustainable development is what will keep minnesota strong and healthy. With respect to health, Minnesota is one of the healthiest and most active states in the union. We are in the top 5- To keep us healthy we need clean air and water, sulfide mining does not meet that goal. Minneapolis and St Paul are vibrant prosperous places to live as compared to other large US metro areas. It is not a coincidence that they are also the most bike friendly urban area in the country and provide plenty of parks and green space to keep there citizens active and living (spending money) in the city versus commuting from a bedroom community like many other urban areas. My town of Duluth is another example; historically mining, timber and shipping put Duluth on the map but higher education, healthcare and tourism will sustain a prosperous Duluth. Duluth is lucky to have trails and is building even more; people come to Duluth both summer and winter to ski, run and mountain bike our trails and it is a rare summer day when our Lakewalk is not crowded with tourists enjoying a cool lake breeze. 2-) Recycle the copper already in our country: We need raw materials to keep our economy strong. There is no question that if we do not supply copper someone else will. My worry is that if we dig a large, likely toxic, hole in our Minnesota backyard and a large multinational firm quickly opens a new copper mine in Chile or Mexico and provides copper at a fraction of the price; our mine is shuttered until the next perceived demand and then what. Once again the sustainability just is not there; we simply cannot out mine other countries with looser environmental laws such as Mexico, Chile and the remote parts of Canada nor would we want to. Our focus should be on reusing and recycling the vast amounts of copper and nickel that are currently in our possession. A robust scrap copper market could be made more mainstream and we would benefit our environment as well. 3-) Accountability: large corporations, especially multinational corporations like Polymet, are often poorly accountable for lingering environmental impacts. St Louis Bay at the western

Jason White

18065

My name is Jason White. I'm here to fully support the PolyMet project. I believe it's a sound environmental project where we can have clean water, clean air, and mining that's responsible and important to the environment.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jason Zabokrtsky

20893

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jason Zabokrtsky Ely, MN Jason Zabokrtsky 1246 Wolf Den Dr PO Box 731 Ely, MN 55731

49688

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jason Zabokrtsky Ely, MN Jason Zabokrtsky 1246 Wolf Den Dr PO Box 731 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay & Mary B Newcomb 42707

See attachment

Jay Dregni 19978

____ From: jdregni@hotmail-com To: dnr@state.mn.us Subject: Copper Nickel Mining Date: Thu, 27 Feb 2014 17:48:25 -0600 To Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Dear Lisa Fay, I am writing once again to highlight the gravity of the decision on copper and nickel mining in Minnesota. I can only imagine our children and grandchildren Saying to us something like the following; “what were you thinking in 2014 when you approved nickel and copper mining in Minnesota. Were you thinking at all of the future, our future.” Considering the weight of the information and evidence to date, I do not think mining for copper and nickel should go forwaRd Actually the water in our state is truly our treasure - the land of sky blue water. Regards, John Carleton Dregni 921 Bayless Place St Paul, MN 55114 Phone 651 644 2786

20016

Dear Lisa Fay, I am not in favor of copper nickel mining in Minnesota at this time due to lack of environmentally successful mining of this sort, plus the years it might take to rectify the water pollution and environment of our state. If however some level of mining is permitted, the following ideas and conditions must be considered: A. A trust fund with at least two parts; first, a multimillion dollar initial contribution (non refundable), and second an annual addition to the trust fund equal to ten percent of some measure such as revenue, tons of copper/nickel removed, etc B. Sixty percent of the jobs at all levels to be held by Minnesotans, and 90% by US citizens. C. Vertical integration of the mining process and subsequent industrial processes to be conducted in the state of Minnesota. This activity to be considered as an add on only if safe environmental conditions can be put in place. D. Operations management and their families to live in the area. E. No special tax breaks to be provided. Thank you for coordinating this written comment response program. Courage, honesty, foresight and transparency can provide for a good outcome, John Carleton Dregni 921 Bayless Avenue St Paul, MN 55114 Phone 651 644 2786

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay Eidem

39468

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. This issue seriously concerns me and my family's future use of the Arrowhead region for recreation; I can't imagine what effect this will have on people that actually live there and have to literally drink the water. My wife and I were seriously considering purchasing land close to the mine site, we will not invest in a future in this area if short-sighted proposals like this threaten the water quality and the environment. Seriously this is the only draw to the northshore and we as Minnesotans should feverishly protect our remaining natural resources. There is no history of sulfide mining in Minnesota, for good reason we should reject proposals like this that threaten our natural resources for little gain for the people of Minnesota. Hundreds of jobs you say, this pales in comparison to the number of jobs that BWCA, Lake superior and its tributaries provide in the form of recreation. Poison the water and poison the future investment in the region. Who will clean up the mess. When Polymet closes their doors, files for bankruptcy and leaves their tailing ponds and rock piles Minnes

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay Eidem

48743

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. This issue seriously concerns me and my family's future use of the Arrowhead region for recreation; I can't imagine what effect this will have on people that actually live there and have to literally drink the water. My wife and I were seriously considering purchasing land close to the mine site, we will not invest in a future in this area if short-sighted proposals like this threaten the water quality and the environment. Seriously this is the only draw to the northshore and we as Minnesotans should feverishly protect our remaining natural resources. There is no history of sulfide mining in Minnesota, for good reason we should reject proposals like this that threaten our natural resources for little gain for the people of Minnesota. Hundreds of jobs you say, this pales in comparison to the number of jobs that BWCA, Lake superior and its tributaries provide in the form of recreation. Poison the water and poison the future investment in the region. Who will clean up the mess. When Polymet closes their doors, files for bankruptcy and leaves their tailing ponds and rock piles Minnesotans will pay to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay Haapala

9562

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as an insufficient plan and find the project likely to pollute beyond acceptable levels. Evidence that the plan misrepresents the boundary of wetlands and tributaries flowing into the BWCA and other protected lands needs to be investigated. The plan should include analysis of underlying bedrock and it's ability to protect groundwater from pollution. The Land Exchange proposal is not an equal or fair tradeoff. Potential conflict with the 1854 Treaty with the Chippewa regarding pollution of reservation lands needs to be investigated. Long term pollution mitigation and financial accountability plans are not sufficient. Conflict with the Clean Water Act seems likely. Polymet's actions are deplorable - instead of guaranteeing a clean operation they are engaging in public relations tactics to convince people we should support their operation. They're running ads, hiring "real people" to tell us we need the jobs, we need the copper for wind turbines and platinum rings. We use copper to build nuclear bombs and bullets too, but they're not talking about that. This is not about the products made from minerals. Polymet doesn't care about what their ore is used to manufacture unless it's a convenient story. It is about money and it's about risk. Their tactics and refusal to guarantee a safe operation are enough to tell me we shouldn't move forwaRd At the Saint Paul public forum I sat next to Polymet CEO Jon Cherry and listened to him laugh and scoff while citizens gave testimony on the verge of tears. He and his group looked like foxes in the hen house. It made me sick - first of all I can't believe they were so careless to act that way and second I can't believe these are the people we are doing business with. If they can't even mind their own image in public, how can they mind a mine. If there was a video of how they acted and what they said, this project would be over for good right now. My dad, grandfather and great grandfather were miners along with many other relatives. Many of them died early and some even on-the-job due to unsafe conditions and exposure. Through history, only recently have mining companies been held accountable to acceptable standards even for the safety of their employees. We know that maximum profits and safety are in conflict. The fact that they can't produce an acceptable plan is proof they're already cutting corners. The stakes are higher than they have been in other Minnesota mining projects because technology has increased our ability to damage the environment beyond repair, and the proposal is to mine unsafely in an exceptionally sensitive area. Proponents of this project invoke "The American Way" of progress and industry and say we should charge ahead. If anything, we've learned this old American Way was wrong and so we learned to be more careful with our natural resources. Please delay the permitting process until we are sure that environmental impact within acceptable limits is guaranteed. Jay Haapala 1560 Grand Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Jay Lehman

18099

This is a special treat for me. I am Jay Lehman. I am from Aurora. I am part of a small family business that has been on the range for 30 years. Thank you to the DNR and the federal agencies that are here allowing us to talk about this. Reading through the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Study, it is a very complicated and extensive document. I am convinced it takes an experienced environmental engineer versed in permitting to fully understand and appreciate it. I will admit that I'm not one of those people. With that being said, I believe we have to put our trust in the experienced scientists and engineers of the lead agencies to determine if this mining project can be done safely. If this project can meet the environmental and financial requirements, then we must allow PolyMet to move forward with this project. Not doing so would be an injustice to the people in Minnesota, especially here on the Iron Range, as we have one of the world's largest deposits of strategic metals. I believe we have the technology and experience to move forward with this project. Copper-nickel mining has been going on for hundreds of years. We know what the dangers are and we know how to avoid them. Our regulatory agencies are staffed with experienced, competent professionals who are some of the best and brightest that our country has to offer. We need to put our trust in them. We keep hearing that in Minnesota we are going to be trading 20 years' of jobs for 500 years of waste water treatment, or even a thousand years. I would like to ask the DNR to make an official statement as to whether or not this claim of 500 years of required waste water treatment post-closure in the SDEIS is in the SDEIS or is it not? I feel many people aren't sure about this issue. This issue needs to be put to rest in the SDEIS of properly informing the public. The financial risk of moving forward with this project does not lay on the taxpayers' shoulders, it lays on PolyMet's. PolyMet, before mining begins, funds must be set aside to cover the entire cost of the closure and the reclamation. The Minnesota DNR determines the amount to be set aside and the company does not get the funds back until all closure and reclamation is complete. I don't know anybody on the Iron Range who does not care about this project being done right and safe. We care not only for the jobs this project will provide, but we care about protecting the environment as well. This is our backyard. We don't want to damage it. Those saying we need to choose between jobs and environment are presenting a false choice. We can have both. Thanks.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay Newcomb

18362

My name is Jay Newcomb. I'm from Duluth. N-E-W-C-O-M-B. Seems pretty clear to me listening tonight that we would all like to have more jobs on the Iron Range, especially good paying ones. And we also absolutely want to protect our environment. So the real question becomes: Who can make this call? Who can make this decision? Obviously PolyMet is supposed to be the expert in mining. But who can really tell us about the environment and how we need to treat it and live sustainably on it? And even though PolyMet now is using the term "NorthMet," and it sort of sounds like they are from here, they really aren't. The people who can tell us how to live on this plant are the Ojibwe. And they have brought up three bands, the Net Lake, Grand Portage, and Fond du Lac band have drawn up a list of 18 disputes that they have with the EIS. They range from not looking at the possibility of underground mining rather than surface mining, the differences in how wild rice would be affected, groundwater, and the hydraulics. And what I would suggest is that before this mine is considered further or goes forward we need to listen to the people who know how to treat this land the right way and sustainably and resolve all these 18 issues. Thank you.

39471

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, By now you have heard it all: economic arguments for and environmental arguments against the PolyMet mine. The very fact that thousands of people have commented on the SDEIS shows how inadequate it is. We fear for our environment and for the future of our clean water. PolyMet spent its money sponsoring the state high school hockey tournament in a public relations campaign rather than dealing with these real issues. Their job is to make money. Your job is to protect our environment. Jay Newcomb 1230 E 8th St Apt/Suite Duluth, MN 55805 2187246141

48744

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, By now you have heard it all: economic arguments for and environmental arguments against the PolyMet mine. The very fact that thousands of people have commented on the SDEIS shows how inadequate it is. We fear for our environment and for the future of our clean water. PolyMet spent its money sponsoring the state high school hockey tournament in a public relations campaign rather than dealing with these real issues. Their job is to make money. Your job is to protect our environment. Jay Newcomb 1230 E 8th St Apt/Suite Duluth, MN 55805 2187246141

Jay Rich

37880

I'm sending my views on opening the boundary waters for more destructive mining: please don't. They are a unique natural resource that can't be replaced or cleaned. I've enjoyed them repeatedly and would had to see them changed or loSt sincerely Jay Rich 11623 Douglas St Omaha, Nebraska 68154

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jay Schaefer

39244

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jay Strachota

39959

I believe the mine should not be built. I do not believe that PolyMet can safeguard Minnesota's ground water and protect it for 500 years. Further more I believe it should be a requirement that when a mining company finishes mining that the site should be cleaned up and left maintenance free. That's the only possible way taxpayers can be protected and even then PolyMet could default before the end of the mining. We can not strap this clean up burden on future generations who will gain nothing from the efforts after the site is mined. It is beyond basic common sense that any amount of damage deposit is adequate to offset 500 years of water treatment and then depending on a corporation to back it. Corporations by definition are only beholden to their shareholders, not the environment or taxpayers. It is further more beyond belief that people exist who think they can calculate the environmental and financial risks and requirements for possibly 500 years, and others who think they can market the calculations, and still others who want to believe it. Jay Strachota 712 6th Ave S Hopkins, MN 55343

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JAY STROHMAIER

11982

I'm writing to voice my feelings about the potential copper-nickel mine proposed by PolyMet near Hoyt Lakes MN. I live in Minneapolis but spend a tremendous amount of time on the Iron Range. My wife's family grew up on the range, and for the past 60 years have been careful stewards of lake property they've owned near Biwabik since the late 1950's. When I first moved here from Washington State in 1982, my first trip "up north" was to this area. Since then, that is what "up north" has come to mean to me. It is a beautiful and treasured part of our state in fact, a treasured part of our country. We were so entranced with this part of the Iron Range that we purchased our own second home in the area a few years ago, as well. We now spend even more time at our home near Biwabik, and plan to move there when we retire in a few years. The beautiful lakes, bike trails, natural forest, nearby boundary waters, and wonderful people; it is truly a gem - it can't be taken for granted. While I understand and appreciate the economic challenges facing the Iron Range and many other communities around the country, where job growth has been scarce amid an evolving service-centric economy, it seems to me, as an economist by training and an investment manager by profession, that the proposed PolyMet mine represents a grossly sub-optimal trade-off from a risk/return perspective. I understand it could create 350-400 jobs for perhaps a 20 year period; maybe a few more jobs, possibly a few less; maybe a few more years, but perhaps a few less. Commodity prices are volatile and the economic and regulatory environment associated with mining profitability can change quickly and unexpectedly. Even in the best case scenario, we need to carefully consider what we'll be facing 20-25 years from now when the mines close and the cleanup begins. More importantly, what may our grandchildren and great, great grandchildren (and beyond) potentially be facing 100 or 200 or 500 years from now, when the lakes have been contaminated with sulfuric acid and no one even knows what a Walleye is because our lakes don't support any aquatic life anymore. When well water could be tainted and unsafe for drinking. And when the costs associated with the clean-up could overwhelm the ability of local communities (or even the state) to bear the financial burden. For 350 jobs for 20 years. For tax revenue for the state that could pale in comparison to the costs that could be incurred to repair the damage - if that's even possible. I've reviewed much of the research on the efficacy of responsible copper-nickel mining. Reasonable people have argued that there are some cases where it has been conducted and remediated fairly effectively. But there are many more cases, way many more, where both reasonable and unreasonable analysts alike concur that this type of mining has been an unmitigated economic and ecological disaster. Is that a risk we want to take. Is it a risk we need to take. I believe that as a state, we would be better served by creating an economic development program that provides state-of-the-art training to residents of the Iron Range to create long term skills for the economy of the future jobs in technology, medicine, science and the like, with longevities into the next century not just the next 20 years. And the cost of such a program would likely be a fraction, a small fraction, of the present value of the potential liability that the state, and its taxpayers, may ultimately face if the PolyMet project moves forward. Finally, I realize that regulators and legislators are working in earnest to ensure that adequate financial assurances can be provided by PolyMet to ensure that potential clean-up expenses will be fully covered. I applaud them for this foresight. But I would also challenge them to ask themselves, "How many companies have been around for 200, 300 or 500 years, with the wherewithal to pay off debts incurred from their business activities centuries earlier." The l

Jay Thacker

38827

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Jay Thacker 4060 Crestview Ln Shoreview, MN 55126-2332 (651) 490-1178

Jaymes G Hubbell

54796

See attachment

Jayne

47693

If we have to put money a side for more then a month then it to harmful to all to move forward , Jayne Sent from my iPhone Jayne.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jayne Fingerman Johnson 6451

To: MN DNR As a resident on the edge of of the BWCAW who depends on the tourism industry AND depends on groundwater for my life, according to the PolyMet DEIS: PolyMet would create polluted water requiring expensive treatment for 500 years after they stop mining, and millions of gallons of untreated, polluted water would seep from the site every year into groundwater and nearby rivers. PolyMet's plan fails to plan for contingencies like pipeline breakages and extreme weather events. PolyMet would leave behind a polluted site requiring hundreds of years of monitoring, treatment of polluted water, and site maintenance. PolyMet's mine plan doesn't provide details about how to calculate an adequate damage deposit to protect taxpayers from the cost of 500 years of cleanup and maintenance. Jayne Johnson 52 Black Spruce Trl. Grand Marais, MN 55604

Jayne O'Connor 54510

See attachment

Jayson Pasch 6479

To whom it may concern; I believe that Ploymet is going to be a valuable asset to the surrounding communities. I for one would love to be employed close to home. I live in Gilbert, MN and have a difficult time finding employment close to home. I find that I have no choice but to work up words of 60 miles from home. Currently I work in Le Sueur, MN 4 hours or 250 miles from my wife and five kids. I make it home for 1-2 days every other week. To relocate is not an option. Northern MN is in need of growth, and income. People living on the range take pride in living in a beautiful area, but most people struggle with income and limited options for employment. There are many educated, hardworking people who are just waiting for an opportunity to shine. I understand that not everyone whom applies will be give an opportunity to work for Ployment, but the construction of the facility and other local business will have more work, and be able to employ qualified workers. I would like to see my State and DNR working with Ploymet to overcome the issues and concerns. We have an opportunity for greatness. Ploymet is working hard to overcome every road block that is and has been in the way. I think it's time to join forces, and use the resources we have to make this dream a reality. Sincerely, Jayson Pasch 416 west Michigan Ave Gilbert, MN 55741 Jayson Pasch Electrical/Mechanical Maintenance Technician Hometown BioEnergy 31889 356th St Le Sueur, MN 56058 (218)750-7599 Cell (612)616-0038 Work jayson.pasch@htbe-ls-com

Jean Beccone 20892

I concur with the LWV Minnesota statement that, while we do not oppose sulfide mining, per se, it must be done without polluting our environment. The SDEIS is inadequate; it does not provide any reassurance that this mining will not result in irreparable harm to the watery environment in our Arrowhead. PolyMet's proposed mine threatens our clean water and public health. Jean Beccone 5341 James Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55419

Jean Bergerson 4716

Submitted by Jean Bergerson 31331 Henselin Road Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Beyer

40639

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, The citizens of Minnesota are justifiably concerned with protecting our clean water and therefore have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota. I believe that the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high-quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest, the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need likely will lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk, and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. A mere twenty years of mining threatens to result in hundreds of years of water pollution and damage to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jean Beyer 7413 W 110th St Bloomington, MN 55438-2375 (952) 941-6541

jean brozic

37754

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jean Brozic jean brozic 1227 e. skyline pkwy. duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

jean brozic

49553

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Jean Brozic jean brozic 1227 e. skyline pkwy. duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Christopherson

19079

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Jean Christopherson 6013 Dublin Cir Edina, MN 55439

Jean Elliott

35344

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. There's no reason to think this won't occur in Minnesota as well. As someone who is downstream from Lake Superior, I want to see that lake kept as clean as possible. Sincerely, Jean Elliott 5151 W Carmen Ave Chicago, IL 60630-2323 (773) 283-5074

Jean Evens

39996

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jean Evens 3192 Town Road 207 International Falls, MN 56649-9022 (218) 283-4667

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Faley

38962

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Jean Greenwood

9616

Dear DNR personnel, I wish to speak in opposition to the proposed copper-nickel mines in northern Minnesota. I believe that the risks to our environment and our health are too great to warrant our proceeding with this mining venture. Let us not be held hostage by our need and desire to create jobs, so that we resort to short-term thinking, heedless of the long-term consequences. I understand treatment will be required at the mine for 200 years and at the plant site for 500 years. All this for a mine that lasts 20 years, creates few jobs, and puts our land, water, air, health at risk. Please do not grant permission for the PolyMet mining to proceed. Thank you, Jean Greenwood 4515 Garfield Ave Minneapolis, MN 55419

Jean Johnson

57174

Minnesota has clean water and beautiful clean lakes. Why would we permit a company to ruin all our water. They say it will bring more jobs. We need more jobs, but we need clean water to survive. Any mining that will harm our water is not wanted in Minnesota. Jean Johnson 3392 Strand Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Lindquist

40364

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Jean Oberle

43120

I am strongly opposed to the Polymet mine project in the Babbitt/Hoyt Lakes area due to the long term environmental ramifications. Jean Oberle 3731South Hills Way Eagan, MN 55123 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Ross

41662

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

42451

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Jean Ross 3624 Bryant Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409-1018 (612) 824-2080

43101

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jean Ross 3624 Bryant Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Schramm

42108

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jean Schramm 850 E River Rd Traverse City, MI 49696-8353

Jean Stephenson

16286

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Jean Wagenius

54881

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Waldt

39379

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please vote to protect out environment. Jean Waldt Sincerely, Ms Jean Waldt 1992 Hyacinth Ave E Saint Paul, MN 55119-3251

Jean Watson

15985

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jean Watson

19789

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jean Watson Red Wing, Minnesota _____ There are now 53 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to National Audubon Society by clicking here: [HYPERLINK "http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition"](http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition)<http://www.change-org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89b> [http://email.changemail-org/wf/open.upn=aGGv9wQ398j6-2FWVT4grdXbWUo0w-2FupjjjD-2Beylk5XeInLuCEKc3fZdho8GXjxxiplFn6SybU80HWYOLHct2MhHcRv7ksg-2F-2Bt-2BBQdFBpjlwWZOJkQr0Nq2XU-2BgsPRAVMRot9q2ePo-2B36CVPtfAeT7-2FwXkoP9lzRfdkFkY0XyhSeD-2F-2F4pn5IxSoFgD0J7Ilyqzq4h9ZbxmTd8NQpRP4SZJNJZngbzTqUPALD7SjQ1N32ULIWRjzUD3XH7ysAd7pl2w6kQw-2BZANKuj31nBr0qdAGN8wQEECKuiegQYm1eu-2FjM-2FJrbeqzSdlAlsYfZKbxs](http://api.mixpanel-com/track.data=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1andimg=1)

Jeanette Curphy

19893

From Jack and Jeanette Curphy (please count as two responses-we only have one computer.. We oppose the Polymet project in Hoyt Lakes. There has not been a "safe" way to mine copper/nickel. It bothers us that Polymet is not an American Company but a Canadian company. Do they really care about our environment. The history of copper/nickel mining companies is that they do their mining, file bankruptsy, and leave the citizens to pay for the clean up, and their is no known way to clean up sulphur material in the water. The Poly Met project is located, at the beginning of three (3) watersheds; namely the St Louis River and Great Lakes watershed, the Mississippi River watershed, and Hudson Bay watershed. For the few hundred jobs offered for this project, that would last approximately 20 years, the damage appears to outweigh the benefits. I would hope the legacy of the DNR and governing bodies would not be the irreversible environmental damage they allowed. Thank you. Jeanette and Jack Curphy

Jeanette Trushess

18247

My name is Jeanette Trushess. The last name is spelled T-R-U-C-H-S-E-S-S. I wish to register my opposition to copper/nickel mining in Northern Minnesota. We call the assurances -- we recall the assurances that taconite mining would not pollute the watersheds and the attempt of the mining company to deny their actions as a source of asbestos pollution to Lake Superior. Even with the best technology and state-of-the-art methods for capturing sulfide, eventually, perhaps several generations from now, those chemicals will leach into the watershed and Lake Superior. The mining company is not going to take responsibility, even if it still exists as an entity 100 years from now. And even if it were to take responsibility, it would not be possible to reverse the damage. No amount of money would compensate the people relying on Lake Superior for their potable water. Fresh water is going to be a necessary condition for quality of life in Minnesota, long after the miners and the minerals have come and gone. I happen to also be a psychologist that works and specializes in fertility, and I'm concerned about environmental causes of infertility. That's it. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeanine Allen

43706

Begin forwarded message: From: Jeanine Allen <HYPERLINK "mailto:jmk.allen@hotmail-com"jmk.allen@hotmail-com> Subject: Opposition to PolyMet Mining Date: March 13, 2014 1:19:51 PM CDT To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Cc: Jeanine Allen <HYPERLINK "mailto:jmk.allen@hotmail-com"jmk.allen@hotmail-com> March 14, 2014 MN Department of Natural Resources Dear Sirs: I am writing to express my opposition to the PolyMet copper mine, and any other such mining, in northern Minnesota. My reasons for doing so are due to the negative environmental impact such mining will have on our most precious and endangered resource, namely clean water. It has been noted in news articles that copper mining will expose and release into the environment sulfate, mercury, possibly asbestos-like particles, and other toxic metals into the water, and possible the air. These releases have the potential to destroy wild rice growing areas, wetlands, increase mercury levels in fish and other aquatic species, along with the potential to add more asbestos-like particles to the drinking water of people and possible airborne particles to areas around the mine. To prevent such pollution from happening, we are told that extraordinary pollution control prevention measures must be implemented, and sustained, for a period of at least 500 years. This is absolutely mind-boggling to me that we would even consider approving a project that gives us 20 years of mining and jobs, in return for more than 500 years of State oversight and maintenance of the mine site. Minnesota has only been a State for 156 years, and to commit future generations to this amount of supervision, and resultant costs, is absolutely irresponsible. In addition, I have yet to find any such pollution control measures that actually work in the real world. Minnesota is known world wide for our Minnesota grown wild rice. Native Americans have been harvesting wild rice for centuries, and will probably continue to do so, "if" we don't ruin the environment which is necessary for its continued survival. As far as I can tell, we have not fully determined the "safe" level sulfides in the water which will allow for the sustainability of our wild rice crop. I feel we should not endanger wild rice production in our State in return for 20 years of copper mining; it just doesn't make sense. We've been trying to reduce mercury levels in Minnesota waters for years. Every summer I hear reports that people should limit their fish intake to so many fish per week due to mercury contamination. And now, we're to consider increasing adding more mercury to Minnesota waters, in return for 20 years of copper mining. Once again, this doesn't make sense. I am also concerned with the asbestos-like fiber getting into the water supply. I lived in Duluth from 1969 to 1975, in the early 70's the City of Duluth informed residents that asbestos fibers were discovered in the water supply, caused by taconite mining. We were told that to prevent aerosolizing the fibers, and risk breathing the fibers in, we shouldn't cook with the water, we should stop taking showers, and wash our clothes in cold water etc, until the City could install filters to remove the fibers from the water supply. I imagine people in Duluth and many other communities and individuals up and down the North Shore who obtained their water from Lake Superior had been subjected to this contamination for years before it was discovered. I also imagine it will be years before the direct negative impact on public health this pollution has, and will, cause. For years I have wondered what will be the eventual impact this will have on my family. People should not have to worry about problems like this. Our government's, including the DNR, primary objective should be protecting Minnesotans and our environment, not catering to foreign corporations. If this in not a concern of the DNR, it should be. Last

Jeanine Center

31247

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Regarding the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Lake Superior's waters were seriously contaminated by the taconite tailings that mining companies dumped into it. This pollution was a threat to both marine and human life until an international effort stopped the dumping. So why would we even consider authorizing a new and similarly dangerous threat to the Lake Superior and the beloved Boundary Waters Wilderness. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest It's time we stopped protecting corporate pocketbooks and started protecting the health of the earth in earnest Sincerely, Jeanine Center 618 Northside Ave Ann Arbor, MI 48105-1133

Jeanne Ford

57219

What are the plans for environmental responsibility (ie – keeping the surrounding land and water ways preserved and clean)?Jeanne Ford5945 10th Ave SoMinneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeanne M Wesley 57182

Minnesota's clean waters and wilderness areas have provided our state with ample economic benefits for decades, and they form the backbone of our healthful way of life that attracts people from around the world. These assets of ours will continue to serve us if we don't ruin them for short-term gain. Sulfide mining carries too many proven risks; chances are very high that Minnesota, in the long run, will pay more than it will gain if we move ahead with the sulfide mining. Jeanne M. Wesley 2421 Kelly Paulson Rd Carlton, MN 55718

Jeanne Piehl 38971

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Jeanne Piehl 24246 Highway 15 N Hutchinson, MN 55350-5401

Jeanne Thoreson 39535

I think it is absurd to embark on a mining operation that gives a few hundred workers 20 years of employment and saddles the state with centuries of cleanup. It is also absurd to risk the health of the Boundary Waters, which is Minnesota's greatest gem. Lastly, it is absurd to allow an out-of-state company to rape our land and carry the profits away. People who think this is a good idea need a sanity check. Thank you. Jeanne Thoreson 504 21st St NE Rochester, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeanne Ward

40826

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jeanne Wright

41970

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Jeanne Wright 221 County Road 44 Grand Marais, MN 55604-2229

Jeannie Rustad

10735

Comment: I am strongly against allowing PolyMet or any sulfide mining in Minnesota because: I believe the toxic waste caused by this type of mining will cause irreparable harm to our environment. The history of this type of mining being able to reclaim the land to it's original state is extremely poor. There is never enough money to pay for the future problems, if it can be fixed at all. I also believe that by allowing sulfide mining to start up in order to provide mining jobs, we will ultimately destroy out tourist industry jobs in Northern Minnesota because of the damage caused by mining for copper. Polymet is at best a short sighted, short term fix for our state. Please do not allow sulfide mining in our state Jeannie Rustad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff 4563

As a Geology Student in the Northern Minnesota area we learn how to tell the difference between different minerals, we learn how minerals are formed. We also learn things like how ore deposits form, the differences between various forms of ore deposits, how acid mine drainage actually works, and how the chemistry of the surroundings effect the pollution potential in a region. I have been watching the debate over PolyMet for quite some time, and for obvious reasons I have a bias in the direction of it going forwaRd However, I also know the difference between reality and fantasy and can use that to make my own opinions on this matter. PolyMet looks to be proceeding with this project in a manner that is safe, open, and responsible and should be allowed to proceed. This is going to be a huge boon to the area, and the state, with the additional jobs and tax revenues. The project will not pollute the boundary waters (not even the right watershed) and even the watersheds that it does lead to, are also safe because mining can be done safely. Minnesota has some of the toughest mine pollution laws in the country, and this is an area that has been mined for well over 100 years without it turning into a wasteland. Previous mining projects were not mining for copper-nickel, but many of them ended up abutting the copper-nickel deposits due to their geography. Let PolyMet proceed with this project, it is the best for the region and it is the best for Minnesota. Jeff Harrison BS candidate, Geology, University of Minnesota, Duluth 7801 E. Superior St Duluth, Minnesota 55804

JEFF ANDERSON 43336

I would like to submit the following comments: As a fourth generation Iron Ranger, resident of northeastern Minnesota and former elected official, I would like to voice my support for the PolyMet project. The mining of these strategic and precious metals will generate significant economic activity, creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. What does this project mean for northeastern Minnesota: 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state and the Iron Range desperately need. We need the good-paying jobs that copper-nickel mining will provide. We cannot afford to miss the opportunity for 360 full-time jobs with hundreds of additional jobs in other industries. Having grown up on the Iron Range, I know all too well that we need jobs for young people and copper-nickel mining will provide our young people with multiple opportunities for challenging and exciting careers. I am an environmentalist I want to make sure we protect our clean air and water. I hunt and fish and appreciate this beautiful place we live. I trust the multiple State and Federal Agencies involved in preparing the document. Minnesotans trust the DNR to study copper-nickel mining and keep our communities safe. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough; the supplemental draft EIS addresses potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. It's time to put people to work. The time is now. Enough is enough; let's get on with permitting this mine. We want and we need jobs. Jeff Anderson Former Duluth City Council President and Duluth Economic Development Authority President P.O. Box 385 Duluth, MN 55801 Personal Office: (218) 590-5970 HYPERLINK "mailto:Jeff@JeffAnderson-org"Jeff@JeffAnderson-org

Jeff Backlund 39596

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I do not believe the mining industry at this time has an economically affordable way to treat tailings of this process. If they prepaid 100 years of treatment which is estimated at 5 million each year then I would say yes lets do it. But from a business standpoint how can any business profit and be able to support the economics of treating waste at this cost into the future. Please do not let these people fool you. Who will pay for this problem when they decide it's not worth it anymore ..you and me while they made a little bit of money and are now defunct. It does not make business sense and won't until they address this issue to which they have not and cannot due to lack of technology in the field of waste treatment. Thank you Longtime resident of NE Minnesota The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jeff Backlund Hazel Trl Woodbury, MN 55129

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Backlund

48809

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I do not believe the mining industry at this time has an economically affordable way to treat tailings of this process. If they prepaid 100 years of treatment which is estimated at 5 million each year then I would say yes lets do it. But from a business standpoint how can any business profit and be able to support the economics of treating waste at this cost into the future. Please do not let these people fool you. Who will pay for this problem when they decide it's not worth it anymore ..you and me while they made a little bit of money and are now defunct. It does not make business sense and won't until they address this issue to which they have not and cannot due to lack of technology in the field of waste treatment. Thank you Longtime resident of NE Minnesota The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jeff Backlund Hazel Trl Woodbury, MN 55129

Jeff Busse

44068

Greetings - I am writing to provide comment on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). My concerns with the SDEIS include: I feel strongly there is a lack of detail regarding the risk analysis in the document that would allow me to fully understand the consequences of the proposed action. While I understand that further detailed risk analysis may be called for at a later stage of permitting, I would urge the agencies to conduct a more thorough, detailed, and complete risk analysis to be included in the EIS. I do not feel the question of financial assurance has been adequately addressed for post-closure, especially given the high likelihood that perpetual treatment is needed. There is absolutely no historical examples of mining in MN that suggests PolyMet will be able to provide the necessary monitoring and funding to make certain that millions of gallons of untreated water don't pollute groundwater and nearby rivers. PolyMet's mine plan doesn't provide details about how to calculate an adequate damage deposit to protect taxpayers from the cost of 500 years of cleanup and maintenance. The plan includes inadequate contingencies for disaster events like pipeline breakages and extreme weather events. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Conrod

15264

I am extremely opposed to the proposed Polymet mine. It is absurd to jeopardize the safety of drinking water for 500+ years in order to get, at best, 20 years of jobs. Why destroy the future just to get something today that will be gone soon. What copper mine hasn't polluted the environment. And who will pay for the cleanup if Polymet doesn't have the money to do so, as has happened so many times in the past with other mines. Why should we believe that Polymet can do it this time when nobody has before. And why rush the project until the full environmental study is done. Are the minerals going anywhere. If the demand is going to decrease, that is just another reason to not do to the project. Please do what is best for Minnesota in the long run, not the short run - please stop the Polymet mine. -Jeff Conrod 426 Cherokee Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55107

37895

The wrong question is being asked. We shouldn't be asking, "Can the Polymet Mine be built, operated and decommissioned without damaging the environment." People who are against the mine can easily point to previous mines that were responsible for environmental disasters. Supporters of the mine can point to changes within the industry made to prevent similar disasters from ever happening again. Neither side can say with any certainty of what will happen in the future. Instead, we should be asking, "Are we willing to sacrifice our environment over the long-term in order to receive the short-term benefits from the mine." This is similar to the parent who considers the pros and cons of allowing their child to go on a long-term, unsupervised camping trip in the Northern Minnesota woods with a convicted pedophile. The child might have a wonderful trip with this person who "learned from their mistakes" (as the mining industry claims to have done) and won't repeat the same "mistakes" they made in the past. Or the child might be scarred for life and may go on to become an adult who makes the same "mistakes" which results in decades of pain and suffering for many many people. Clearly a responsible adult would not allow their child to take this trip. The parent's job is to protect their child since they aren't always able to protect themselves. Just as clearly, a responsible state agency, whose charge is to protect the environment (which can't protect itself) MUST not allow this mine to operate. Yes, it is POSSIBLE that it can be built, operated and decommissioned without damaging the environment, just like it is POSSIBLE that a participant in the Minnesota Sex Offender's Program might go through their program and never commit another crime again. But there is a reason why only one person has ever been discharged from the program - the risk is too great. The mission of the DNR is to conserve our natural resources and allow them to be used in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life. Putting the area around the proposed mine at such a high risk of being destroyed for 25 generations is irresponsible and reckless, just as allowing a child to be unsupervised with a pedophile in the woods is. Please protect our environment the same way that the Department of Human Services protects our children. Please don't allow the Polymet mine to be built. Jeff Conrod 426 Cherokee Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55107

jeff durfee

38127

Because of the water rich environment, why not use under ground mining methods. This might help with the water run off problems. Insist on maintaining Minnesota clean water. Jeff Durfee, 5949 Koski Rd, Duluth 55804 On Thursday, March 6, 2014 9:05 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Evans

46072

My name is Jeff Evans, I live at 1692 Princeton Ave, St Paul 55105- I also own a cabin near Ely and have been taken over thirty canoe trips to the BWCAW. I owned and docked a sailboat on Lake Superior for five years. I am opposed to the plan to mine copper nickel in Northeastern Minnesota for these reasons: 1- The lack of transparency on the financial assurance calculations. Not providing the assumptions or contingencies is short sighted. I realize this by law is to be part of the permitting process but the DNR and other agencies should've realize the lack of faith citizens would have in this process and provided that information. To not make those calculations is akin to saying we are going to Mars next year but not provide the details as to how to get there. 2- The lack of a mercury/sulfate standard for wild rice. How can the state make a wise decision if the rules for sulfate standards haven't been decided on yet or updated. 3- What are the health risks from this type of mining. Has it been studied. 4- How much of the technology has been tested in the field rather in the laboratory. Reverse osmosis operates differently in a controlled environment of the lab. 5- What is the cost to the state and local communities on the infrastructure. Crime will increase so will heavy loads on highways. Is this considered. How this project will be taxed has not been determined. Let's solve that problem firSt 6- What are the costs of 200 to 500 years of pollution compared to twenty years of a few jobs. 7- Modeling should be revised. The new information on water flows indicate that the models are incorrect and need to be substantially revised. The state should make an informed decision with the best information possible, not a hurried political one. I was impressed by the professionalism and patience displayed by state agency personnel at the public hearings. I hope that same professionalism and patience is displayed when they consider the adequacy of the SDEIS.

Jeff Ferris

16933

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Hanson

44301

Dear Sirs, My name is Jeffrey Hanson. I grew up in Babbitt, MN where we built the family home on Finn Bay of Birch Lake. After high school in Babbitt I attended Vermilion State Junior College in Ely and the University of Minnesota for Mechanical and Environmental Engineering. We still have and use our family home at 8457 Spring Ridge Road, Babbitt, MN 55706- Since we first cleared the land and built our home overlooking Birch Lake we have considered ourselves avid environmentalists and diligent stewards of the natural environment we love so dearly. Based on these convictions, I have been concerned about the eventual impacts of copper-nickel mining ever since its was first discussed in the mid 1960's and found along Spruce Road near to Birch Lake. No one is more passionate about protecting our waters then I am. At the same time I recognize the essential nature of mining and that it does cause impacts on the natural environment. We moved to Babbitt in 1958 due to taconite mining and the new high school it built where my Father was the industrial arts teacher. My first job after high school was working at Reserve Mining where I saw first hand the real impacts of mining. Over the years I have followed from a distance the development of mining above the shores of Birch Lake at the Dunka Pit of Erie LTV Mining. This mine pit is a prime example of the sulfate and acid mine drainage problems that can result from any type of mining where sulfide ores such as copper sulfide or iron sulfide (pyrite) are present. This pit was dug to extract taconite in an area where both copper sulfide and iron sulfide are present. Problems arose and the pit was later closed. To this day seepage from this site is treated before being discharged into Birch Lake, and it still exceeds some contaminate limits. Now PolyMet Mining is hoping to develop copper-nickel mining with a pit behind the Northshore Mining taconite mining pit with processing on the brownfield site of the deactivated LTV/Erie taconite mine and processing facilities. This site is not virgin territory and already has the legacy environmental impacts from times when mining operations were not required to evaluate these impacts prior to initiating operations. Today we do have a rigorous EIS review process to attempt to foresee these impacts and address ways to minimize or eliminate these impacts. I am extremely well impressed by the level of concern and the depth of the review that has been conducted by the PolyMet SDEIS process. This is exactly the type of review that is needed to rationally anticipate and mitigate the environmental impacts that could happen. One of the best aspects of this project and SDEIS review process is that it is on a brownfield site. This is an area where we must address both the potential impacts of copper-nickel mining, as well as the legacy of the taconite mining that has been in the area for 65 years. This is a unique opportunity to take all precautions and learn how to mitigate the impacts of both types of mining. After all, both copper-nickel and iron/taconite mining have impacts on the environment that need to be evaluated. I am further impressed and pleased that the MPCA through their water permits and the SDEIS process have required that PolyMet and Erie evaluate methods for the reduction of sulfates, sulfides and dissolved metals in mining impacted water discharges. I am a strong proponent of biological reduction technologies that can remove 1,000 mg/l, or more, of sulfates from mine pit waters that have high sulfate levels and convert it into pyrite before being discharge downstream. This technology uses nature's normal processes to address the problem of sulfates and their potential transformation to hydrogen sulfide, which is topic to wild rice and humans alike. We are currently conducting field tests that have demonstrated that this can be done on the industrial scale needed to handle the industrial scale problem we have from the legacy of high sulfat

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Harrison

15395

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on Alces Americanus, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. The moose habitat is being destroyed by climate change, this has nothing to do with Polymet, it has more to do with the interruption of natural fire cycles and the resulting parasite populations. It seems that there is a population who will make any stretch to try to blame the destruction of the planet on a mining project. The reality is far more complex, but mining a few acres of Minnesota, or even a few tens of thousands of acres of Minnesota is not going to do nearly as much damage as human presence in the form of hunting, fishing, camping, sightseeing, travel, commercial transport, and the like. As a result unless we are willing to completely let the entirety of Northern Minnesota go feral by moving every person out and never allowing anyone back in the moose are going to go through their natural cycles regardless of what Polymet does. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Harrison 7801 E Superior St Duluth, MN 55804-3109

Jeff Heikkinen

38105

The risk reward just isn't worth it for the Polymet proposal. A few hundred jobs and 20 years of work compared to 500 years of possible ecological impact doesn't make sense Thanks Jeff Heikkinen

jeff hopkins

42440

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr jeff hopkins 69 Amber Ct Lindenhurst, IL 60046-7912

Jeff Iisakka

18333

Good evening. My name is Jeff Iisakka. And I live in Esko, Minnesota. I'm a shy Finish kid. I grew up in Virginia, Minnesota. And as you know Virginia is surrounded by open-pit mines. In fact, in my backyard on Fifth Avenue North in Virginia was the Oliver Iron Mining Company. We had a very good quality of life in Virginia back 30 some years ago. And I'm sure that 50 to 75 years ago the environmental regulations were very minimal if none; and our quality of life was very good. I'm very confident that with today's high technology, strict environmental regulations that the PolyMet mining facility will be highly successful and we'll be enjoying the fruits of their labor for many years. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Kopp

18137

My name is Jeff Kopp. It's spelled J-E-F-F, K-O-P-P. And I grew up in Aurora, Minnesota. And I now reside in Saint Michael, Minnesota. There was this young boy who lived across the street from this beautiful A-frame Lutheran church that was perched up on this hill. Just below this hill was this beautiful park that had two outdoor hockey rinks in it. He used to wear his skates to ski down that hill to that hockey rink. His mom used to ring the dinner bell and he would hear it and he would race way up this hill as fast as he could to see how far he could get up that hill for dinner time. After prayers and dinner, he would skate back down that hill and play hockey until they turned the lights out. All this happened because my mother was a schoolteacher from Gilbert, Minnesota; and my father was a miner from Erie Mining Company. Yes, the same place and the same buildings that PolyMet is going to bring back to life. Let's get to PolyMet and breakdown who they hire. Two companies come to mind. Barr Engineering, who has won world accolades for their engineering abilities; and GE and their reverse osmosis systems. And let's not forget Mr. Jon Cherry, whose 25 years in the mining industry, who has a bachelor of science degree in environmental engineering. This is a miner that has a bachelor degree in environmental engineering. This 2,160 page SDEIS is a summation of thousands of engineered documents created -- to create the most expensive and comprehensive mine plan yet on this planet that I know of. The iron mining industry paid billions and billions of dollars of taxes to the school systems and the universities to educate our youth. The copper, nickel, PGMs that are on the brink of being mined and allows the chance to continue the billions of dollars the state so needs. I know PolyMet, Minnesotans, and the DNR are going to set world-class standards with this mine plan. I would like to thank all the miners in this room. And especially those that I've known have given their lives for me to be free to be standing right here. I know where I can buy copper, gold, nickle, platinum plating, cobalt. Saved a guy's life back here, that cobalt. If it's not grown, it's mined. But no one can tell me where I can buy sulfide. Whoever created this phrase "sulfide mining," you need to go back and get a new education. I know you're in this room somewhere. Because it didn't work. There is no definition in Webster's Dictionary for "sulfide mining." This is hard work mining. Leave the mining to the miners and allow the children of the Iron Range to have the opportunity to skate both ways to that hockey rink.

Jeff Lentsch

42150

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the economic gain, and environmentally friendly procedures, mining in Minnesota should stay. There is huge demand in the world for mining, and if we don't do it here, it will be done elsewhere, like China. China doesn't care about the environment like we do. So let us keep those good paying jobs here in Minnesota. There have been plenty of health impact study's done on the poor, and their not as healthy when compared to the wealthy. Wealth is the only thing we can invest in the technology that make these procedures more environmentally friendly. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Lentsch 42085 County 14 Blvd Kenyon, MN 55946-3209 (651) 494-2132

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Mogush

38466

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resource: The discussion regarding the proposed Polymet mine has resulted in a great deal of rhetoric. Quantifying the comments is difficult. Some things we know: The world needs copper. Copper mining would result in many jobs in NE Minnesota. If the Polymet mine is permitted, many more mines will likely follow in NE Minnesota. Polymet says that they can mine copper safely. Copper deposits and mines exist in parts of the world where conditions are so arid that water supplies are not placed at risk. Sulfide mining is inherently toxic to aquatic ecosystems and has never been done without causing environmental damage. Environmental damage poses risk to the tourism business in northeastern Minnesota. Copper mining would have a negative impact on real estate values in NE Minnesota. The SDEIS indicates that it may take as long as 500 years to completely treat the water that would be polluted by Polymet in the normal course of operating their proposed mine for twenty years. The SDEIS is based on the assumption that nothing goes wrong. No accidents occur. No strange weather events cause any damage. No pumps fail. No liners leak. The water treatment system works perfectly every day for 520 years. NE Minnesota has abundant fresh water. Parts of the US are experiencing water shortages. White Bear Lake water levels are extremely low because of excessive use of the Prairie du Chien-Jordan aquifer. It is important to protect our abundant supply of fresh water. If this were just about economic benefits, it would be difficult to argue against permitting Polymet's proposed mine. The fact that this process has never been done safely along with the need to treat the polluted water for 500 years, should make any thoughtful person skeptical. The fact that the SDEIS assumes that nothing will go wrong is not defensible. The risk to the abundant water in the area makes this project a poor choice for our State. Sincerely, J.Jeffrey Mogush 1230 West Minnehaha Parkway Minneapolis, MN 55419-1163

Jeff Pearson

45063

This is a terrible, terrible idea. How can you PLAN to pollute a pristine area like this with 500 years of pollution. What company will be around in 500 years. Our children will hopefully be alive to live with a horrible decision, should this be approved. Turn it down. Don't do this to the BWCA and Minnesota and the people of Minnesota. You know it is wrong

Jeff Peterson

39462

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Peterson PO Box 177 Marine ON Saint Croix, MN 55047-0177 (651) 433-2653

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Rohlk

39563

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Rohlk 2129 Fair St Mankato, MN 56001-5523 (507) 317-8528

Jeff Rupp

40743

DNR, I am against this mining project because waste water (acidic) must be treated on a continuous basis as rain water and ground water make contact with sulfur containing waste rock. I did attend the Saint Cloud Polymet sponsored meeting where no mention was even made about sulfur containing rock and how it would be handled.. Until I asked, and then they stated that the sulfur containing waste rock would eventually be placed into the depleted mine site and then allowed to naturally fill with water- Polymet's stated the reason being, "sulfur containing waste rock surrounded by water isn't exposed to oxygen so won't produce sulfuric acid contaminated water".. So therefore very little water treatment is required after mine closure.. First of all I don't think that simple premise holds true in the natural environment. I think it's possible for algae, plants and bacteria to produce oxygen underwater as a result of natural metabolism especially if exposed to sunlight. Second if this premise isn't true and the waste water from the mine will require continuous treatment as it flows away from the mine site-how can a company and the DNR be certain waste water won't find hidden cracks and fissures at the mine site and percolate to unexpected areas contaminating lakes or groundwater in unforeseen locations, making water treatment very difficult. Also, during the mining process and after how would they handle water treatment if for example they had another very intense prolonged rain event with record setting amounts of rain in short period of time like what occurred last summer.. Lastly, I want to mention that not all mining results in an economic boost for the surrounding communities. I had recently driven through the town of Miami in Arizona and counted over 7 different mines operating in the surrounding hills and this town looked like a ghost town most of the businesses were boarded up and the streets and parks were in extreme need of repairs. It was a very empty looking, depressing town to drive through and just goes to show most economic benefits occur mainly in the early stages of mine construction- not as much during mine operation.. I am afraid if this type of mining is allowed here, it will open the door for the next mine planned just south of Ely Minnesota - even bigger mistake.. Thank you.

Jeff Scharlau

46027

Nothing that comes out of that mine is as important as fresh water and the unspoiled beauty of the Superior National Forest. Cancel plans for the mine. Jeff Scharlau 2629 W. 43rd St #309 Minneapolis, MN 55410

Jeff Schuller

42477

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As an avid fisherman, hiker and outdoors enthusiast, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. All for just 20 years' worth of operation. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Schuller 3933 Aldrich Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409-1413

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Soderstrom

45165

My name is Jeff Soderstrom 2055 Salem Court Orono, MN 55356 Thank you for accepting my comments on the Polymet NorthMet EIS. Copper mining involves a much greater environmental threat than iron mining. I am a grateful supporter of the legacy of mostly successful iron mining in Minnesota. However, the proposed mining is an entirely different ballgame and the EIS does not sufficiently address many serious concerns. Perhaps foremost among concerns, while the EIS makes clear that treatment of contaminated water will be perpetual (arbitrarily defined as 200 or 500 years), no decrease in contamination is seen in the graphs projected through these very long time periods. Given this long and indefinite time period, the EIS should state how the treatment mechanisms will be maintained for hundreds of years. It does not state how long geomembrane covers and liners will last, how they will be replaced and what replacement will coSt It doesn't state how long the equipment doing the treatment is projected to last and how it will be replaced when it fails. It doesn't state how Polymet will maintain the physical plant after operations. In general, it doesn't provide adequate information for the public, voters and regulating agencies to evaluate whether Polymet will be able to treat contaminated water as projected. Given that Polymet has clearly stated in public disclosures (including 2013 Annual Report) that is has no experience with mining or treating contaminated water, the EIS should be required to inform the public in more detail how they will maintain water treatment for 500 or more years. Additionally, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Mitigation plans for these seepages must be accounted for. On the point of Polymet having no mining experience, no present financial capacity to develop and maintain a copper mine and because it is clear to any business person that control of their decisions and ultimate operations would fall to the established mining entities that would ultimately fund the operations, why is Minnesota not requiring the controlling company or companies from making the commitments required of such a massive mining operation. I fully understand why Glencore and other mining giants set up their quasi-affiliates as they do, but I don't believe that should prevent the DNR from requiring clear accountabilities from named funding entities. It is irresponsible to do otherwise. Glencore will be among the primary beneficiaries of permits granted and as such should be the applicant and be subject to legal recourse by the state of MN for any failures to comply with the permits or other violations of law. As an executive of a fortune 300 firm in Minnesota, I would not consent to do business with a shell firm such as Polymet given the significant potential liability of operations and potential damage to the economic and intrinsic value of the region. I accept and understand that not all potential consequences can or should be anticipated. Some problems cannot be anticipated and must be left to address when they arise. However, in these circumstances with technology and processes largely untested on this scale, considerably more contingency planning is warranted. For an entity with no mining experience, asking for the immense responsibility of protecting the water rich environment they seek to mine requires greater and more confident planning and demonstrated ability to address inevitable, unexpected breaches in the mitigation mechanisms outlined in the EIS. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, fai

Jeff Stromgren

42470

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Jeff Stromgren 711 W Lake St Ste 516 Minneapolis, MN 55408-2994 (612) 925-1840

Jeff Sullivan

9960

I support the Polymet project because I am involved with advances being made in the waste water treatment industry and believe that there are effective, practical, and environmentally responsible developments available that will help meet the needs of this project now and far into the future. For more information see: [HYPERLINK "http://us-mg5-mail.yahoo-com/neo/www.evaporationworks-com"](http://us-mg5-mail.yahoo-com/neo/www.evaporationworks-com) [www.evaporationworks-com](http://www.nidincorporated-com/) Regards, Jeff Sullivan [HYPERLINK "http://www.nidincorporated-com/"](http://www.nidincorporated-com/) www.NIDincorporated-com ===== Jeff Sullivan, General Manager Northern Industrial Distributing, Inc. 1552 Carr Lake Rd SE, Bemidji, MN 56601 USA Office: 218-755-1000 Fax: 218-755-1001 Cell: 218-556-1382

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeff Treptau 54878

See attachment

Jeff Wilson 17081

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Remember Reserve Mining. They dumped millions of tons (literally) of iron tailings into Lake Superior. When called out on it, they arrogantly made it clear they will dump whatever they want into the lake. It wasn't until a college professor noticed that that tailings look like asbestos fibers that action was taken. It was the EPA that sued Reserve and stopped the dumping. Remember the EPA. They used to protect the environment. In West Virginia and Kentucky mining companies are blowing up mountains to extract coal. They have blown up 500 mountains so far. They extract the valuable resource and ship it to India, and the residents of West Virginia are left with a pile of toxic rubble, as well as high rates of cancer and birth defects. Last weekend the state of Oklahoma experienced 103 earthquakes as a result of fracking. We are stupid if we believe the "science" and promises of mining companies. We've managed to keep the Arrowhead pristine up till now. Why even take a chance of destroying it. If you want to create jobs, start extracting valuable materials from our waste stream. People throw old appliances into the trash, and they go into a landfill. To make their new appliances, we go mine more copper, iron, nickel, chrome, etc This is clearly unsustainable, expensive, and ruinous to our environment. Time to do things differently. Best regards, -Jeff Wilson resident of Minnesota and regular visitor to the Arrowhead Jeff Wilson 3145 Harbor Lane N Apt 1313 Plymouth, MN 55447

51035

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Remember Reserve Mining. They dumped millions of tons (literally) of iron tailings into Lake Superior. When called out on it, they arrogantly made it clear they will dump whatever they want into the lake. It wasn't until a college professor noticed that that tailings look like asbestos fibers that action was taken. It was the EPA that sued Reserve and stopped the dumping. Remember the EPA. They used to protect the environment. In West Virginia and Kentucky mining companies are blowing up mountains to extract coal. They have blown up 500 mountains so far. They extract the valuable resource and ship it to India, and the residents of West Virginia are left with a pile of toxic rubble, as well as high rates of cancer and birth defects. Last weekend the state of Oklahoma experienced 103 earthquakes as a result of fracking. We are stupid if we believe the "science" and promises of mining companies. We've managed to keep the Arrowhead pristine up till now. Why even take a chance of destroying it. If you want to create jobs, start extracting valuable materials from our waste stream. People throw old appliances into the trash, and they go into a landfill. To make their new appliances, we go mine more copper, iron, nickel, chrome, etc This is clearly unsustainable, expensive, and ruinous to our environment. Time to do things differently. Best regards, -Jeff Wilson resident of Minnesota and regular visitor to the Arrowhead Jeff Wilson 3145 Harbor Lane N Apt 1313 Plymouth, MN 55447

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffery Kane

36458

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage COME ON. you can't see the issue. I own land 20 miles East of the mine. I bought this land to wipe my carbon foot print. How can you allow the this project to go forwaRd This will be the biggest screw up in MN history and your names will be part of it. If the two paragraphs below don't show proof enough then what will. read it again and stop looking through bought glasses, see it for what its worth to are kids and their kids. COME ON. Minnesota history. PolyMet would dig up nearly 1,000 acres of high value peat bogs, part of the 100 Mile Swamp, a critical habitat for many plants and animals. This wetland is designated an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey. In addition, over 6,000 acres of wetlands could be damaged or destroyed by PolyMet changing the water flow. When you dig a deep hole in the ground, it fills with water. That water would come from surrounding wetlands, and could dry out and destroy them. PolyMet is required to replace lost wetlands, but they understate the area of wetlands they would affect, they fail to replace the unique habitat offered by peat bogs, and they propose replacements that are far from the mine site. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Jeffery Kane 2136 Ford Pkwy # 187 Saint Paul, MN 55116-1863 (651) 307-4805

Jeffery Loman

28894

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental No cumulative effects analysis of reasonable foreseeable mining, including uranium mining near Lake Superior. Wisconsin's new mining law is inconsistent with federal law. Wisconsin is about to approve mining activities that will violate federal law. Michigan has already permitted hard rock mining in a manner that's inconsistent with federal law. Meanwhile - EPA Region 5 has been sitting around like last year's Christmas tree making dozens of video presentations by which EPA managers and staff sing parodies that make light of oil spills and the Asian carp debacle. Videos of ballet performances, karate demonstrations, singing and dancing and other inappropriate workplace activities. Then - they placed them in the public domain on YouTube. Disgusting and just plain wrong. Sincerely, Jeffery Loman PO Box 142 Lanse, MI 49946-0142 (907) 720-8680

Jeffrey

54192

the river please don't do it because it will probably effect are drinking water and it will hurt other animals.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey Brown

11335

Dear DNR Professionals, While I am a business professional and would like to see economic growth in Minnesota, I can not support the Polymet and other copper-nickel mining projects being considered for our state and hope that you will stop these project before they ever get started. The proposed economic and employment benefits are small (if they truly exist at all) in comparison to the economic cost and the high probability of damage to the environment in the region. The state's taxpayers are likely to bear the burden of mitigating the negative environmental impact of the Polymet project for generations to come. This is an unfair burden to be placed upon our children and grandchildren and their children and grandchildren. The negative economic impact on property values and tourism could far outweigh any economic benefits. Clearly these negative impacts are not a certainty, but even a small assumed probability (and I believe they are actually quite high) when multiplied by the very large negative economic impact, should lead our shepherds of our natural resources to say no. I urge you to make it very clear that Northern Minnesota, where the land is a wonderfully dynamic, porous mix of rock and water, is not a place where this type of project should be developed. Thank you for the due diligence that is being exercised and the opportunity for the public to make itself heard Jeffrey Brown jdbrown1@gmail-com

Jeffrey Bryan

14491

Dear Sirs, I am writing regarding the mining proposed by Polymet in northern Minnesota. I do not think that this can be done without contaminating and changing the ecosystems surrounding the mining operation. The attempt to contain and treat the waste rock during and after the mining operations for several hundred years after is ludicrous. There will be plenty of problems that will cause heavy metals and other wastes sulfides/sulfuric acid etc to get into either surface or underground sources of water. I think the damage will be substantial and impossible to mitigate. Flooding such as happened to Duluth recently or seismic activity could easily cause the containment to fail. The superfund that cleans up hazardous waste sites have plenty of mining sites that it is working with and this could be a future site. The money that the mining company puts up for clean up would quickly be expended. The brief economic gain for the area is far outweighed by the cost of clean up and the time that this site will have to be cared for into the future. I am against the proposal and want you to reject the applications on these grounds. Sincerely, Jeffrey W. Bryan

Jeffrey D. Rome

7347

Attn: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the NorthMet mining project addresses a variety of potential environmental hazards presented by this project from the perspective of current scientific understanding of climatological factors that have bearing on estimations of risk. One such climatological factor of particular relevance to risk modeling for this project is precipitation, particularly storm water runoff. This specific issue is the topic of my comments and concerns. The water quality implications of this project are, appropriately, an important focus of the SDEIS and mitigation efforts on the part of the proponents of the project. The potential adverse effects on water quality are clearly recognized; acidification and heavy metal contamination are particularly important in this regard. The estimations of risk and P90 thresholds related to storm water runoff presumably have been calculated on the basis of climatological factors as we understand them today. However, the modeling (MODFLOW, XP-SWMM, GoldSim) used to predict the hydrologic and water quality effects of the mining for the next 200 – 500 years cannot, with an acceptable degree of accuracy, incorporate the effects of climate change on precipitation in the arrowhead region of northern Minnesota. The data to do this are not available at present nor will they be in the foreseeable future. Substantially increased amounts of annual precipitation in this geographic region in the decades/centuries ahead have a significant but unquantifiable potential to overwhelm the water containment and water treatment methods described in the SDEIS. Thus the statement that the "water quality model predicts that the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would not cause or increase the magnitude of an exceedance of the groundwater and surface water evaluation criteria at the P90 level " [ES-35] is inaccurate and untenable. Because the proponents of the project accept and plan for risks to water quality and the need for mitigation for 200-500 years they have placed this unattainable burden of proof on themselves. One needs only to look at recent history to develop an appreciation of the hazards of storm water runoff from the proposed mining project and the potential for widespread and long-lasting effects on water quality in the region. The deluge in the Duluth area of June 19/20, 2012, was unprecedented and exceeded the capacities of both natural and man-made systems for managing it. A storm water runoff event of similar or greater magnitude at the mine site creates an unacceptable risk of environmental contamination in a large surrounding area. Climate change appears all but inevitable, and with it significant alterations in patterns of precipitation, including the distinct possibility of increased frequency and intensity of storms. In this context, the NorthMet Project, which necessitates mitigation efforts for centuries to come, presents a risk of water quality degradation that is too high for the project to meet applicable environmental protection standards.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

jeffrey dickson

19182

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I am a resident of Finland Minnesota and am highly concerned about the ramrodded mining venture that the State and the mining industry is trying to blow past the scrutiny of Minnesota citizens. I perform NEPA reviews for FEMA and fully understand the kind of detail that goes into an EIS. What you are attempting to pull off, under this limited public response period, intentionally targeted over the busiest holiday period of the year, with this exceptionally lengthy document, is in my opinion despicable and possibly bordering on illegal. The time period afforded the mining industry to respond to their first initial dismal failure of the first EIS has been a number of years now. They have had a lot of time to examine the errors of their ways. Now that they have had several years to improve their argument, can not the opposition have similar latitude. I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, jeffrey dickson p.o

Jeffrey Domingues

41823

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jeffrey Domingues Northfield, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey Grosscup

10705

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The investment in Minnesota and the small 10-year projection of jobs/mining is insufficient compared to the unknown costs to the environment. What other industry would create such short term employment opportunity when a better fit would be creating perhaps 300 jobs for 60 years. Planning for the short term needs to be discarded in favor of a sustainable long term approach. If the mining were to exhausted the deposits after ten years, where would the city of Ely look like with another shut down industry. A bad fit and short sighted in my estimation. Sincerely, Jeffrey Grosscup Minneapolis,, Minnesota Jeffrey Grosscup 4801 Portland Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417

18402

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The investment in Minnesota and the small 10-year projection of jobs/mining is insufficient compared to the unknown costs to the environment. What other industry would create such short term employment opportunity when a better fit would be creating perhaps 300 jobs for 60 years. Planning for the short term needs to be discarded in favor of a sustainable long term approach. If the mining were to exhausted the deposits after ten years, where would the city of Ely look like with another shut down industry. A bad fit and short sighted in my estimation. Sincerely, Jeffrey Grosscup Minneapolis,, Minnesota Jeffrey Grosscup 4801 Portland Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417

50521

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: The investment in Minnesota and the small 10-year projection of jobs/mining is insufficient compared to the unknown costs to the environment. What other industry would create such short term employment opportunity when a better fit would be creating perhaps 300 jobs for 60 years. Planning for the short term needs to be discarded in favor of a sustainable long term approach. If the mining were to exhausted the deposits after ten years, where would the city of Ely look like with another shut down industry. A bad fit and short sighted in my estimation. Sincerely, Jeffrey Grosscup Minneapolis,, Minnesota Jeffrey Grosscup 4801 Portland Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417

Jeffrey Hanson

18219

Hello. My name is Jeffrey Hanson. I think everybody can spell Hanson and Jeffrey. I am from Babbitt. I grew up there. I moved there when my father was hired as the industrial arts teacher, built a high school there. We lived in town for a couple of years, and then we cleared the woods on the edge of Birch Lake and built a house. I grew up looking out my bedroom window over Birch Lake. Not specifically related to the PolyMet project, but copper-nickel, Birch Lake is ground zero. The deposits are under my lake. They're by the shores of my lake, and I have been passionately concerned about that since they first discovered copper-nickel back in 1964. Ever since then, I've known sometime they're going to mine around my lake. I moved there because of mining. I live there because of mining. I know it's important. But we cannot exchange the environment for mining. It's not an either/or. It's how can we do it right. Reserve mining was built there before we had EIS statements. They had problems. They were shut down. They corrected the problems, and they opened again. The Dunka Pit of Erie Mining you can see from Birch Lake. It has drained acid into the lake and they've worked on cleaning it up. I have dedicated about the last six years of my life to saying what can we do to mine safer. I've been working on sulfide-reduction projects to clean up taconite mining in bear waters. PolyMet is on an old taconite mine site. They are helping support even my project to clean up taconite mining-impaired waters and yes, it can be done. I'm proud we're in a state, we're in a country where we go through this process of an EIS to try our level best to analyze the problems and do what can be done about it. I support the PolyMet project because they are seriously looking at those things. They are helping me research sulfide-reduction projects and how to minimize the impacts in the future through passive biological treatment. We can't do that if we don't have the industry supporting us. We have a lot at stake. There are many other projects that have happened in the taconite industry that we need to clean up, and we have to do the future of copper-nickel mining right, and I believe we can and we're really working seriously on it, and passionately. Nobody is a stronger environmentalist than I am and my lake in Babbitt.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey Iverson

47003

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Since childhood I have spent summers and winters in the Ely area as one of hundreds of thousands of annual visitors who pour millions of dollars into the area's outdoor tourism economy-clearly among the most dominant sectors of the regional economy. I continue to fish today with my father in the White Iron Lake system, which would be directly impacted by any pollution from the proposed Franconia Mine. It literally breaks my heart to realize that if this project is approved, it is likely that I will not be able to teach my son to fish in these same beautiful lakes, because as we know, past sulfide mining elsewhere has resulted in acid mine drainage causing extensive and expensive damage to water quality and the environment. Given the rarity of protected forest and lake country in America, and the undeniable preciousness of Minnesota's Superior National Forest and the nearby BWCA, I cannot understand why we would risk potentially catastrophic pollution in exchange for the short-term profits that could be earned from exploiting these lands for their limited mineral resources. I am strongly against this project, and I fear greatly that it will be approved in the end. I ask that every revision possible be made to this project to limit as much as possible the environmental damage I believe to be unavoidable, and attain every possible assurance that Polynet will pay for the cleanup necessary, and for the economic losses the region's outdoor tourism industry will suffer. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Sincerely, Jeffrey Iverson 2172 Stanford Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105 Sincerely, Mr Jeffrey Iverson 2172 Stanford Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1221

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey Kirst

40208

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jeffrey Kolnick

40018

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It's not worth it. The answer is conservation and investment in a sustainable economy. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Jeffrey Kolnick 568 State St Apt B Saint Paul, MN 55107-3094 (651) 308-7241

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey L Cerar

6630

Just a comment after looking over the EIS. I feel this is an extremely thorough document. No stone was left unturned. The amount of time, money, and effort put into this is incredible. I firmly support the project and believe that it can, and will, be done in the safest way to the surrounding lands, air, and water. As a life-long Iron Ranger and an employee in the mining industry my whole career, I see the importance of making sure things are done right (and I've seen the consequences when they are not done right). The 10+ years of study on this proposed project has given me the undoubted comfort of knowing that the Polymet project is safe. I would never voice my support if I thought otherwise, as I fish, hunt, and enjoy the beautiful areas around this project site year round. So let's finally move forward and issue the permits. What an exciting time for our area and our communities.. Jeffrey L. Cerar 7674 Woodlawn Drive Eveleth, MN 55734 218-744-1840

This electronic message and any attachments included with this message are for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to which it is intended to be addressed. This message may contain information that is privileged or confidential and thereby exempt and protected from unauthorized disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, or the use of its contents, is not authorized and is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication and are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original message from your e-mail system.

Jeffrey Lyon

47196

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to urge you to reject PolyMet's proposal to build a sulfide mine in northeastern Minnesota. As a resident of Duluth, I do not look forward to having our watershed contaminated mine run-off. The history of these mines is problematic, as they often leave behind a legacy of pollution once the mine is closed down. This is not to say that at some point, with better and cleaner technology, the metals could not be pulled out of those veins without the risk we face now with current technology. The metals will be there for the taking, and there is no rush to bring them to market at this time. Many of us who live in the Arrowhead region choose to do so because of the pristine ecosystems and natural beauty. The PolyMet mine proposal threatens to upset what ecological balance we have remaining here in the north part of the state. Clearly, more jobs are needed in the region. But extractive industries do not make for long-term economic health in small communities, which has been shown over and over again in case studies. Please do not allow construction of this mine. Sincerely, Dr Jeffrey Lyon 1125 W Victoria St Duluth, MN 55811-1694 (218) 249-0887

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeffrey Masco

18990

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Jeffrey Masco 2720 40 Ave S. 2720 40th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Jeffrey R Jukich

46403

To whom it may concern, I want to voice my support for this project. I have faith in all the agencies involved to ensure the environment is protected. I live on Bass lake(57-16) in the St Louis river watershed so water quality is of utmost importance to me. I am also a former LTV steelworker who understands the concepts of open pit mining. I think this is an appropriate use of this land and I believe the economic impact is greatly needed in this area of St Louis County. Sincerely, Jeff Jukich 4621 Bass Lake Road Gilbert, MN 55741

Jen Olson

44615

To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed mining activity in Northern Minnesota's pristine National Forests. As you know, sulfide mining produces incredibly toxic and dangerous byproducts which have the potential to contaminate our public trust resources. The EPA classifies hardrock mining as one of the nation's top polluters, and sulfide mining in particular has a terrible track record. The EPA called Polymet's environmental review "inadequate and unacceptable" in 2010- If Polymet can't prepare adequate environmental documents, how will they treat our public lands. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is the crown jewel of Minnesota-there are few other places like it anywhere in the world. I lived in Minnesota for the first 25 years of my life-I grew up and went to college in Duluth, just a few hours south of the proposed mining locations. My mom and I camped and hunted for ruffed grouse in some of the forests where Polymet is proposing to mine. All of my family still lives in MN, and it's heartbreaking to think that areas which continue to provide so much recreation, enjoyment, and food and clean water for my family and other Minnesotans could be irreparably damaged by an industry that knows and cares little about the area it may destroy. Please preserve these places in the name of wilderness, public health, and the environment. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Jennifer Olson Current address: 2699 Pleasant Avenue Eureka CA 95503 Phone: 707-502-2372

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jen Quiners 54202

I believe the mine is not beneficial to us in the long run. While the increase in resources will help the economy in the short run, the value I place on the environment is much [ILLEGIBLE] Please consider the children in your business endeavor.

Jen Y 6

This copper mine sounds like a terrible idea. Minnesota has too many times been taken advantage of by corporations that don't live up to their word (delta comes to mind) I would not trust a company to say they would do this maintenance (or pay for it) for the duration. Please do not allow this to start happening. It's bad for the environment and bad for Minnesota. The few jobs are not worth the environmental impact. Thank you. Jennifer kingsbury- yungers Sent from my iPad

Jena Ketchum 39090

---Original Message--- From: marcusandjena@gmail-com [mailto:marcusandjena@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:04 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Jena Ketchum 6740 97th St NE Monticello, MN 55362-2914

Jenn Pontinen 6069

Hello Ms Fay and the EIS Project Team, Attached is my letter regarding the PolyMet project. Thank you. Jennifer Pontinen

Jenn Young 54902

The earth doesn't belong to 360 people who could potentially benefit from jobs with PolyMet. It belongs to us all! What is being done by this mining will have ramifications, maybe not for our Earth now but the Earth of our descendants decades & centuries from now everywhere! Pollution doesn't care where it goes & what it destroys.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jenna Grove

18275

Jenna Grove. I am the grassroots project manager at Clean Water Action and I am here to voice my concern about allowing PolyMet to open the copper-nickel mine here in Minnesota. I am worried that on top of the negative environmental impact, the impact on the economy and the potential burden to taxpayers, that if approved, there will be an opening of the floodgates for more sulfide mining across northern Minnesota. We know that sulfide mining has a significant impact on our environment and with such a water intensive area, that waste rock, when it is exposed to air and water, yields that sulfuric acid, which will produce that harmful pollution. And according to PolyMet's own reports, this pollution will last a minimum of 200 years at the mine site and 500 at the plant site. And it just really doesn't seem responsible, especially with only 20 years of mining. And I do understand the appeal of the creation of new jobs and economic stimulation. And in a perfect world, there would be no environmental degradation and PolyMet would offer all of its employment opportunities to members of local communities and the resources that they planned to mine would be endless, but that is obviously not realistic and we know what implications this will have on our environment. The mining companies will typically import employees from elsewhere and only half of those jobs will go to members of local communities. The metals that will be extracted are most likely going to be exported, putting profits in shareholders' pockets rather than in the pockets of Minnesotans. The resources are not limitless and eventually will become depleted, and ultimately these mining companies will pack up, absolve themselves of their responsibility left behind and move on to the next profitable opportunity, leaving our once pristine environment both polluted and destructed for the next few hundred years. Those jobs will be lost and remind us of the dramatic collapse of the 1980s and could possibly become vulnerable to the boom and bust cycle of mining again. In a report prepared by Thomas Michael Power of the economics department at the University of Montana, it states that, "Environmental quality is not just a matter of prettiness or aesthetic preference, it is an essential part of any region's economic base and potential for economic vitality. He also adds that the question here is whether the public benefits and costs justify approving the proposal. When total costs exceed the benefits, economic rationality would call for the mining project to be rejected. That's all.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jenna Spicer

14928

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Jenni OLink

45100

The SDEIS for the Poly Met Mining Project is flawed and does not guarantee that sulfide mining can be done in Minnesota without seriously harming water and habitat. This project should not go forwaRd Sincerely, Jennifer O'Link

Jennie Manar

40089

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Jennie Manar 13001 Pennock Ave Trlr 95 Apple Valley, MN 55124-8598

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Adams

16656

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jennifer Adams 1200 27th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

50039

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jennifer Adams 1200 27th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Applebaum

17186

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jennifer Applebaum 1Fletcher place Hopkins, MN 55305

50451

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jennifer Applebaum 1Fletcher place Hopkins, MN 55305

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Austin

14

To Whom It May Concern: According to a DNR press release, the supplemental draft of the Environmental Impact Statement for Polymet's NorthMet project will be released on the federal register today. I've been searching the register this morning and have not been able to find the draft. Would you be able to direct me to where I can find it. Thank you. Jennifer Austin Reporter KBJR-TV HYPERLINK "<http://www.nncnow-com/>"www.nncnow-com (218) 969-8104

Jennifer Brajdich

40163

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Gross

44056

To Whom it May Concern, First off, thank you for taking the time to read my comment. I'm sure the average demographic responses the DNR is receiving is from middle-aged people with strong personal ties to the BWCA. I am a 23 year old woman and want to say what happens and doesn't happen in northern Minnesota in the coming years matters to my generation too. A few summers ago, I worked up north in Ely a resort where I was first exposed to the idea of mining for precious metal. The resort I worked at was on the Kawishiwi River, near the BWCA. That same summer, there was some exploratory mining going on around the Kawishiwi and Birch Lake. We could hear that mining that was happening 3/4 of a mile or more away. Talk about ruining the aesthetic appeal of the Northwoods. As I learned more about Polymet's plans to mine in the area, I became more and more concerned. The waters in that area are all connected. I think it's a huge gamble to take mining in such an environment where a mistake is not only colossal and can potentially harm waters that go into Lake Superior and also into Canada, but any mistake would also be very expensive. In the event that the water becomes contaminated, I highly doubt Polymet is going to see the treatment of the water through for the next 500 years. Inevitably, the burden will fall on the tax payers or possibly even go without being treated. That risk alone, I think should caution people when they consider mining in northern Minnesota. 500 years of water treatment, potentially ruined the lynx and moose habitat, and wild rice patties – is this worth 15 or 20 years of jobs. I'm not convinced. I might be more inclined to the idea of mining in such a sensitive area if Polymet instead considered underground mining, but it sounds like the plan is to use open pit mining, in which case run-off water is harmful to the environment, yet guaranteed. Given what is at stake, I find mining for precious metals dangerous to the environment, to the aesthetic appeal of the BWCA, and to our tax payers. Instead of looking at the big picture: what are we going to leave behind on this earth for our children, mining in the area is a way to make money and a short-term solution. I am lucky enough to have experienced the BWCA myself and readily enjoy a good hiking and fishing trip in the Northwoods. My experiences have taught me an important lesson that most people would benefit from, and that is to walk more gently upon our earth. Thank you, Jennifer Gross Operations Coordinator Stop Loss Cost Containment Team ING US 20 Washington Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55401 612-342-7191 HYPERLINK "mailto:jennifer.gross@us.ing-com"jennifer.gross@us.ing-com ING US (NYSE: VOYA) Becoming Voya™ Financial in 2014 ----- NOTICE: The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential and intended only for certain recipients. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or other use of this communication and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender by reply transmission and delete the message without copying or disclosing it.

=====

Jennifer Jewell Thomas

10280

Dear DNR: My family has enjoyed wilderness camping in the BWCA Wilderness Area nearly every year for over 30 years. The area is one of the treasures of the State of Minnesota and the nation. The pristine waters are essential to the appeal of the area for the vital tourist industry that supports visitors like me. The long-term risk to water quality from the proposed PolyMet mining is enormous and the potential benefit is very small. The few mining-related jobs that would go to Minnesotans would be quickly offset by the devastation in the tourist industry that would result from long-term contamination of the watershed. Only small errors in the water-flow models could lead to the destruction of the wilderness. The potential gain is small and the risk is enormous. Residents in West Virginia know, all too well, that contaminated drinking water destroys jobs and basic livability of a community. Minnesota is better than that. Please do not approve this or other mines in or near the wilderness area or watersheds. Jennifer Jewell Thomas 4744 Thomas Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410 HYPERLINK "mailto:jjt@jjthomas-net"jjt@jjthomas-net H: 612-920-4246 C: 612-386-5724

58112

My family has enjoyed wilderness camping in the BWCA Wilderness Area nearly every year for over 30 years. The area is one of the treasures of the State of Minnesota and the nation. The pristine waters are essential to the appeal of the area for the vital tourist industry that supports visitors like me. The long-term risk to water quality from the proposed PolyMet mining is enormous and the potential benefit is very small. The few mining-related jobs that would go to Minnesotans would be quickly offset by the devastation in the tourist industry that would result from long-term contamination of the watershed. Only small errors in the water-flow models could lead to the destruction of the wilderness. The potential gain is small and the risk is enormous. Residents in West Virginia know, all too well, that contaminated drinking water destroys jobs and basic livability of a community. Minnesota is better than that. Please do not approve this or other mines in or near the wilderness area or watersheds.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Lasch 41895

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jennifer Lasch 11213 President Dr NE Blaine, MN 55434-1774

Jennifer Libby 54683

See attachment

Jennifer Lund 14922

Good morning. The PolyMet project, NorthMet, will create a positive addition to the area and the state of Minnesota as a whole. The estimated \$10 billion in estimated impact over the twenty years of the project (study by UMD) will help the region to flourish. This growth and sustainability will help families create a stable base for a successful and happy life in our state. When it comes to mining, the concern always comes up about the environmental effects of the project. However, PolyMet has openly addressed and alleviated my concerns. With the federal regulations being strictly regulated and the increase in the technology behind the mining process, preserving the environment appears to be top of mind. Keeping the outdoors as beautiful as they are now is extremely important, and I feel that Poly Met Mining, a Minnesota Corporation, understands that as well. With all of the precautions being taken and the jobs that will be created by the project, we cannot afford to say no. PolyMet has my full support. Thank you for your time. Jenny Lund Payroll Administrator Industrial Lubricant Company P.O. Box 70 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 (218) 328-0263 tel | (218) 328-0259 fax
HYPERLINK "<http://www.industriallubricant-com/>"www.industriallubricant-com cid:image003-png@01CE99AF.096E6780

Jennifer Lynch 57222

The resources we have in NE Minnesota are far too valuable to risk with introducing sulfide mining. The “technology” to prevent polluting our waters are not new and have not proven to be safe. We have the largest source of fresh water in our hands to protect for our children and grandchildren – please do not risk contaminating it. Jennifer Lynch 2650 NE McKinley St Minneapolis, MN 55418

Jennifer Marabella 42767

See attachment

Jennifer Osufsen 7372

Good Afternoon, This area desperately needs the jobs that PolyMet can provide, and all the research and preparation has shown this operation will be a responsible and profitable venture for everyone involved. Please support the people of the Iron Range and allow PolyMet to begin mining. Thank you, Jennifer Osufsen Aurora, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

jennifer p

16585

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jennifer p 640 st paul, MN 55101

49991

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jennifer p 640 st paul, MN 55101

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Pearson

4222

Dec 31, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Pearson

10061

Jan 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

42802

See attachment

Jennifer Popernack

43863

- HYPERLINK "<https://s3-amazonaws-com/uploads.wisestamp-com/63a47253aaf32896212fc5a85d32a210/1364504875-png.chaching=none>"photoJennifer Lynn Popernack Technology Services Assistant Humanities, B.A. History, Politics, and Gender Studies c: (218) 409 0356

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Rials

39227

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Jennifer Rials 13068 Vernon Ave Savage, MN 55378-2429 (952) 953-3180

Jennifer Saran

47832

March 13, 2014 VIA EMAIL Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: PolyMet Mining Comments on NorthMet SDEIS Dear Ms Fay: On behalf of PolyMet Mining, I am pleased to provide the attached comments on the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Completion of the EIS and issuance of the Clean Water Act Section 404 permit are critically important, and we appreciate the hard work that the DNR, US Forest Service and US Army Corps of Engineers have put into this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at 651-600-5457- Sincerely, Jennifer HYPERSLINK "http://www.polymetminning-com/"Description: Description: Description: Description: Description: Description: Description: cid:6AFFE152-73DD-4C01-990F-8A7BF909FA71 Jennifer Saran Director of Environmental Permitting and Compliance Mobile: 651-600-5457 | Office: 651-389-4108 | Fax: 651-389-4101 HYPERSLINK "mailto:jsaran@polymetminning-com"jsaran@polymetminning-com | HYPERSLINK "http://www.polymetminning-com/"www.polymetminning-com This message is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient. The message and any files transmitted with it may contain material that is confidential and/or legally privileged. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Schultz

41050

To whom it may concern, As the mother of two young children, I care deeply about environmental issues. I am dedicated to protecting and preserving our environment for my sons and all Minnesotans. There is no substitute for clean water. As an economist, the issue of pollution has special resonance as well. Pollution is a way that businesses and others pass part of the cost of operation off to other people, especially current and future taxpayers. For the public to make an informed decision and to protect our environment many things need to happen. There are more than twenty sites in the Duluth Complex that are designated as potential mining operations. Any review of the environmental impact of mining should require assessment of the impact of all of the projects together, not piecemeal analysis of one project at a time. No project should start before this analysis is performed. There should be no change to our allowable limits for water quality. These limits are the result of unbiased application of the best scientific information. To allow them to be significantly altered - by as much as 28 times more allowable pollution - in response to political and financial pressure is not acceptable. It is my understanding that the techniques planned for water purification are incapable of reaching required water standards today, much less complying to those standards for hundreds of years in the future. The project should be stopped if it cannot meet our existing, scientifically established, standards. Allowing our regulatory agencies to issue variances to pollute is not acceptable. In addition to the water quality issues being addressed, rational assessment requires evaluation of pollution by many other potential contaminants that are being ignored. This includes not only mercury, arsenic, and other chemical pollutants, but also both air and water pollution with small mineral fibers. These have been shown to cause cancers. We should not be threatening our lives and our children's and grandchildren's lives for short-term gains. Financial guarantees should require indemnification not just for the estimated minimum \$450 million cost for closing the project, but for potential costs of chronic or catastrophic failures of safety systems. The legislature should pass laws to ensure this, requiring bonding guarantees in the billions of dollars. Mining companies should be held responsible or not be allowed to operate. These costs should not fall on taxpayers, as they have so often elsewhere. Good quality on-going monitoring and assessment of environmental impact and pollution will be critical from day one until hundreds of years in the future, in order to assure public safety. To provide for this, we will need to hire many trained technicians and invest in scientific instruments to perform continuous monitoring on an independent basis. Funds to pay for this should come from taxes on the mining operations themselves, and should not be passed off to general taxpayers. These new taxes should be passed by the legislature to pay for independent monitoring now and for centuries to come. Finally, any intelligent approach to developing extensive new mining should include a comprehensive, unbiased economic cost-benefit analysis. Benefits of new jobs created and new taxes generated must be weighed against the costs of pollution and costs to existing businesses and residents, including the impact on the recreation and tourism industry. Increased costs of public infrastructure, of monitoring and of possible abatement of environmental impact must be included in these calculations. Unless this type of analysis is made before starting operations, we have no way of knowing if this project is a benefit or a detriment to society's welfare. Development should stop until this analysis is complete. Potential guarantees based on supposed adequate performance in mining operations elsewhere are not sufficient. The history of industrial catastrophes

Jennifer Seeger

41916

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jennifer Seeger Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jennifer Stokes 41609

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jennifer Stokes Saint Paul, Minnesota

Jennifer Tudor 40044

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Jennifer Tudor 3960 Jackson St NE Columbia Heights, MN 55421-3943 (612) 267-2612

Jenny Brude 42820

See attachment

Jenny Hanlon 38590

Please stop destroying our beautiful planet Sent from my iPad

Jenny Kedward 58115

I understand and appreciate the work put into the SDEIS. Based on the EIS, I cannot support a mining operation that would leave the state or federal government liable for actions of one business. Water quality is evolving constantly. This EIS does not address new concerns or proposed limits of water treatment. And even with the best WWTPs, pollution is still possible. Lead pollution is stated as inevitability with this plan. We know for certain the health and environmental risks associated with lead and mercury. China is the main consumer of copper – more that all other countries put together. I do not feel we need to destroy our land, air, and water to feed Asian growth. We have also not exhausted our recycling efforts for copper. As a recycling educator, I see firsthand what precious metals we send to the landfill.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jenny McDermott

40108

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Jenny McDermott 4055 Meadowbrook Ln Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-4608 (952) 935-7509

Jenny Putnam

39101

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan
Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model
In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corpor

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jenny Putnam

39110

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan
Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model
In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporati

Jensen Ronald J

44754

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed PolyMet sulfide mining project in Minnesota, and my serious concerns with the flawed SDEIS. This project should not go forward As a 35-year Minnesotan, I consider the BWCA and Superior National Forest to be a state and national treasure, and a place that I personally enjoy and support financially several times every year. It is a place of spiritual renewal, and truly one of the best things about living in Minnesota. When I go the DNR website, I see drop-down menus for “recreation”, “destinations”, “nature”, “education/safety”, and “licenses/permits/regs.” I do not see “mining” anywhere. My hope is that the DNR will continue to protect our natural resources for the use of all Minnesota citizens, rather than allowing the environment to be destroyed for the benefit of a Canadian corporation and a few hundred jobs. I sympathize with the workers in NE Minnesota who need jobs, but I don’t think their employment in a boom-and-bust industry like mining is worth the cost to the other 5 million Minnesotans and the entire country, for generations to come. Past history shows that it is not a question of “if”, but “how bad” the environmental impact of sulfide mining will be, and in this regard, I think the SDEIS is seriously flawed in its water flow models, estimates of habitat destruction, and cost/risk models for environmental clean-up. There is no reason to believe data or performance that has not been previously demonstrated. I urge you to think of the greater good of all Minnesotans, our precious natural resources, and generations to come, and not give in to short term economic interests. My ultimate hope is that sulfide mining will never occur in northeast Minnesota, but at a minimum, I expect the DNR to demand an EIS that is accurate and comprehensive. The current SDEIS does not meet the standards I expect for Minnesota. Thank you, Ronald Jensen 9704 Oxborough Road, Bloomington, MN 55437

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jere Wilkerson

40385

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jere Wilkerson 1680 Linden Ct. Cambria, CA 93428 US

Jeremiah Boe

16739

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jeremiah Boe 529 Henry Lane Lino Lakes, MN 55014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeremiah Boe

50099

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jeremiah Boe 529 Henry Lane Lino Lakes, MN 55014

Jeremy Beck

43075

I have many concerns regarding the Polymet mine. The key ones are: 500 year cleanup - Who is going to be maintaining this cleanup operation, especially when Polymet or Glencore are no longer in business. Flawed Water Study - The water modeling was done using water flow data from a time with historically low water levels. I feel more representative data should be used to assess the full impact. Contaminant breach - We've had several 1,000 year floods in the last few years. What happens in the event that the containment basin is overflows or is otherwise breached. Our water resources in NE Minnesota are far more valuable than the mineral resources. This proposed project is far too risky to Lake Superior and the surrounding watershed. NO to Polymet and their proposed mine. Jeremy Beck 415 University Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55413

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeremy Reichenberger

9477

"You've all heard that northern Minnesota is home to one of largest copper deposits in the world. It's not. It doesn't even come close. At peak production, this mine would produce 72 million pounds per year. The largest copper mine in the United States, which doesn't even make the list of the top 10 mines in the world, is the Morenci mine in Arizona, which produces 1 billion pounds a year. People ask, can we trust PolyMet. It's not PolyMet we need to trust. It is Glencore Xstrata, the primary owner of PolyMet, which [reportedly] will buy the rest of PolyMet once all the permits are in place. So, who is Glencore Xstrata. Glencore Xstrata is a Swiss-based firm known for its ruthlessness. It is the fourth-largest mining company in the world. It controls 50 percent of the world's copper through its ownership of more than 100 mines around the world, and its commodities trading operations. Glencore Xstrata has run up a long list of labor and environmental abuses, including 58 mining fatalities between 2008 and 2010, over twice the number reported by any other mining company over that period. Just in 2012, their environmental and labor record includes dumping raw acid in waterways in the Congo, failure to provide a vapor barrier to keep an acid mist from descending on 3,000 people in Zambia, utilizing child labor as young as 10 years old in mines in Congo, and causing environmental damage at its McArthur River mine in Australia. Can we trust these people to do it right' in Minnesota. I think not." - Ron Sternal of St Louis Park, a retired Wall Street executive speaking at a public forum on the PolyMet mining project in Northern Minnesota - Jeremy Reichenberger University of Minnesota [HYPERLINK "mailto:vicke034@umn.edu"](mailto:vicke034@umn.edu) reich298@umn.edu Confidentiality Notice: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you think you have received this message in error, please advise the sender and then delete this message and any attachments immediately.

Jeremy Swanson

39363

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. These are sad times we live in when corporations and government care less about the real people that have to live here and only about the bottom line. My wife and I are already researching other states to move to that value natural resources and human life and wildlife more than money. We'll be prepared to move when and if these mines are approved, it will be disheartening, but we literally and physically and mentally cannot support such disdain for the wildlife and nature of this state and country. We've seen programs where PolyMet 'claims' they're environmentally safe and have cleaned up their act. They say they'll implement cleaning acts to help with ground water contamination [a clear admission of fault in and of itself] once their new mining facilities are opened. If they really cared about the environment, why wait for mines to open, clean up the water now, show the people they care. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jeremy Swanson PO Box 140 Mora, MN 55051-0140

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jeremy Swanson 48694

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. These are sad times we live in when corporations and government care less about the real people that have to live here and only about the bottom line. My wife and I are already researching other states to move to that value natural resources and human life and wildlife more than money. We'll be prepared to move when and if these mines are approved, it will be disheartening, but we literally and physically and mentally cannot support such disdain for the wildlife and nature of this state and country. We've seen programs where PolyMet 'claims' they're environmentally safe and have cleaned up their act. They say they'll implement cleaning acts to help with ground water contamination [a clear admission of fault in and of itself] once their new mining facilities are opened If they really cared about the environment, why wait for mines to open, clean up the water now, show the people they care. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jeremy Swanson PO Box 140 Mora, MN 55051-0140

Jerilyn Breitreutz 39915

unsubscribe me. On Thu, Mar 6, 2014 at 6:05 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)
"mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Jerome 54733

See attachment

Jerome A Challman 42763

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerome Comeau

18900

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Jerome Comeau 3316 Emerson Ave S 3316 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408 612-825-4049

Jerome Ekre

57560

I live approximately one mile north of the Clay County, MN Landfill. This was sited in the 1970's with permission from the State. It was placed on a water recharge area with only a clay liner. The site leaked VOC's into the shallow water table. Follow-up has been to transfer waste and relining most of the original site. The liner is heavy tough plastic. The local governments and the State have learned some tough lessons. The state has been improving and regulating the site. If the local and State-Federal governments allow the Poly-Met mining project the investors and the employees will benefit. Use of this resource will be needed. The land exchange sounds to be a reasonable action. Extreme environmental groups and a few local "Not in My Back Yard Groups" can best be used to lobby for the best science to protect the area and extract the resources. The Laws must be used to make the best and safe use of the resource. I see nothing from this project but knowledge of how to use the resource with safety and provide jobs in an area where Iron has been removed in some of the area. This is an environment that has been used. Some of the Iron sites will have a use and be cleaned up in the future. Allow this project. Thank You Jerome Ekre 18059 17th Ave South Hawley, MN 56549 218-937-5504

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerome Kernes

33648

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest REGISTER TO VOTE AND VOTE I AM 81 YRS. OLD AND LIVE WITH MY WIFE ON MY SOC.Sec I AM A VOTER REGISTRAR AND ELECTION JUDGE. THERE IS ONLY ONE WAY TO ACHIEVE REFORM: FIGHT TO HAVE ALL AMERICANS REGISTER AND VOTE. ALSO, THE RIGHT TO VOTE MUST BE DEFENDED AND PROTECTED. VOTER SUPPRESSION IN ALL OF THE REPUBLICANS DESPERATE ATTEMPTS TO PREVENT VOTING IS THE GREATEST THREAT TO OUR LIBERTIES AND FREEDOMS WAKE UP AMERICA. IT IS PRACTICALLY OUR LAST CHANCE TO PREVENT THE COMPLETE TAKE OVER OF AMERICA. MANY DEMOCRATS HAVE ALSO CONTRIBUTED AND PARTICIPATED IN THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR MIDDLE CLASS ENABLING THE MILITARY AND INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX TO WEAKEN THE ECONOMY BY REMOVING BANK REGULATIONS AND ALLOWING THE RICHEST AMONG US TO AVOID PAYING TAXES, INCLUDING SUBSIDIES AND A HOST OF LOOPHOLES. INSTEAD, THE TAX ISSUE IS BURIED IN WASHINGTON UNDER MEDIA SPIN AND SIDE ISSUES CONTRIBUTING NOTHING TO PROGRESS OF UNDERSTANDING WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO THE 47 PERCENT OF AMERICA, ABOUT WHOM MITT ROMNEY INADVERTENTLY MADE REFERENCE. JEROME S. KERNES, DES PLAINES, IL Sincerely, Jerome Kernes 9735 Sumac Rd Apt 418 Des Plaines, IL 60016-1730 (847) 736-0001

Jerri Ann Walseth

54150

I think this is a terrible plan. I think it will lead to pollution that no one will want to pay to clean up. Please do not allow this to proceed. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Jerritt Johnston

44701

To whom it may concern: The PolyMet SDEIS is deeply flawed and should not be accepted. There are numerous, significant problems throughout the document, but four stand out to me. 1- The models used to predict water flow are inaccurate and do not match actual rate of water flowing from the site. This means that all the amount of pollution and impact on the Partridge River and subsequent waterways are underestimated. After this many years of study, if PolyMet cannot accurately measure water flow, they are not competent enough to operate a mine in this area. 2- Minnesota state law requires that closed mines be maintenance free. Two hundred years of water treatment at one location and 500 years of treatment at the other do not meet that requirement. PolyMet fails that test Even those numbers are suspect, as the model used ends at those years because there is no longer a change in the level of pollution. It does not stop because the pollution has been eliminated. Also, no amount of financial assurance that a company will be willing to pay will cover the costs of maintaining this site in perpetuity. 3- There is not enough attention paid to cumulative effects of this project in relation with past iron and taconite mining in the area. More importantly, cumulative effects need to be addressed in relation to other copper-nickel mining projects moving forward in this region of the state. 4- As with work supporting much of this document, the socio-economic impact section is lacking. It was prepared using an IMPLAN model, which has been shown to overestimate the impact of new economic activity. Even with those biases, the document states that employment will only be increased by about one percent in the region. This is not a compelling reason to move forward with a project that will cause this much damage. As a resident of Ely, and someone who cares greatly about the economic and environmental viability of this region, I have no confidence in PolyMet's ability to safely operate a copper-nickel mine. The Superior National Forest and the woods in northeastern Minnesota are among our greatest assets. To destroy these assets to mine for possibly 20 years is failing the DNR's mission to manage our resources and is in direct conflict with the Forest Service's responsibility to manage the forest for multiple uses. Sincerely, Jerritt Johnston 737 5th Ave S Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerrold Gershone 41938

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Dear Ms Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Please reject the proposed mine. Future generations will thank us for our foresight in protecting this environmentally sensitive area. Thank you, Jerrold Gershone Sincerely, Mr Jerrold Gershone 13111 April Ln Minnetonka, MN 55305-2735

Jerry & Nancy Irsfeld 42783

See attachment

jerry and Shirlee maertens 45301

To whom it may concern: Please accept and consider my comments regarding the above mining SDEIS by PolyMet Inc. Although a lay person (me) is ill-prepared to technically review any document of this magnitude and formally prepare comments that are “informed, specific and relevant” to the SDEIS as prescribed by the agencies, still, I have attempted to be specific and relevant to those items I have addressed. My concern is about all the types of environmental degradation that usually always occur with large land transformations. True natural areas are becoming less and less and what often replaces them are the scars and contaminations left on the land for future generations to deal with. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR MINING - Alternative for the “need” to mine and JOBS It is stated that the purpose and need for this mining project is to meet the “rising global demand” for these products to domestic and world markets. Just how great is this “demand” at this time. It seems that there could be a possible ALTERNATIVE to mining at this time also. Before we mine our deposits here in Minnesota with an unproven method of copper sulfide mining, we should consider and make an honest attempt to recycle these same metals from the electronics that we as Americans so readily discaRd This trash waste stream is also a rich resource in and of itself and certainly provides more sustainability than does depleting the raw resources in the earth. (Personally, I think it’s more about someone being able to make \$\$\$ from a perhaps ‘easier’ method than the ‘dirty’ process of recycling.) JOBS Certainly there is a need for jobs--and there will always will be a need for jobs as the population grows, but the 300-400 permanent jobs that this mining project provides for only 20 years is a small number in the long-term scheme of things, and likewise for the spin-off jobs---a short-term fix if you can call it that. And after the mine closes, where will the next set of jobs for the area come from. It really is not worth the uncertainty and cost of possible consequences to the waters and land in that area at this time. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT - WATER Waters are perhaps the most important and major concern of mine. Surface and groundwaters are unequivocally one of and perhaps the most important “element” of our natural commons. (Right.) Any project that poses or threatens harm and degradation to water should not be allowed to go forward until such time that it can be shown/proven that the project actually works as described in the mining process and operations description. Why would you risk Minnesota’s waters and lands. We should be at least as cautionary as Wisconsin who evidently has a prove-it-first policy or standaRd Michigan’s situation remains to be seen. The fact that evidently no where on earth has copper sulfide mining been benign to the environment should not go unheeded. So the process of reverse osmosis has not “stood the test of time” and is only part of the total operation. 1- I am concerned that this process of chemical extraction in order to separate copper and other metals from the sulfide rock material requires vast amounts of water that have the potential of polluting or contaminating surface and ground water quality. To even (having to) refer to water treatment after (only) 20 years of mining, for 200 or to 500 years after the mining has shut down is unthinkable; it is human hubris to the nth degree. NO ONE can assure any of us, the citizens of Minnesota, that treatment would be feasible into the future for hundreds of years and who can tell what the real cost would be. Citizens in places like some of Montana’s mining are paying millions annually for clean-up from mining companies who walked away after filing bankruptcy. In addition, natural calamities happen all the time; WHO can guarantee that something will not occur to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerry Fruetel

45684

If this project is approved, Minnesota will be exposed to enormous environmental and financial risks. If we get this wrong, we risk ruining the environment in one of the most pristine areas of the state, and incurring enormous financial costs for generations to come. Should that occur, the value of the jobs and other economic benefits created by this project will pale in comparison to the damage done. Therefore, I urge each and every regulator on this project to gather your courage, remind yourself of what's at stake, and do your utmost to protect Minnesota's environment and minimize its financial exposure. You should approve this project if, AND ONLY IF, stringent environmental protections and financial assurances are firmly in place. Minnesotans now and for generations to come are depending on you (regulators) to make the right call. Set the bar high, and do not not compromise your standards or judgment in the face of pressures from Polymet, unions, or local leaders who understandably are motivated more by short term economic interests than by the long term well-being of our state. We're counting on you to get this right, and so are millions of future Minnesotans.

Jerry Fryberger

18191

My name is Connie Smallman, C-O-N-N-I-E, S-M-A-L-L-M-A-N. I've been a 25-year member of Local 49 Operating Engineers. I mostly run backhoe and that big yellow, heavy equipment. The one lady who spoke earlier was wondering if a union job was a good-paying job. I'm a single mother of two. I raise my kids all by myself with good pay, good health benefits, and I look forward to a good pension in the future. I yield the rest of my time to Jerry Fryberger. Thank you. Thank you. I am honored to be here. My name is Jerry Fryberger, F-R-Y-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm a lifelong resident for my 76 years and counting in Duluth, Minnesota. I work for the same company, Hallett Companies, in Duluth for 50 years and counting. One of the companies we have is Hallett Dock Company in Duluth. We are in the business of handling, storing and shipping bulk commodities from our three facilities in the Duluth-Superior harbor. We ship by truck, by rail and by vessel. We ship to folks in Minnesota, Wisconsin, throughout the Great Lakes, Eastern Canada, Europe and South America. And I have, like so many of you here, have read parts of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the PolyMet project. I questioned the three co-lead agencies; namely, the US Corps of Engineers, the Department of Natural Resources, and the US Forest Service to get a better understanding. You see, I lived here for a long time. I started paddling with my family when I was nine years old in 1946, and I've been going ever since in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and adjacent Quetico Provincial Park. And I love the clean water, I love the clean air. I like to be able to paddle and sit around the campfire and look at the constellations in clear skies, and that's an environmentalist right to the core. And I am embracing the PolyMet project in my backyard simply because of the superlative job that the H. Cody Agencies (ph) have done. They have done their due diligence. They rolled up their sleeves, rolled up their socks, and made sure that we're going to have a continuation of clean water, clean air and clean skies. I want to particularly honor and thank the leadership provided from these agencies; namely John Stein, who's Commissioner for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Cam Foss, who is Commissioner -- or Director of Mining, Tom Landwehr for the Department of Natural Resources, Tamara Cameron for the US Corps of Engineers and Brenda Halter. I thank you very much.

Jerry Giefer

39752

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jerry Giefer 1252 2nd Ave N Windom, MN 56101-1557 (507) 831-1316

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerry Groeneveld

4335

Jerry Groeneveld 943 Wales Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616 218-834-9552 n0Mrjerry@gmail-com I'm a retired chemical engineer that worked for a major Minnesota company for 35 years. I contributed to many EIS reports for projects where I did research and development, plant design, and startup. I want this and other northern Minnesota noble metal mining projects to succeed because of the value to the area and our country. However, I must also be respectful to my many friends that oppose these projects. I've read a good deal of the report but must apologize up front if I missed sections that describe process and chemistry that I need to form an opinion. I believe these type mining operations can be run in an environmentally friendly manner but I was surprised to see what I believe to be a lot of details missing from the report. Details that I need are the entire physical and chemical process throughout the operation. Again, sorry if I missed this in the report. I read of the physical mining and crushing operation, some sketchy words on a dual flotation operation, a few words on a heat treatment and a large discussion of the disposal of waste. There is mention of RO (reverse osmosis) purification of water. I believe missing is the chemistry, material balance, energy balance and control strategy throughout the entire operation. There may be some trade secrets in parts of the operation but these can be handled in an open manner and with generic chemicals. Each part of the entire operation should have a detailed material balance of all inputs and outputs including physical and energy inputs and outputs. Process control should be included to show the process is well understood to avoid upsets. An additional value of a detailed process overview is that there might be waste streams that can be a valuable byproduct of these operations. Byproducts can be additional revenue and eliminate the possibility of these products being slowly leached into the water or vented to the air. More details can lead to increased yield of the desired minerals and even discovery of other valuable products. Details of an energy balance can show unusually large energy usages that can be reduced. Another item that could be valuable is a comparison to ferrous mining that has been done successfully for many years. How do the waste streams compare, how are they handled and what have been the problems Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on this report. If more process details are forthcoming I would appreciate the opportunity to read.
Jerry Groeneveld

Jerry Hallead

29940

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest This is an egregious attack on the human, animal and environmental state of this region of the United States and will very certainly have destructive effects that will never be reversible. I would direct your attention to the unspeakable damage to the environment in the mountains of West Virginia from open coal mining. Please do not allow this to happen in Minnesota and Michigan. Please keep these States and the wilderness areas, that most certainly will be affected, in the pristine condition that is now enjoyed, so that it can be enjoyed for generations to come. Sincerely, Jerry Hallead 3627 Matador W Apt 42 Traverse City, MI 49684-4651 (231) 510-6039

Jerry Kahlert

51581

Dec 23, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The known - and unknown - hazards of sulfide mining demand that any permit granted for mining in Minnesota be conditioned on a posted bond sufficient to cover the costs of mitigating any and all of those hazards. Beyond that, the state must first be assured by all competent authorities that this project will not damage Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations. The state must recognize that the mining of precious metals beneath our surface may first require the development of new mining technologies. In this regard, would-be miners should be encouraged to contribute funding for research by the University of Minnesota and work with the University to develop those safe mining practices. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jerry Kahlert 900 Robert St S Apt 110 Saint Paul, MN 55118-1484 (612) 839-0725

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jerry Pederson 9747

This email is in support of the project that will provide jobs for union families at the PolyMet North Project in Northern Minnesota. Jerry Pederson | APi Construction | Vice President of Construction | 1100 Old Highway 8 NW | New Brighton, MN 55112 | Providing Mechanical Insulation, Scaffolding and Refractory Services | P: 651-604-2718 | C: 651-271-8803 | HYPERLINK "<http://www.apiconst-com/>" www.apiconst-com | HYPERLINK "<http://www.youtube-com/watch.v=igUTx5Yjhz0andfeature=youtu.be>" API_VIDEO "WE LIVE BY OUR VALUES. OUR RESULTS SELL THEMSELVES."

Jerry Stahnke 54877

See attachment

Jerry Witcher 40307

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jerry Witcher 416 Rail Overlook Adairsville, GA 30103 US

Jerry Witte 7707

The current ferrous mining has old mine and current mines tailings that produce acid runoff into ground water, streams and rivers. The level of this runoff is at or beyond the level that nature can naturally clean it up. From what I read in the EIS is that the Polymet mine will also allow a degree of acid seepage into a water system that is already at or beyond its pollution max. Reverse osmosis water treatment is Polymet's solution to the bulk of there process to minimize the pollution. I propose a moratorium on the Polymet mining process until a working reverse osmosis water treatment can be installed at the worst polluting ferrous tailing pit or mine. This will prove the technology works, the cost of the technology, and the cost of the hundreds of years of filtering that will be needed. If the watershed shows improvement, then the cleaner waterways will be able to accommodate the add planned runoff of the Polymet mine. Jerry Witte Duluth MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jess Walczak

40181

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Jess Walczak 1680 Westminster St Saint Paul, MN 55130-3039

Jesse Bearheart

39576

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a wild rice harvester and a First Nations person who depends on subsistence living I am most concerned about the legacy that sulfide mining companies of any kind would leave behind. We need to address the concerns for the Earth and all living things for the next seven generations and hopefully leave it better than we found it. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jesse Bearheart 8387 Beatty Rd Cook, MN 55723-8802 (218) 666-0279

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jesse Dermody

40708

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Respect the good earth, our only home while we're physically alive. Sincerely, Mr Jesse Dermody 8484 Arkola Rd Kelsey, MN 55724-8032

Jesse Peterson

18133

Hi. I'm Jesse Peterson and I'm from Duluth. I want to talk a little bit about some of the job creation that has gone on with the PolyMet mine. One of the jobs created was a wonderful job for a poor fellow who's been pining to have his life put back together ever since the BP oil spill. His name is Tony Hayward and he's got a job with Glencore, which is the lead investor in PolyMet. He doesn't have such a great record, and I'd like to just speak to Glencore a little bit. I think it's highly inappropriate to do business with a company that's manufactured famines as a way of doing speculative trading to inflate the price of food and they've also been implemented sitting on ore to inflate the value. And so they're a criminal organization. They're invested in PolyMet and I think it's highly inappropriate to be working with them and that it behoove us that if this is inevitably done it eventually can be done right, that we do not do business with people who have been implemented in exploiting child labor, killing organizers and union members in other mining projects around the world. And now, I'd like to speak to some stuff that has been done properly in the SDEIS. The PolyMet SDEIS artificially limited cumulative-effects discussion of water quality to just the Partridge and Embarrass Rivers. The St. Louis River was left out completely. This cuts out anyone who be fishes or eats fish caught downstream in the St. Louis River and Lake Superior and ignores the impacts on the Fond du Lac Tribal Waters. It is not good science. The PolyMet Project would increase mercury in the Embarrass River and could increase mercury methylation near the mine site, as well. Increases in mercury or sulfates at PolyMet could increase mercury in the fish in the St. Louis River. Both existing LTV tailing seeps and the other mine discharges flowing into the St. Louis River also carry high levels of specific conductance which the EPA has found can be toxic to fish. Tribal research shows that specific conductance is the water chemistry signature for mining discharge that can take more than 100 miles to dissipate. Cumulative analysis of water quality impacts in the SDEIS must include the St. Louis River and must specifically analyze impacts on mercury contamination of fish and impacts of specific conductance levels on fish. So I feel it would be very important for these things be done and that this is an inadequate document done, so far. It looks like I have more time to say that Glencore is really evil and I hope you people could Google them. I do believe something like this could be done, maybe 50 years in the future. I think that people should consider nationalizing the resource and keeping all the money in the United States, guaranteeing that the jobs pay well and guaranteeing that the ore stays in the United States, in Minnesota, before they do business with anyone. I don't think it behooves anybody to rush into this project. You should investigate all the players and think about all the possible ways that this stuff could be mined and the money could be kept in our region. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jesse Whitney

38822

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jessic Marshall

41989

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jessic Marshall Maple Grove, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica cortez 41954

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jessica cortez Hugo, Minnesota

Jessica Durbin 54640

See attachment

Jessica Eberl 57353

"Topic: Cumulative Effects, Arsenic and Cancer." (Reading.) Okay. "Arsenic is rated by the USEPA as a Class A carcinogen. That means it causes cancer in human beings. Colby Lake provides drinking water for the City of Hoyt Lakes. It already has high arsenic levels. The EIS states that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will increase arsenic in Colby Lake by 38.5 percent. EIS Page 5-145. The EPA has adopted rules calculating how much arsenic in water unacceptably increases the risk of cancer. 40CFR 131.36. PolyMet's increase in arsenic in Hoyt Lakes' drinking water is above both the threshold set by the EPA and in the cancer risk level in Minnesota. In addition to arsenic in their drinking water, people in Hoyt Lakes would ingest arsenic by eating local fish and wild rice. Low income people who fish and use rice for food would have the most cumulative risk. The FDA recently tested rice for arsenic and found wild rice had six milligrams per liter of arsenic." (Reading.) The EIS should be redone to make a cumulative assessment of arsenic exposure and cancer risks for people in Hoyt Lakes, including formula fed infants and people who rely on fish and wild rice for food.

Jessica Gardner 57980

I am worried about the impacts this project will have on moose, lynx, & other animals. This project should be cancelled. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Hacker

15858

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Hacker 1805 250th ave canby, MN 56220

Jessica Hemmer

43079

For the past five summers I have worked and enjoyed our great woods and waters at a canoe outfitter located just outside of the Boundary Waters. My love for this unique place compels me to be very nervous about the sulfide mining already taking place in parts of our arrowhead, and especially cautious when considering this large scale proposal that is now in question. I feel the boom then bust that would be created by this mining proposal is not worth the harm it would ultimately cause to some our unique plants and animals. Can we really believe that these big mining companies will be around for hundreds of years to continue to clean up the mess they promise to make. I just don't think it is a risk we should be taking. Thank you for considering my comments, Jessica Hemmer 4510 60th Ave SE St Cloud, MN 56304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Hensley

16125

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica I. Ostrov

9326

Thank you so much for giving the public an opportunity to voice their thoughts. I am going to tell you the same thing that I tell my six year old: accidents happen. Plain and simple. Accidents happen. There is no end to the list of environmental disasters. Even in the past few months, the news is flooded with these stories. You have the opportunity to just say no. No, we won't even tempt fate and invite accidents to happen here. Minnesota is smarter than this. We value our environment too much. We know that it is simply too risky to do this particular type of mining here. The ecosystem is connected in all directions with water. That is just too risky. Why would we invite something like that to take place at the headwaters of 20% of the world's freshwater. There are stories all over the news about the shortage of clean water. It is more precious than copper. All of this for little more than 300, short term jobs. I hear that there's a Wal-Mart opening in Northern Minnesota that will employ about the same number of people as the PolyMet mine. I guarantee that Wal-Mart will have a far greater lifespan than the PolyMet mine. It is not worth it. We know that all of the big profits will go overseas. Is Minnesota going to allow itself to be used like this by international corporations. It seems that we should be smarter than this by now .we KNOW that accidents happen. Do the people of Minnesota not have a right to have an opinion about what happens in our state. This type of pollution is permanent, irreversible and devastating. It doesn't matter what is written in a 2,167 page document. It doesn't even matter if PolyMet were to put all of the millions and millions of dollars aside in case of an accident. That money can't bring back clean water, habitat lost, wildlife lost, the countless opportunities for people for whom a chance to experience wilderness enhances, even saves their lives. No apologies or "we couldn't have predicted this" can bring that back. I am a single mother, whose opportunity to work at a camp at the edge of the Boundary Waters every summer with my son has literally changed our lives. We are careful about not even letting our campers use chemical shampoos in our lake. Yet sulfide mining is being considered. I understand that PolyMet says they will capture 90% of the waste water. First of all, anyone who understands wetlands knows that it would be impossible to predict a figure like that, but even if they could realistically promise that, it still allows 10% of the sulfuric-acid laden water to escape into the waterways. That is unacceptable. I just cannot understand why this is even on the table. Haven't we learned any lessons from the multitude of disaster stories. Are we really going to let this happen in Minnesota. Accidents happen. There's no way around it. And by then, it will be too late to say you're sorry. Just say no. Now. Please. Jessica Ostrov 819 Tuscarora Avenue St Paul, MN 55102 [HYPERLINK "mailto:tzelah@hotmail-com"tzelah@hotmail-com](mailto:tzelah@hotmail-com)

Jessica Langevin

18272

Jessica Langevin. I just think there are things more important than jobs. It is only for 20 years, and the environment, I mean that's forever. That about sums it up.

Jessica Ley

58174

March 10, 2014
Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager
MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources
Environmental Review Unit
500 Lafayette Rd, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager:
I am writing to urge you to deny PolyMet the permit to mine near the BWCA. Minnesota is well known for our natural areas and our lakes. That being said, the BWCA is the only wilderness area our state has to offer, and it has been protected for 35 years. Now is not the time to support a project that will undeniably have effects on this pristine watershed. Sulfide mining carries with it proven environmental impacts. Acid mine drainage will drastically lower the pH of our waters, potentially changing the community of life that resides in our northern lakes and rivers. These changes will reach far and wide in a watershed with little buffering capacity. Erosion accompanies the deforestation that will be unavoidable. This increases the turbidity of nearby waters, reducing photosynthesis and oxygen levels, also detrimental to life in our aquatic ecosystems. Air pollution from the equipment used in mining and processing ore is also guaranteed. In a part of our state that receives a large part of its revenue from ecotourism, 20 years of mining and the temporary jobs it will bring is not worth lifetimes of water pollution and destruction of natural environments. The cost of this project certainly outweighs its benefits. Outfitters, camps and lodges are just a few businesses that benefit from this area staying pristine. The copper and nickel this mine would produce is such a low grade that they need to remove an incredible amount of rock to make it worth it. This will scar the land beyond recognition, in the most beautiful part of our state. The stored tailings can contaminate the groundwater, and communities would have nowhere else to turn for their water. Mining companies have demonstrated time and time again that they do not stick around to clean up their mess. This is another reason the financials do not make sense. I urge you to deny PolyMet the right to scar our land, destroy our wilderness, all for minimal community benefit and corporate profit. It is not worth it. Enclosed are numerous letters from high school students who chose to speak their mind about this mine. They are the reason you should oppose this project. They should have the opportunity to bring their children to the BWCA and other natural areas up north. If we keep rubber-stamping mines and other devastating projects like these they won't have anywhere to go in our country to see true wilderness. Sincerely, Jessica Ley 603 7 Clinton Ave Minneapolis, MN 5541

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Martinez

41763

Hello, My name is Jessica Martinez. I live in a small town in Southern Minnesota and I have recently heard about the possible mining project that is going to be voted on in Ely. I want you to know that I oppose this completely. It is going to destroy more liveliness than will be created and it is a solution that corporations and companies are using just to create a simple solution for the NOW, not for the future. Anything that happens now is going to be left for cleanup by the next generation and that is not fair. We are putting more value in making money and objects for consumers with these minerals, but no value in educating the children about what mining would do to their future and how much work they are going to do to minimize their suffering. It really seems like the "older" generation doesn't even care about the young people because if they did, they wouldn't put us through making decisions that won't affect them 20 years from now seeing as they'll probably be gone. Don't accept this mining proposal. Respectfully,
Jessica Martinez

Jessica Rocheleau

9359

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Rocheleau 9470 Ranchview Ln. Maple Grove, MN 55369

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Rocheleau

18837

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Rocheleau 9470 Ranchview Ln. Maple Grove, MN 55369

50911

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Rocheleau 9470 Ranchview Ln. Maple Grove, MN 55369

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Schadt

9892

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Schadt 3780 London Road Apt 110 Duluth, MN 55804

18654

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Schadt 3780 London Road Apt 110 Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Schadt

50729

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jessica Schadt 3780 London Road Apt 110 Duluth, MN 55804

Jessica Stein Diamond

13

To Whom It May Concern, I was born in Duluth and now in my 50s travel to N. Minnesota to visit the Boundary Waters Canoe Area every summer I can. This wilderness region is vitally important to me, to the Minnesota region and the nation as a whole as a place of respite, recreation, wilderness and clean water. It is absolutely unacceptable for the state of Minnesota to approve the PolyMet mining plan for 500 years of treatment of polluted water to be left behind from 20 years of mining. There is absolutely no economic good worth poisoning this beautiful, essential and priceless resource for so many generations to come. Sincerely, - Jessie Jessica Stein Diamond 610 Yale Road Bala Cynwyd PA 19004 610-667-1449

Jessica Straczowski

44819

As a resident of Michigan's Upper Peninsula I have always opposed sulfide mining for many reasons. However, the main reason I am opposing this kind of mining is the dangers it poses to our clean water. Sulfide mining in Minnesota or Michigan or anywhere else in the world affects our future for hundreds of years. Who are the ones who will make sure that clean-up is done appropriately in a hundred years. Why would anyone knowingly risk our water quality - our meaning it affects all of us and our future generations. Please deny Poly Med the permit to operate a mine that risks all of our future. Thank you, Jessica Straczowski Marquette, Michigan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessica Wardlaw

41558

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Jessie Kruchowski

38176

Rudy's Bar and Grill Aurora Mn Tim and Jessie Kruchowski We support Polymet 100%. We bought Rudy's in March of 2003- We have been through some rough times and everyday we hang on in hopes that Polymet will open and one day we will have a prosperous business. When we opened in 2003 we anticipated Polymet was right around the corner, 11 years later we are still waiting. Right now we employ 16 employees. If Polymet opens their doors we anticipate we will employ anywhere from 20-30 employees, that is 20-30 families right here in our community that will be supported by just one small business. So please let's get the doors open so we can continue to do what we do best and make our community happy. Thank you, Tim and Jessie Kruchowski Owners Rudy's Bar and Grill

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jessie Thompson 41820

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jessie Thompson Minneapolis, Minnesota

Jessy Carlson and Eric R Bong 42593

See attachment

jfalk 57389

16 South 25th Avenue East Duluth, MN 55812-2227 Lisa Fay, Public comment Manager, DNR DNR Ecological and Water Resources 500 Lafayette Rd Suite 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4032 Dear Ms Fay: I have lived all of my adult life in Minnesota. I love its beautiful natural resources and have raised three children to do likewise. As a citizen and taxpayer, I write to express my opposition to the reported conclusions in the SDEIS draft for the PolyMet proposed for Northern Minnesota. (To be frank, the document is too complex and lengthy for me to make an informed analysis based on my own knowledge.) As it has been repeatedly pointed out, correctly, any jobs for Minnesotans are temporary, the bulk of the profits will flow out of the local economy, and the "toxic legacy of damaged waterways" will remain permanently here in Minnesota. To date, "Mining without harm" and "environmentally safe mining" have been promised, but there is zero evidence to back up the claim that sulfide mining can be done without causing devastating watershed pollution. In fact, mining of sulfide-metal ore has never been accomplished without causing eventual acid-metal leachate pollution of ground and surface waters. As a result, Wisconsin wisely placed a moratorium on sulfide mining operations in 1997, until it could be demonstrated that such a mine would not pollute the water. The construction of a mine such as the one PolyMet proposes violates the Precautionary Principle: "if an action or policy has a suspected risk of causing harm to the public or to the environment, in the absence of scientific consensus that the action or policy is harmful, the burden of proof that it is not harmful falls on those taking an action." Only if and until, the mining industry has a demonstrated track record that it has the means and the willingness to invest the effort and the capital necessary to mitigate all present and future environmental costs, the benefits of the mine cannot possibly outweigh the damages to Minnesota's water resources, resources that may require treatment for more years into the future than can be accurately predicted. Thank you for your attention to my concern. Jackie Falk

"I go down to the shore" I go down to the shore in the morning and depending on the hour the waves are rolling in or moving out, and I say, oh, I am miserable, what shall what should I do. And the sea says in its lovely voice: Excuse me, I have work to do. - - Mary Oliver Jacqueline H. Falk 16 South 25th Ave East Duluth, MN 55812-2227 ground line: (218) 724-7407

jgust350@yahoo.com 38485

The iron ore mines won't last forever -let's get something new going on up here. Sent from my iPhone

Jill Alisa Holmen 57262

How wretched it would be to witness the demise of our precious BWCA and subsequent lakes and waterways. It's the thing we hold most dear and brad the most about as Minnesotans. The proposed mining is a massive invasion to the landscape and wildlife, not to mention a permanent damage for very short-term gain. Please use your hearts in making this decision. Jill Alisa Holmen 731 North 3rd Ave EDuluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Boldenow

15332

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Jill Boogren

48849

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm concerned about the major impacts to water and wetlands this project will have in northern Minnesota, especially given Polymet's own study that says water from the mine site would need 500 (500, not a typo) years (YEARS, also not a typo) of treatment. Sulfide mining should not be given an ounce of consideration, since it a) has not been done in Minnesota, b) is not allowed in Wisconsin (which shares much of the same topography), c) is run by a multinational corporation that has no stake in this location, and d) is not clear who would pay for 500 years of water monitoring and treatment. There is absolutely no way to guarantee Polymet will be around that long to pay for it. And if we leave a trail of toxins in our lakes and waterways, in our wetlands, in our beloved Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, well I guess we won't be around to care. Have we not learned anything from our mistakes. That toxic spills are terrible for our health, our wildlife, and our public lands, and they take FOREVER to clean up. We have an incredible array of wildlife here in Minnesota - bear, bald eagles, loons, lynx, moose - including the largest population of wolves in the lower 48- And we want to tamper with their drinking water. Please, if we're going to take a 500-year view of these areas, make it be the one where we're doing more to clean up the water, doing more to ensure these wildlife populations are stable, doing more to ensure diversity of plant and animal species, doing more to preserve the landscape. I understand much of the proposed project would use public lands - these are OUR public lands. And the understanding is the government is supposed to protect them for current and future generations. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Jill Boogren 2925 E Minnehaha Pkwy Minneapolis, MN 55417-1315 (612) 722-2391

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Burnham

40990

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Jill Burnham 32 W Point Rd East Hampton, CT 06424-1004 (860) 597-4584

Jill Doerfler

39816

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Eisenberg

18264

My name is Jill Eisenberg. I want to speak on behalf of the future of Minnesota and the generations of Minnesotans to come. Water is one of our most precious resources. So important, in fact, that we even note it on every license plate, the "Land of 10,000 Lakes." I am a union worker and I'm in support of some mining. The hard rock mining of taconite is something that I can live with in this state. But the proposed copper-nickel mining is wholly different from taconite mining. 43 years ago I got a D in chemistry, but even I know that when you mine for copper sulfide, it mixes with the oxygenation in the air to turn to sulfate, which in turn mixes with water, and you get sulfuric acid. This is acid rain. In fact, a minus 3.6 pH is what is listed in the Environmental Impact Statement. And when the water evaporates from the tailings ponds, it will be even more concentrated. I know there is a need for jobs in Minnesota, but 500 years of jobs cleaning up the environment are not what we need. As other states are dealing with severe droughts and the lack of water, and we read about the impact that this has on the entire country, I implore you not to play Russian Roulette with our aquatic future. Thank you.

Jill F Blooston

44516

Please investigate the disaster that is starting to show up in North Dakota brought on by the drilling companies who said they would protect the environment. Sounds like the hollow claims now being made by PolyMet, policing and regulating of mining and drilling companies has always turned out to be a failure, once they have the go ahead they never look back and couldn't care less about the environment. Please think of the next generations, they do not need any more super sights to clean up, find another way for people to be employed.

jill faulknr

16960

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, jill faulknr 7619 gleason rd Edina, MN 55439

Alphabetical by sender's first name

jill faulknr

50251

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, jill faulknr 7619 gleason rd Edina, MN 55439

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Hamze

41709

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Holmen

11350

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jill Holmen 731 North 3rd Avenue East Duluth, MN 55805

18390

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jill Holmen 731 North 3rd Avenue East Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Holmen

39144

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Governor Dayton and DNR, I think you know in your hearts that a decision to allow Polymet to engage in mining here in northeastern Minnesota will prove catastrophic in many ways. Don't be the ones responsible for the destruction of our waterways, our groundwater, and the BWCA, all of which are what make Minnesota the destination and pride that it is. People travel here from across the globe to take in one of the last places of pristine, unspoiled wilderness. The mining proposal and EIS simply do not account for all the unexpected and prolonged issues that will occur, and will subsidiSt If its jobs we seek, let's consider jobs in greener energy and tourism, the true reasons why people proudly call Minnesota home and why visitors keep coming back. I implore you to stop this wasteful project and show your Minnesota citizens you have our future and best interests in mind. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Thank you, Jill Holmen Sincerely, Ms Jill Holmen 731 N 3rd Ave E Duluth, MN 55805-1201 (218) 624-8903

50509

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jill Holmen 731 North 3rd Avenue East Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jill Lyman 47258

Dear Sir/Ms: I am extremely concerned about the proposed PolyMet copper-nickel mining project. No matter what regulations are in place or how much money is set aside, the inevitable byproducts of sulfide mining promise to include sulfur-dioxide emissions, acid rain, millions of tons of solid toxic waste, and the slow leaching of chemicals from tailings into surface water and ground water. Glencore, the Swiss mining and commodities trading giant funding PolyMet, has a history of polluting the areas that it operates mines in. They have also been involved in corruption and human rights violations. This is not a company that we want doing business in Minnesota. Please deny PolyMet's permit. Protect the fresh water in the Lake Superior water basin. We need to find jobs for our state that are sustainable and environmentally sound. Thank you. Jill Lyman 3205 Greysolon Road Duluth, MN 55812 218-728-3133 HYPERLINK "mailto:lymans@q-com"lymans@q-com

Jill Murette 43267

Being a public health nurse, focus on being proactive with the pollution. Prevention FirSt Prevent the pollution before it happens, putting money in a fund for clean-up isn't going to solve the problem. Once you have pollution, the environment will never go back to what it was. You have altered it permanently. Don't let them mine until they can prevent the pollution. Jobs are important, I grew up on the Iron Range, but you can never turn back time. Jill Murette

Jill Mooney 39809

This is dangerous and will ruin the NE section of Mn permanently Please don't do this. We totally oppose this Sent from my iPhone

Jill Radman 3386

I'm not sure who this should go to but I'd like to state my avid objection to an opening to a sulfide mine in Northern MN. These mines always have terrible pollution and it lasts up to 500 years. A few extra bucks is not worth acidifying out beautiful land and the harm the pollution will cause. I'm voicing my opinion that I strongly object to the proposal of a sulfide mine in MN. Minnesota resident, Jill Radman Sent from my iPhone

Jill Thomas 42432

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Jill Thomas 12510 43rd Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442-2716 (635) 452-9718

Jillian Tjosvold 54774

See attachment

Jim Abell 47658

I don't believe the rules for environmental protection is strong enough. Jim Abell 9260 foxline dr Corcoran mn 55340 Sent from my iPhone

Jim and Joyce Tabor 54839

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Atkinson

18115

Hi. My name is Jim Atkinson. And I don't consider myself an expert. However, I do consider myself somewhat of an expert on the agencies that are the lead for the environment. I worked in a heavily regulated industry for 28 years and had to get many different permits and have gone through environmental reviews and full-blown EIS's with the DNR and the Army Corps and the Forest Service. And what I know about it is they always without fail have been very cautious and deliberate and really spent the time and energy necessary to make sure that things were the way they were supposed to be. My observations about the Supplemental Draft EIS are, first of all, that it's been a long time in the making. Ten years is enough time for any EIS to be fully developed. And it's based on what I think are very conservative assumptions. I think we're really looking at a worst-case scenario in the predictions that are made. And reality provides a comprehensive and understandable analysis of the issues which it should after 10 years of development. I think PolyMet has demonstrated a commitment to do this right. They've been at it for 10 years as well. They've put in tens of millions of dollars into the environmental studies. And it's also clear that they respect the role and the obligations of the agencies that will have to give them permits. My opinion is that this SDEIS is more than adequate. And it's time to move forward into the permitting stage. Based on everything I've known and all my experiences with the agencies, I think we can all trust them to do just as good of a job in the permitting as they've done in developing this EIS. Thank you.

Jim Baratto

4482

Regarding Polymet I would like to provide my full support and would like to know how an average citizen can help to make this process move forward in an effort to get this mine up and running to provide jobs in Minnesota and boost the overall economy. Efforts to slow the process or even prevent the mine from moving forward in my opinion are self serving to those that continue to try and throw up road blocks. It is time for our leaders to look at the facts and move forward with this project. It is apparent environmentalist groups have a single minded position and that is to stop or delay the progress on this project in the hopes that Polymet will just go away. The questions have been asked and the answers have been provided, let's make this thing happen. Jim Baratto Owner/President Baratto Brothers Construction, Inc. 13872 Shafer Road Crosslake, MN 56422 218-692-1070 office 218-851-4375 cell 218-692-1071 fax HYPERLINK "mailto:jimb@barattobrothers-com"jimb@barattobrothers-com HYPERLINK "http://www.barattobrothers-com/"http://www.barattobrothers-com BC322437

46756

Creating jobs in Greater Minnesota is the single most important task our legislatures should be concerned with. Mining in that area of the state has been going on for over 100 years and has provided good jobs for hard working people. Go Polymet Jim Baratto Owner/President Baratto Brothers Construction, Inc. 13872 Shafer Road Crosslake, MN 56422 218-692-1070 office 218-851-4375 cell 218-692-1071 fax HYPERLINK "mailto:jimb@barattobrothers-com"jimb@barattobrothers-com HYPERLINK "http://www.barattobrothers-com/"http://www.barattobrothers-com BC322437

Jim Barott

45596

To: Minnesota DNR From: James A. Barott 1103 E. Washington St Ely, MN 55731 As a professional soil scientist who is intimately familiar with the soils and landforms of northern Minnesota, I believe the shipping of the mine tailings by rail to northwest Minnesota should be thoroughly analyzed for its economic and environmental benefit. The shipping of tailings by rail is nothing new. When I lived in Blackduck, Minnesota, iron ore mine tailings from northeastern Minnesota appeared to have been used for the railroad bed. The benefit of shipping the sulfur laden rock to northwestern Minnesota would be due to the calcareous / higher pH / high cation exchange capacity nature of the soils in that area. The soils in northwestern Minnesota a high buffering capacity, compared to a low buffering capacity / lower pH soil in its current northeastern Minnesota location. The terrain is relatively flat in northwestern Minnesota with relatively few lakes. There are also relatively few people who live in some parts of NW Minnesota. The environmental consequences would be much less in the long run. Thank you for your consideration. James A. Barott

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Beeby

16287

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jim Belland

38687

From: Jim Belland [mailto:Jim@Rebarfabinc-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 5:21 PM To: 'NorthMetDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us' Subject: If the majority of the substance of the "Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness presentation on PolyMet" article in the 3-1-2014 article in the Grand Marais, MN Cook County News-Herald are factual, I oppose PolyMet Mining Inc.'s proposed NorthMet Mining Project. Sincerely, James A. Belland 6051 Foxtail Dr White Bear Lake, MN 55110 (principle residence) 2530 E. Highway 61 Grand Marais, MN 55604 (vacation residence)

Jim Bennie

39991

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jim Bennie 10720 Rockford Rd Plymouth, MN 55442-2865

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Butcher 48163

For some reason my first attempt to submit my Polymet comments were unsuccessful. They were not delivered. The routing error message was delivered to my Spam folder which I do not regularly check. I am attempting to resend my comments. I am hoping that as I originally submitted my comments well ahead of the deadline that this technical hiccup will be forgiven and that my comments will be accepted. Thank you, Jim Butcher On Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:54 PM, "postmaster@ead.state.mn.us" <postmaster@ead.state.mn.us> wrote: --- Forwarded Message --- Delivery has failed to these recipients or distribution lists: HYPERLINK "mailto:www.NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us The recipient's e-mail address was not found in the recipient's e-mail system. Microsoft Exchange will not try to redeliver this message for you. Please check the e-mail address and try resending this message, or provide the following diagnostic text to your system administrator. _____ Please find attached a file containing my comments on the Polymet SDEIS. Thank you. Jim Butcher 11627 110th Ave Finlayson, MN 55735 612-210-6155 Please find attached a file containing my comments on the Polymet SDEIS. Thank you. Jim Butcher 11627 110th Ave Finlayson, MN 55735 612-210-6155

Jim Cashman 42745

See attachment

42811

See attachment

Jim Clapp 39750

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jim Clapp 24613 N Melissa Dr Detroit Lakes, MN 56501-7263 (218) 847-8703

Jim Ferstle 43373

James Ferstle 539 Lexington Pkwy S St Paul, MN 55116 The saddest part of this debate over permitting for copper/nickel mining in Northern Minnesota is that it is wasting time, money, and resources on a project that doesn't merit this sort of attention. If some company proposed drilling under Lexington Pkwy, for example to bring out some precious metal resource there and tried to justify it based on "creating jobs," or mining the product in the US rather than having some other country grab the profits from this exercise it would be dead on arrival, as they say about doomed legislation in the legislature. And any company promising to pay "costs" of cleanup is something goes wrong is akin to the proverbial huckster joke about selling somebody worthless swampland in South Florida. Please end this charade and rightfully put a stop to this dog and pony show masquerading as a legitimate business deal. Regards, James Ferstle

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Fitzpatrick

58094

My Name is Jim Fitzpatrick, I am speaking today as the Board President of the ErnestC. Oberholtzer Foundation, "Ober" as his friends called him was responsible for the protection of the BWCA and Quetco (?) and the first president of the Wilderness Society. He did all of the behind the scenes negotiation on the federal level and got the law written. Ober would be furious about this project. The SDEIS is full of holes. I will talk about only a few but promise a written letter to the DNR and ACE by March 13th. Wetland impacts are unacceptable. 913 acres of direct loss, 7531 acres of indirect impact = 8264 acres of wetland damage. The study of hydrology at the site is inadequate. There is an under estimate of the Partridge ground water base flow. It should be 200 to 300% higher. This is the largest Wetlands destruction project ever proposed in the U.S Army Corps of Engineers Region. The SDEIS says there are no fractures of underground bedrock at the site. I saw a map built by Minnesota History Society that shows the site is riddled with fractures. Not just one or two but many. These fractures will allow onsite pollution to get into the ground water. Putting the tailings on top of an old unlined LTV tailings pile will allow active pollution runoff. This unlined tailings dump from the 50's was built on top of streams to allow drainage of water through the tailings. Surface and ground water seepage at the LTV tailings site ALREADY violate water quality standards in Spring Mine Creek and even Second Creek. The SDEIS does not reveal the levels of contamination that will be placed into the HRF nor does it admit that this highly toxic dump will leak, even if it is lined. It does not analyze the level of acidity, corrosion and toxic metals (or you called it "filtered sludge") that will go into the HRF but it seems very likely that it should be considered and regulated as "hazardous waste landfill" unless PolyMet proves that it isn't. Minnesota statutes and rules require a permit for hazardous waste facilities. They also prevent the siting of hazardous waste dump on wetlands. For these and many many other reasons I can not deal with in 3 minutes I request that the MNDNR At the very least make Poly Met go back and address each of the problems addressed here today by me and others or at the very best reject the SDEIS out right as incomplete. I further request that the USACE deny the section 404 permit request involved in this project.

Jim Foti

43495

Extraction industry megaprojects of relatively brief duration, such as the PolyMet mine, financially benefit only a small portion of a single generation, and yet burden all future generations with a permanently changed landscape. And in this case, hundreds of generations would be left to deal with the pollution impact. One need only be the most casual student of business or history to understand the likelihood of a corporation following through on an environmental responsibility (such as treating the water flowing toward the Great Lakes) for more than a few years after its profits have been made. Unlike the desperately poor areas of the United States and the world that embrace extraction projects, Minnesota is fortunate to have the choice to invest in its future in more economically and environmentally sustainable ways. Let us not conduct this massive science experiment in our beautiful north woods. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Jim Foti 400 Groveland Ave #209 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Jim Hanson

39372

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Jim Hanson 10283 Gilbert Trl Brainerd, MN 56401-6153

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Houlihan

18087

My name is Jim Houlihan and I live in Grand Rapids Minnesota, and with my family, I'm a co-owner of Industrial Lubricant Company, a mine company, and a former mayor of Grand Rapids -- 100 years ago former mayor of Grand Rapids. A couple of comments. I offer, first, that we are all here tonight with the very same interests. That is that we are all environmentalists, and we all need to earn a living and strive to feed our families, to provides housing, education for our children and to live in safe and clean communities. Our need to enjoy and to be renewed by being in the outdoors and in the Boundary Waters is not in conflict with our need to earn a living. By taking even better care of our natural resources and by being even better stewards of our environment, we are able to take even better care of our families. I add my urging to you that this review ought to be about "and" thinking, not "or" thinking. Like many of my neighbors, I own a snowmobile and I own a canoe. I'm a stockholder in PolyMet, and I'm a stakeholder in Northern Minnesota. PolyMet's requests and their operation is aligned with our broader community interests. Next opportunity. We constantly read in today's newspaper about the growing disparity of income and wealth; the divide between the haves and the have-nots. The key indicators for the state are staggering compared to Northern Minnesota. On indicators like percent living in poverty, median household income and percent working, ages between 60 and 64, as reported by the Wilder Foundation, are stark. For example, percent living in poverty, statewide, 11 percent; St. Louis County, 15. PolyMet would not be a silver bullet, but would be an opportunity for those of us in Northern Minnesota to strive to earn a living like those in the rest of the state. Based on the mining industry's record of environmental improvement over the years and process changes and all of our aligned interest in both living here and working here, we should move forward with confidence that all members of our community, both industry and environmental communities, will operate and can support PolyMet in a responsible and ever-improving manner. Thank you for your service, and thank you for the opportunity.

Jim Howitt

36518

--Original Message-- From: jim.howitt@gmail-com [mailto:jim.howitt@gmail-com] Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2014 3:34 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: The PolyMet SDEIS has many flaws which should be rectified, but we do know from it that PolyMet is planning over 500 years of pollution for 20 years of mine operation. This is unacceptable. The mine should not be permitted unless much greater pollution controls are planned for. Sincerely, James Howitt 2639 Aldrich Ave S Apt 101 Minneapolis, MN 55408-1312

Jim Husman

1773

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, US Forest Service and Army Corp of Engineers: I am writing to express my support for the “proposed connected actions” land exchange between Polymet Mining Inc. at the NorthMet Mining Project and the US Forest Service-Superior National Forest as presented in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It appears to me that the land offered by PolyMet in exchange is of higher quality than the land they will be acquiring adjacent to the NorthMet property. The exchange does not have any significant negative effects on the Superior National Forest. I believe that the continued wise development of Minnesota’s natural resources is good for Minnesota, the local communities and for the country. Minnesota has a rich mining history and I believe that state and federal support of the NorthMet Project will lead to a resurgent of the economy of northeast Minnesota. Thank you for the opportunity to support this land exchange. Sincerely, James Husman 48 Spruce St Viburnum, MO 65566 _____ This message is intended solely for the designated recipient and may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this e-mail are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of The Doe Run Company. Finally, the recipient should check this message and any attachments for the presence of viruses or malware. The Doe Run Company accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused through the transmission of this e-mail.

Jim Jr Companion

42812

See attachment

Jim Koepke

7156

Rather than use the tailing ponds, which leak, why not use one of the open taconite pits, which are below ground level. This will keep the sulfur below ground level and will not runoff onto surrounding land.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Kultala 47836

No to PolyMet mining, environment is worth more then the damage caused my mining the minerals in this way. Clean water is like "gold" Sent from my iPhone

Jim Lamppa 21587

The supplemental draft looks great. Get r done. Jim Lamppa 4245 miller trunk road Eveleth,Mn. Sent from my iPad

jim lassi 46627

My Name is Jim Lassi. I live at 35 Fir Circle, Babbitt, MN 55706- I strongly favor granting of all permits to PolyMet for the following reasons. I am a 15 year member of the Babbitt City Council, and as such I have had numerous opportunities to attend information sessions sponsored by PolyMet as well as Twin Metals and Teck. I am convinced that these companies have developed the technology, such as reverse osmosis that will insure a safe operation. I know that the company execs are men of integrity, and will do what it takes to insure that the environment will be protected. If reverse osmosis can clean up an existing disaster like the Kennicott Mine in Utah, it can certainly be used at the onset for the PolyMet mine. I live in the middle of the potential precious mineral development. Base on the SDEIS, I am confident that the impacts to the land, air, and water will be minimal. The economic benefit of such a development far outweigh any potential negative affects. PolyMet can mine these minerals in an environmentally sound manner that creates hundreds of jobs that can support families that will hopefully locate to my community to booster our economy. I have a hard time understanding the opposition to this project by environmentalists who use these precious minerals every day. It seems to me that they will oppose any type of mining even though it is proven to be safe. Lets let the facts speak for themselves. PolyMet can operate safely. Approve the permit. We need to strengthen our economy in our local communities and across the state. Thank you

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Marsden

41556

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim McWethy

44667

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jim McWethy 1150 LaSalle St Wayzata, MN 55391

Jim Melander

54663

See attachment

jim or bev

5960

I cannot believe the delay in granting a permit, eight or more years and millions of dollars spent, professional agitators with little or no regard for what the truth is holding a whole section of the state hostage, these people should have to post a bond when coming up with there misguided stories of gloom and doom, we in northern Minnesota need the jobs and tax revenue that this project would provide.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Pounds

16212

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Sandy Wolfe

15349

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Saint Paul, Minnesota February 9, 2014 Dear DNR, My review of the Full SDEIS did not find anything that addresses the issue of enforcement actions for violations of environmental quality standards and criteria. Planning for environmentally safe operations is presented and is necessary and critical but it is also insufficient. A clear plan of actions that will be taken when operations do not go as planned are equally critical to maintaining a focus on safe operations. I did not find any wording in the SDEIS that would trigger the shut down of mining operations in the event that environmental quality standards are violated. It appears that once mining starts, nothing will stop it other than the exhaustion of the deposits of profitably-mined ore. If environmental standards are violated or if environmentally sound practices are not followed even while the environment has not yet been harmed, then mining and mining profits should stop. The fact that some corporate entity might be liable for remediation costs will be cold comfort once damage is done, and those costs may not be sufficient to deter poor oversight of operations. Water quality in the area of the proposed NorthMet mine site is already impaired because of previous iron ore mining activities. Some seem to think that this makes the site a perfect place to continue mining activities. But this logic is not only faulty, it shows a lack of appreciation of the heightened dangers that Minnesota's waters will face if this new form of mining is permitted. This form of copper mining will generate waste that is much more toxic than existing iron mines, and copper-sulfide mining already has a horrible track record of water pollution in areas that have a tiny fraction of the amount of surface waters found in Northeastern Minnesota. I ask that Minnesotans' concerns for our shared environment be taken more seriously than I find them to be in this SDEIS. We already know from the well-publicized poor quality of the initial DEIS that we should be suspicious of any claims of concern for the environment by the leadership of PolyMet Mining Incorporated. If this new kind of mining is permitted, then the consequences of harming the environment need to be clearly stated. For example, 'If the levels of pollutant X exceed level Y at any monitoring station then mining operations shall be halted until the source is identified and the problem is corrected. PolyMet will continue the pay and benefits of all employees during such an interruption in operations ' I understand people's hopes for new jobs that a mine would provide, but the outsized chance of environmental damage from this form of mining during operation and long after mining stops and the subsequent damage to the existing tourism economy almost guarantees that the costs to Minnesotans will outweigh the benefits. I do not support the permitting of copper-sulfide mining in Minnesota. James A. Wolfe Wood 220 Pineridge Lane Stillwater, MN 55082 651-351-7194

Jim Satterstrom

20112

Please support the PolyMet project. The area needs jobs and this project will bring jobs that will allow family's to stay in the area. Thank you Jim Satterstrom 952-300-1059
_____ This email has been scanned by MessageLabs

jim saufferer

129

This is a great balance for the betterment of man kind, our state and all those involved and affected by this project. Jim saufferer 952-288-3076 19296 Norman dale Rd prior lake minn.55372 Jim

jim sulerud

43083

I propose that there are at least two major deficiencies in this EIS. 1- The land exchange, per se, is a forfeiture of the public wealth and right. In this document there is no public purpose stated for the land exchanges, per se. Further, while your Executive Summary states a foundation for prohibiting this project as proposed, "allowing private surface mining would be inconsistent with USFS legal mandates for acquiring and managing these lands," there is no guarantee that the exchanged lands will be managed by these same mandates. The US Government relinquishes control to accomplish these mandates. 2- There is no rationale proposed in the EIS that there is an obligation, a priori, on the part of the public, or its government, to yield anything that it holds, in the face of a private mineral rights ownership. There is no rationale in this document for a quid pro quo. The State should hold to a position of NO risk taken on by the citizens and its government. Instead, the document details mitigation of risk, and weak discussions of probability and extenuations, that gives evidence that public risk is assumed. Jim Sulerud, 730 Vogelsberg Trail, Chaska, MN 55318 952-445-4531

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Suttie 20052

I'm against copper / nickel mining in MN done by Polymet or any other company. I think the environmental risks are too great. I'm against it even if Polymet says they will take care of any environmental damage caused for 500 years and is willing to pay money "up-front" to take care of that. Who knows whether they will pay enough to cover the costs of clean-up. No one knows how long it would take or how much it will coSt I don't trust that they won't just mine for 20 years, then shut the operation down and we will be responsible for dealing with the aftermath. Thanks. Jim Suttie 7940 Pequaywan Lk. Rd Duluth, MN

JIM VOYTILLA 43028

Please read and consider the attached comment. I am basically requesting that this SDEIS be redone because of the seriously flawed LTV tailings basin dumpsite alone. Feel free to call me re any questions about this public comment at 651-214-5597- Sincerely, Jim Voytilla

Jim Warzala 26641

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, IF ANY ONE HAS THE LEAST BIT OF COMMON SENSE, WISDOM, INSIGHT AND FORESIGHT IN D.C. - IT'S YOU, SO PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE. FRACKING OR ANY OTHER PIPELINE IN THIS COUNTRY. ONE SPILL FROM A TERRORIST ATTACK, EARTHQUAKE OR POORLY CONSTRUCTED PROJECT WOULD MEAN IRREPARABLE AND IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE TO THE ENVIRONMENT. ALSO SAVE THE LIVES OF ANIMALS and THEIR HABITATS. WE'VE HURT ANIMALS ENOUGH. MAKE FOREIGN AID, AMERICAN AID Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Jim Warzala PO Box 150 Crystal Falls, MI 49920-0150

jim weigle 38952

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks which cannot at this time be accurately projected nor quantified. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr jim weigle 4751 Dona Ln Golden Valley, MN 55422-3536

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Welch

18063

I was born in 1930. And that was the time of the Dust Bowl. I don't personally remember it because I was pretty little, but that was an environmental crisis and we had to fix it or we would have had all desert in the western part of the United States. So people got together -- and they didn't agree on lots of things -- but they did solve the problem. And so I think you could solve problems of a mine and new jobs if you can get together and work on it. I was born in Alpena, South Dakota, which was in the middle of the Dust Bowl. And my parents were Nellie and William Welch. Nellie, my mom, was born in 1903 and my dad in 1899. And they had some successful crops, and then they had crop failure because the Dust Bowl came in and blew all their crops away. So they were -- basically everybody up there was starving to death. So they all got together and worked and co-oped and raised gardens and hauled water and did all kinds of things to survive. Well, there was pretty much no surviving after 1932 or so. So my dad went down to Minnesota. And he found a farm where he could be a sharecropper, which was you worked the farm and you would get half of the crop and you would give away half of the crop. So that was a way of survival. And I had an older brother and sister. And we were able to survive on what dad would make. And then in 1937, dad had saved enough money -- which wasn't much -- but to save the farm and to put money down on a new farm. So we walked from the old farm to the new farm, which was about 15 miles, and drove the cattle. By that time I was six years old, and I can remember walking most of the way there. And I worked in the fields as my bother did. My brother was four years older. And anyway, they survived by a garden and working out on other jobs. We had an artesian well on the farm, which is kind of an automatic well. It runs. It's like a spring. And my mother and father hauled water to the garden. And they were able to raise some garden crops that way. Well, in 1937 I said dad bought a farm. And then World War II came along, and farmers did quite well. And by 1945 when the war was over, dad had been able to pay for the farm. So we went from being very poor to relatively well off. This all comes down to, I joined the National Guard and went in high school and was called up in '49 for the Korean War. Came back and went into pharmacy, graduated from U of M with honors. Had three girls. At that time we moved to Hoyt Lakes in 1974 and brought six children with us. We left four in the Cities. Since I've been up here, I worked on tourism, Iron Trail, civic board, and I worked on Giant's Ridge. And you might ask what all this means, but also when I worked at Giant's Ridge, I learned about the marsh marigold, which is a very rare flower. It's found in every swamp between here and Duluth or the North Shore. But that was the point where they didn't want to build because of the marsh marigold. Anyway, I learned to look at both sides of every problem or sometimes more than both sides. I also worked on Forest Highway 11 and on the new road to Embarrass and Ely, but that one never came to pass yet anyway. PolyMet has a few people that live in town, and they've been in my store many times. And they're very nice people and they care a lot about the area. And I know that just by the many interactions I've had with them. And I think as long as they live in the area they would be interested in having a safe area. And my opinion is that people ought to look at both sides of all the problems and compromise enough so that we can have some jobs in the area so we can survive. When we moved here there was over 4,000 people here. Now there's probably less than 2,000 people in Hoyt Lakes. And we need people, young people for schools, to keep the area active, to appreciate the area, and being able to go out and fish and do all the things that are fun to do here. We need new jobs to support our community like Hoyt Lakes, Aurora, Embarrass, Ely, Biwabik, Virginia, Mountain Iron, Palo, Gilbert, Markham, Eveleth, and the west range. And I don't know who I forgot. I think the citizens should be able to direct their behavior to support a safe, successful operation so that families that have children will be able to stay together in the area if they choose to. Many of them will choose not to, but it's nice if you can have your children stay with you if they want to. And I think some of the opposition to the mine might also have ideas that would help create a safe mine. I've been retired since 1995. I've been down to Honduras 17 times on mission trips. I work at the store every day as a volunteer. And the reason I volunteer is because my daughter that's the pharmacist has five girls. So it allows her to have a little time with her family and I can still correct and check every prescription that goes.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jim Wichmann

40109

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Jim Wichmann PO Box 385 16424 660th Ave Conger, MN 56020-0385

jim wilson

15327

To whom it may concern: As a long time resident of this beautiful state, I'm adamantly opposed to the polymet mine in north east Mn. We need to preserve what we have left in this wonderful state. Our children and future generations will never be able to restore the consequential damage to the landscape, rivers and lakes of this state. The best policy we have for insuring this pristine area is to leave it alone. Sincerely, Jim wilson

Jim Young

14978

Please add me to the list supporters of the Polymet Mining project in northern Minnesota. The additional, living wage jobs combined with economic impact to the region can not be replicated in this area. I believe that the Polymet Group has met and surpassed all regulations and guidelines put before them. It is time to move forward with this project and stop looking for a ghost behind every tree. Thanks, Jim Young Industrial Lubricant Co. Cell: 218-259-6367 Direct: 218-328-0274 Fax: 218-328-0259 jyoung@inlube-com

Jim/Janet

44114

From: Jim Woehrl 12793 Wawina E Wawina, MN 55736 Telephone: 218-387-5006 I am requesting that there be no action taken on the SDEIS for the NorthMet (Polymet project) for the following reasons: The long time frame of up to 500 years for the monitoring of the project and the unknowns of the effect of climate change on the hydrology of the region. The fact that sulfide mining is new to Minnesota. There is no good proven technology or long term model to prove that the environmental protection technology will work as described. The fact that the SDEIS grossly underestimates the amount of water that will flow through the 4-5 square mile site that is unlined and where water seepage through the site. The barriers to bedrock can crack and leak. This alone should disqualify the project. The SDEIS contains no credible information about the actual cost of monitoring, maintaining, and replacing the equipment needed to treat polluted water for 500 years or more. It provides no details about the nature or guarantees of a financial assurance scheme that would remain viable for 500 years, yet it does acknowledge, disturbingly, the possibility of events such as "unanticipated liabilities" and "failure or limitations on the ability of third parties to pay." It does not attempt to explain how a corporate entity could realistically be held accountable over such an absurdly long period of time. Finally, even though the SDEIS admits that water pollution will last for a minimum of 500 years, its financial assurance section is an exercise in generalities. The actual cost of water treatment, monitoring, maintenance, repair, and reclamation is completely unknowable. The SDEIS says that PolyMet estimates initial closure costs of up to \$200 million, with post-closure monitoring and maintenance costs of up to \$6 million annually. The Grand Portage Band of Ojibway concluded that PolyMet's numbers are vastly below the actual amounts required. The Grand Portage Band calculates that the minimum amount that should be set aside for financial assurance at the outset, assuming a 3% return on the amount, is \$90-5 billion.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JinianVictoria Herdina

42029

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, JinianVictoria Herdina Silver Bay, Minnesota

jkohnen

46934

To whom it may concern, Please do not destroy northern Minnesota with a new mine. The Polymet mine could continue to pollute our waterways long, long, long after any benefit is garnered from the mine. There is NO WAY to guarantee the waterways of Minnesota won't be polluted long after the mine has closed and Polymet no longer exists. It will be left to our multi-great grandchildren to bare this expense. The number of sustainable jobs is minimal as compared to the long term expense. It is very short sighted thinking to allow this mine. Please do not allow new mines in Minnesota. Sincerely, Jane L. Kohnen 5357 Ewing Ave S Minneapolis MN 55410

Jo Ann McNaughtn-Kade

43318

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Jo Ann McNaughtn-Kade P.Box 396 Effingham, IL 62401

Jo Morse

38596

_____ From: morsejoann@hotmail-com To: northmetsdeis.dnr@state.mn.u Subject: SDEIS - Polymet Mining Project Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2014 19:39:26 -0500 While I am sympathetic to the need for good jobs in Northeastern MN, I think that the risk far outweighs the reward for the Polymet Mining Project. If the state allows the mining companies to potentially ruin the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, one of the major incentives for drawing and keeping an educated work force in Minnesota will be gone. My husband and I are both tech workers who have chosen to relocate to and live in Minnesota because of the wonderful outdoor recreation opportunities in the Arrowhead region. I think that the state of Minnesota will lose people like us if Polymet Mining is allowed to pollute the BWCA and that will ultimately affect the state's ability to attract and keep educated people. Thank you, Jo Ann Morse 1405 29th Ave N.W. New Brighton, MN 55112

Joan and Illegible Mork

58027

We live right near the (truly) Great Lake. There are no benefits greater than its beauty & wholesomeness. Do not let sulfide ore mining compromise this treasure. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joan Beard 54849

See attachment

Joan Christensen 9287

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joan Christensen 3292 County Rd 24 Intl Falls, MN 56649

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joan Christensen

18416

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joan Christensen 3292 County Rd 24 Intl Falls, MN 56649

50536

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joan Christensen 3292 County Rd 24 Intl Falls, MN 56649

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joan Gunderson-Palmer

10541

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney, I wish to urge you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS on the grounds that the project is likely to cause irreparable damage to our cultural and natural resources as well as result in violations to the treaty that the US made with the Chippewa Bands of Ojibwe people. From the Fact Sheet: "The Project area is also located on land that was ceded to the United States by the Bands under the 1854 Treaty. As part of the Treaty, the Bands reserved the right to hunt, fish, and gather on these lands. Some resources — such as fish, plant, and animal species — may be affected by the project, the degree to which in a cultural resource context is unknown. " Additionally, damage may be done to Wild Rice Harvests which would have a detrimental effect on the Ojibwe and many other Minnesotans. While I appreciate the actions PolyMet proposes to mitigate the potential harm that may be done by the project, I do not believe they are substantial enough to truly prevent or account for the damage that could continue for hundreds of years and more after the project closes. There are too many unknowns in this report, and the consequences are too dire for us to proceed with this project. Sincerely Joan Gunderson-Palmer 999 Seminole Ave West St Paul, MN 651-442-6509

Joan Osgood

58035

It will leak. Loss of Tourist Economy Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Joan Scully

43988

Date: March 12, 2014 To: Department of Natural Resources State of Minnesota From: Joan S. Scully 718 27th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55454 Re: PolyMet Copper-Nickel Mining Proposal It is my understanding that the DNR is accepting public comments on the proposed open-pit copper-nickel mine and ore processing facility in the Hoyt Lakes area in northern Minnesota. I have deep concerns related to the environment, our health, the survival of our wildlife and their loss of habitat, jobs for Minnesotans, and our economy. There has never been one sulfide mining operation -worldwide - that has not polluted the environment. There are still locations in England where the sulfide mining done by the Romans still pollutes the environment 2500 years later. Our precious wetlands, our rivers and streams, will be adversely affected by mercury, arsenic, and other toxic metals - the 'natural result' of sulfide mining - and it may be necessary for the animals, fish and birds to be instructed on how to keep away from the huge toxic 'ponds' that will require monitoring for the next "500 years" (as far as the company's report would go) or, more likely, forever. The health effects stemming from this mining affects humans, wildlife, and the environment. Tourism would suffer if this mining operation were approved. The number of jobs related to tourism is much higher than are jobs related to mining, and if we continue poisoning our state, how will we attract tourists to see our lovely toxic waste ponds or waste piles. Native populations' tribal rights would be violated if this mining project goes ahead, and their cultural practices and economic livelihoods would be seriously compromised; some would be terminated. As a retired union worker, I have been aware of the historical shortage of good jobs in the northern tier, so I understand the workers' enthusiasm at the promise of good jobs, but many of these jobs will be filled by people they bring in from other operations, and will probably number in the hundreds, a few hundred. A few hundred jobs for 20 years sounds good to Minnesotans who need to support their families, but there are other ways to create better well-paying jobs for the northern part of our state. It would be better to create jobs in manufacturing alternative energy parts, for example, or building solar panels or wind turbines, or growing hemp for clothing, 'concrete', and a myriad of products derived from hemp. Twenty years of jobs resulting in the permanent poisoning of our beautiful state - in its most beautiful part - is just not a good business model. We count on the DNR to protect the state from perpetrators of dangerous money-making schemes that will harm our state. Please listen to our plea: Please Reject PolyMet's proposal to mine for copper and nickel, etc, in northern Minnesota. Thank you for considering this plea. Sincerely, Joan S. Scully

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joan Sutliff

44053

I stand with the research provided by and thoughtful comments and opinions of the organization, Water Legacy. They are as follows - "PolyMet's open-pit sulfide mine plan should not be allowed to directly destroy 913 acres, and indirectly destroy as many as 7,351 acres, of high value wetlands in the Partridge River headwaters and 100 Mile Swamp. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands in the "compensation package" are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. The Land Exchange plan does not maintain the value of public assets and comes nowhere near replacing the ecological functions lost in the St Louis River Watershed. PolyMet's Mine Plan doesn't even look at alternatives that would reduce wetlands destruction, restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. Minnesotans need to know every alternative has been explored if the permitting process is to be legitimate in the eyes of the public" I ask that you deny the proposed plan from going through and agree that much more work is need to determine a smarter course of action. Thank you. Sincerely, Joan Sutliff 5325 Fish Lake Dam Road Duluth, MN 55803

Joan Thom

41948

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Joan Thom Minneapolis, Minnesota

Joana Cipriano

40427

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Joana Cipriano Beco de St° Cristo, n.° 1 Coimbra, ot 3040-657 PT

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joanie Davis 42957

Please find my Comment document attached. Joanie Davis, 4895 Safari Pass Eagan MN 55122-2690

JoAnn Ailes 52310

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, JoAnn Ailes 575 E 950 N Westville, IN 46391

JoAnn Huss 3454

Dec 21, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Why would you even consider a business venture that has a 100% rate of environmental destruction to the state of MN. Not only would the area surrounding the mine sites be affected, the water sheds far beyond will be adversely damaged for a long time after the mining is done. My family and many other MN families are very worried about the human health risks that you are entertaining. This type of mining will put arsenic, manganese and other contaminants in their drinking water and mercury contamination will happen to the fish in the watershed and most likely far beyond, even into Lake Superior. The research has shown that more than 8,000 acres of irreplaceable wetlands in the St Louis watershed will be impaired or destroyed IF you say yes. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PLEASE JUST SAY NO to this lethal project. Thank you. JoAnn Huss 916 North Payne Street New Ulm, MN 56073 United States of America The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs JoAnn Huss 926 N Payne St New Ulm, MN 56073-1474 (507) 354-1644

51647

Dec 21, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Why would you even consider a business venture that has a 100% rate of environmental destruction to the state of MN. Not only would the area surrounding the mine sites be affected, the water sheds far beyond will be adversely damaged for a long time after the mining is done. My family and many other MN families are very worried about the human health risks that you are entertaining. This type of mining will put arsenic, manganese and other contaminants in their drinking water and mercury contamination will happen to the fish in the watershed and most likely far beyond, even into Lake Superior. The research has shown that more than 8,000 acres of irreplaceable wetlands in the St Louis watershed will be impaired or destroyed IF you say yes. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PLEASE JUST SAY NO to this lethal project. Thank you. JoAnn Huss 916 North Payne Street New Ulm, MN 56073 United States of America The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs JoAnn Huss 926 N Payne St New Ulm, MN 56073-1474 (507) 354-1644

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JoAnn Olson

38820

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JoAnn Sternberg

15838

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, JoAnn Sternberg 16590 Alpaca St NW Ramsey, MN 55303

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JoAnn Sternberg

40462

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Joanna Schlegelmilch

36350

Dear DNR, The Polymet debate has been plaguing me for some time now. My worry is only eased knowing the decision lies in your capable hands yet I still feel the need to voice it. The overwhelming point is that the stakes are too high and the sacrifice is too great. You as the DNR have been given the task of being stewards of the land and all its naturalness and as such, it is your duty to protect it without being blind sighted by money. This scenario has been played out too many times before in various places all over the world (the promise of economic success for the "simple" use of resources) but rarely if ever has it come without consequences for the land and all that it had supported. Diminishing the quality of life for the next 500 years for the economical benefit of one lifetime sounds completely ludicrous. Please, you must not allow the pristine beauty and vitality of our land to be robbed by big business because they're lying through their teeth if they think this is ultimately beneficial to we who wish to live here long after those mines close. As a recent graduate from UMD and a citizen of Duluth for the past five years, I have always enjoyed doing projects on the water quality of Lake Superior and after travelling to faraway places, I can still honestly say this is the best water I have ever tasted and I feel safe drinking it. It is for the lake alone that I gave up notions of living elsewhere as I wish to live here now, on a lake so superior to all the reSt But even before I was aware of Polymet, I dreamt of disaster threatening the water. My nightmares held black muck seeping into the water, people ridden with grief over children dying of cancer, illness and disease. This sounds dramatic but there is no other way to voice my concern. Please listen to the people and their cries. Defend this land skin, tooth and bone. It's not worth the gamble. Joanna Schlegelmilch 5356 Greenwood Road Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joanne & Larry Spears 42725

See attachment

Joanne and Jim Collins 32205

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining should never take place in the areas around Lake Superior, and in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. It is absurd to even think about mining these pristine areas around Lake Superior. We are opposed to all mining around these most precious areas. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Protect our lands and waters. Sincerely, Joanne and Jim Collins 86360 Meyers Olson Rd Bayfield, WI 54814-4510

Joanne Engelking 16193

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Joanne Iskierta 42753

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joanne Kalnitz 38718

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am not a Minnesota resident but an Illinois resident who is interested in protecting the environment and wildlife. I am very concerned about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Joanne Kalnitz 2920 W Sherwin Ave Chicago, IL 60645-1210 (773) 761-1701

Joanne Luongo 43457

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Joanne Luongo 1636 pingsong creek rd Kettle Falls, WA 99141

Joanne M Engel 42834

See attachment

joanne smith 43302

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According to the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Many years ago, I drove with my family through Ontario Canada and was shocked to see the devastation to the environment for several miles surrounding one of these mines. At the time we were told that it was 'acid rain.' You know very well that we are looking at this kind of destruction of you approve this mine proposal, and there will be destruction that wouldn't be fixed from at least 500 years. This is too much damage for the few jobs that would be affected during construction and then for the actual mining operation itself. I come from this area. I was raised in Two Harbors along beautiful pristine Lake Superior, and my husband was born on the Range and raised in Babbitt. He, too, knows the negative impact that this would have on our famous clear water sources plus the northern Minnesota woods and habitat. Clearly this should be a NO vote on these issues. Please listen to the conscience of the people on this one. Sincerely, Joanne Smith 697 23rd Ave NW New Brighton, MN 55112-6516 (651) 636-7736

Alphabetical by sender's first name

joanne smith

43344

My name is Joanne Smith, and I was born and raised on the shores of Lake Superior near Two Harbors MN. As a young child, we took a trip north along Lake Superior, and in Ontario Canada we came across an area that looked like it had been white-washed. For miles the trees were stripped of vegetation and life, and we gradually found out that this was the effect of acid rain a byproduct of the mining industry in that area. If you have never seen images of this kind of destruction, you would NEVER vote yes on letting these mines in to do their destructive mining techniques. Think what this would effect. Not only would it be destructive to the lives of the people that make this area their home, it would literally decimate the tourism industry along the North Shore and over in the BWCA. Our lakes and rivers would be irreparably harmed, as would Lake Superior itself the source of drinking water for many thousands of people. The jobs that we are talking about do not have that kind of economic impact. Yes, there would be construction jobs but only for a while. As for the miners, as many as want to work, there are jobs already available in the iron mining industry. This is a short term vision for a LONG TERM PROBLEM. Please listen to the conscience of the people on this one. This is not simply a tree-hugger issue. This is the future water quality issue for the State of Minnesota and Wisconsin and also Canada. Thanks for listening to a voice of reason, Joanne Smith 697 23rd Ave NW New Brighton MN 55112 651-636-7736

JoAnne Stick

16379

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, JoAnne Stick 5031 148TH PATH W. CTSTRT APPLE VALLEY, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JoAnne Stick

49948

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, JoAnne Stick 5031 148TH PATH W. CTSTRT APPLE VALLEY, MN 55124

Joanne Sunderland

58073

Just stop it! We don't need it, it is not essential. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joanne Swanson

39081

---Original Message--- From: jos1281@gmail-com [mailto:jos1281@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 7:54 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Joanne Swanson 1281 Como Blvd W Saint Paul, MN 55103

Jodi Broadwell

11260

Dear DNR, I am against the NorthMet proposal and any other copper/nickel/sulfide mining proposal that comes to Minnesota. Copper/nickel/sulfide mining has a history of leaving devastated wastelands and poisoned waterways behind when the mining is done and the tailings remain. Mining companies have not found a way to keep the tailings contained. There is 1 copper mine, the Mopani Copper Mine in Zambia, Africa where the tailings are contained. The tailings are contained by a Dolomite shelf that surrounds the copper-this shelf occurred naturally within the earth. The Dolomite has made it environmentally safe for copper mining in Zambia. We do not have a Dolomite shelf surrounding our copper here in Minnesota, we have water. I love living in the land of 10,000 lakes and I choose to buy my home here in 2010- I have invested thousands of dollars into my home and I fear that if our waterways become poisoned I will be forced to move and if the proposed mining project turns the Northland into a wasteland and poisons the Minnesota waterways, I imagine no one will want to purchase my home. Please protect our water and our investments from becoming a poisoned wasteland of loss and devastation. Say no to NorthMet. Jodi Broadwell 317 N. 22nd Ave West Duluth, MN 55806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jodi Broadwell

41991

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jodi Broadwell Duluth, Minnesota

Jodi Johnson

38811

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jodi Johnson 5830 Grand Ave Duluth, MN 55807-2568

38812

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jodi Johnson 5830 Grand Ave Duluth, MN 55807-2568

38842

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Jodi Johnson 5830 Grand Ave Duluth, MN 55807-2568

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jodi Libey

15681

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Jodie Prohaska

40777

To Whom it May Concern, I strongly believe the PolyMet mining proposal requires more time in order to sift through issues regarding the maps. I have been conflicted about the mine. I realize jobs for Minnesotans are crucial. My husband has been unemployed for several months and we personally feel the strain of a slow economy. However, I am not convinced that this pollution can be contained. The topographic maps are not accurate. The sulfuric acid will most certainly drain into pristine watersheds. I urge the DNR and stakeholders to look more closely at these maps and require more time to investigate their accuracy. We need resources. We need jobs. However, evaluating the risk to the environment needs more time. Thank you, Jodie Prohaska

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jody Copp

40682

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Jody Copp 4222 Scott Ter Edina, MN 55416-5036 (952) 926-3740

Jody Goldstein

48169

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Jody Goldstein 2124 Schmidt Ct SE Rochester, MN 55904

Jody Schulman

40313

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Jody Schulman 3305 Coventry Ct. Dr Ellicott City, MD 21042 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Adler

40131

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Areas around and near to the BWCAW need to be protected at all costs. We have seen too many of these areas ruined by indiscriminate development, with the average citizen losing out. It not only costs taxpayer money to try to clean it up, but deprives everyone of recreational opportunities. All the mining company has to do is declare bankruptcy when they have extracted the majority of the minerals from a site, and all future clean up, if it can even be remediated, becomes the responsibility of taxpayers. This is wrong. Minimally, any mining company wanting to mine an area should be forced to put in place an escrow of a minimum of 10% of the value of the deposit in order to have funds available for cleanup. Letting them proceed with a permit, using bad data, is negligence on the part of our public servants. This must be stopped. Sincerely, Joe Adler 3305 E 126th Lane NE Blaine, MN 55449 Sincerely, Mr Joe Adler 3305 126th Ln NE Unit E Blaine, MN 55449-6611 (763) 862-8447

Joe Baltich

15743

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Baltich

18314

Joe Baltich from Ely, Minnesota. Third generation Slovenian since we're counting. I grew up in Ely and I spent my entire life there and am still there. My family has had a resort in Ely since -- well, it started as a cabin in 1939 and became a licensed resort in 1944 by my dad. And it's operated continuously since 1944 until now. This summer will be our 70th year of operating as resort in the tourism business in Ely, Minnesota. So I know tourism and I know for 30 years prior to the inception of our resort as a licensed facility and to current date mining has occurred in Ely around us for all of these years. And we've lived with it and we've done quite well. The water is clean. The fishing is good. Tourism isn't as good as it is due to competitive forests perhaps, you know, and other things, economic factors and whatnot. But I do know one thing. That Ely won't survive on tourism alone. Tourism is one slice of the pie. Another slice of the pie, from what I see in Ely, is mining. It may be a big slice of the pie, it may not. It depends on how you want to look at it, because all businesses wax and wane. They come and go. Mining will have its peaks and lows. So does tourism. As result I want to see mining on the Iron Range. I want to see the opportunity for the people on the Iron Range to have jobs that aren't just tourism, because tourism comes from Ely next to the Boundary Waters Canoe area where I'm from. It doesn't happened in Virginia, Minnesota, per se. Sorry, Virginia, but it doesn't compare to Ely. And so what I'm trying to stay is you need it all. It's 2014. We've had oh, many, many years now for mining technology to increase over the years and improve. And I believe in the year 2014 that we have the capability to actually function as an ecologically sound mining institution or area or region. One comparison I will make -- and I will try to be brief -- this morning I was reading the news on the Internet and they said China today is having dangerously high outputs toxic air pollution, because China they are all about making money. They don't care what they do. They showed pictures. You couldn't see anything. It was a sea of smog and people walking around with masks. Well, China is one of the biggest places for copper production in the world right now. They're dominating it. And so as a result we've got China doing whatever they want. When they have output of any kind, they dump it out in the sea. They don't care. I will tell you one thing, in Minnesota on the Iron Range we have a lot of fishermen and hunters who like this area. That's why we stuck it out here so long. And as a result we're going to see these people being good shepherds and good stewards to their land. We are not going to see the kind of pollution you're seeing in China. The United States of America, Minnesota, the Iron Range, and Ely should be leading that charge. And that's where I stand.

Joe Begich

18315

My name is Joe Begich and I've resided in Eveleth for the past 84 years. I've been involved in the Minnesota legislature and served on one of the toughest committees in the Minnesota House. The committee of natural resources and environment. We served under a tough chairman. The laws and rules that we are operating under now are the toughest in the USA. Just recently somebody mentioned West Virginia. That plant hasn't been inspected for 20 years. This will be inspected on a daily basis. And there's nothing wrong with mining and providing jobs if we do it the right way. And from what I can follow and what is clear to me, this company is planning to do it the right way. Otherwise I would not support this. I aim to protect the environment like everyone else. But I live in Eveleth in the middle of the mines, of the Eveleth Taconite. 90 feet from my driveway is Eveleth Taconite. I don't have a problem. They live by the good rule. I live by my rule. There is no problem. Why can't we all get together and live the proper way and open that mine and provide long paying jobs for our area, for our youngsters coming up graduating from school.

Joe Cherra

14999

Has anybody researched or even thought to investigat the use of fumerole biotics as a tool for mitigating the sulfur problem associated with sulfide mining. I'm thinking of the deep sea organisms that break down the SO2 and CO3 into oxygen and nutrients to live off of. On Mon, Feb 10, 2014 at 9:32 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Cherra

15303

Minnesota has the 4th largest deposit of Copper and Nickel bearing ore on earth. University of Minnesota - Duluth geology professor, Jim Miller, says that estimates are as much as 4 billion tons, worth more than \$1 trillion, creating thousands of jobs for maybe a century. Polymet proposes to mine this ore near Aurora / Hoyt Lakes with an annual output of 36,000 tons of Cu, 7,700 tons of Ni, 360 tons of Co and 7200 pounds of precious metals. They estimate that this project will provide: Approximately a \$500 million construction project, creating two million hours of construction work. 360 full-time mining jobs 600+ related jobs Estimated \$15 million in annual local and state tax revenue Estimated \$45 million in annual federal tax revenue \$720 million in wages over a 20 year period \$10-3 billion in economic benefit to St Louis County \$300 million in new local and state tax revenues \$900 million in new federal tax revenues. These are Polymets' numbers. What troubles me is: 360 full time mining jobs + 600 related jobs for 20 years is going to create almost 1,000 unemployed 40 and 50 year olds in 20 years in an area that has been hard hit, for years, with scarce job opportunities and higher than the state average unemployment numbers. What happened to the 100 years that Jim Miller forecaSt Even if other mining companies move into the area in the next few years, will they be able to absorb Polymets' unemployed. Will Polymet be paying enough in unemployment compensation taxes to cover these large numbers. Polymet proposes to create 360 full-time mining jobs. They will provide \$720 million in wages and benefits to 360 full time employees over a 20 year period. This looks very promising until you consider that \$500 million of that projection will go to construction. Subtract that from the \$720 million and the number is closer to \$220 million. \$30,000 in wages looks good until you start deducting the benefits they promise. It doesn't take much to make that good looking job a "slightly better than a poverty level" job for a provider of a family of four. Estimates range from 200 - 500 years to treat the water flowing through the site at a cost of \$3-5-6 million dollars per year. No corporation, especially one dealing in a mining project as devastating as this, can guarantee being around that long, even if it's only 200 years. We have to assume that the taxpayers are going to be footing the bill for a clean-up project ranging from \$700 million to \$3 billion. There goes the local, state and federal tax revenues. This figure should be enough to stop the project in its tracks. The EPA estimates the total cleanup cost would exceed \$50 billion. I grew up in Duluth, MINnesota in the shadow of US Steel's Morgan Park plant, a few blocks from the St Louis Bay which the steel plant used as a sewer. My father worked the steel plant from the time he returned from WWII until he was terminated in 1972 when U.S. Steel closed the plant, shipping all of its equipment to Venezuela rather than cleaning up their mess. The grounds of US Steel's Morgan Park operation is now a Federal Super Fund site. The St Louis Bay is still waiting to be cleaned up. US Steel fled rather than fix. I returned from VietNam to find that Duluth's drinking water was contaminated with asbestos dumped into Lake Superior by Reserve Mining Company. Duluth had to build a new water filtration plant to rid the water of the asbestos. Duluth and the federal government paid for this, not Reserve Mining. Reserve Mining closed rather than fix it. The company that took over the Reserve Mining operation lost a tailings pond which dumped mining waste into Lake Superior. LTV closed rather than fix. Polymet has a bad reputation in South Africa and South America. They tend to leave messes behind just like US Steel, Reserve Mining and LTV. Can we trust them to live up to any of their promises. I have learned to be skeptical of any promises made by any corporation that depends on short-term profits ra

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Cunningham

10085

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joe Cunningham 1486 Pleasant Ave Baldwin, WI 54002

18829

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joe Cunningham 1486 Pleasant Ave Baldwin, WI 54002

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Cunningham

50901

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Joe Cunningham 1486 Pleasant Ave Baldwin, WI 54002

Joe Feidt

44883

Our home address: Susan Hangartner Joseph Feidt 802 6th St Hudson, WI 54016-1708 On Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 8:32 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

47259

To: State of Minnesota From: Susan Hangartner and Joseph Feidt, Beaver Bay, MN Dear State of Minnesota: We own a home in Beaver Bay, MN on the shores of Lake Superior. The house has been in my (Susan's) family since the 1920s. My great grandparents were some of the original settlers in Beaver Bay. I have roots here that go way back. Both of us have hiked and explored this area since we were children. We urge you look beyond the short term gain of jobs to the relatively near future when the mine is closed and the mining company has pulled up stakes. Can you guarantee the pollution from this mine will not reach streams, rivers, and Lake Superior. Do we really want to gamble on our environment once the mine is closed. Superior is the cleanest of the Great Lakes. It is our jewel to protect. Let's keep it that way for generations to follow. Respectfully Submitted, Susan Hangartner and Joseph Feidt

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Folio 7678

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecology and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit: I have reviewed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement documents. I am not a scientist and did not read the entire 2,000+ page document but did read the Executive Summary. In my opinion, the SDEIS provides more than adequate coverage of the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Water quality, air quality, cumulative effects, closure, etc are extensively analyzed and studied in the SDEIS beyond the MEPA and NEPA statutes and criteria. The project should be allowed to proceed to the EIS phase. On a personal note I'd like to add that I am from Ely, Minnesota and our town has been dying since our last mine closed on April 1, 1967- We are sitting on one of the largest copper/nickle and precious metals deposits in the world and it would be a shame not to use our natural resources, but import them fro overseas. We need jobs in this area and we also need clean water and air and I believe we can have both. Minnesota has the strictest environmental laws in the nation and we will mine safely. Regards, Joseph R. Folio 546 E. Wilson St Ely, MN 55731 218-365-2474 folio@reagan-com

Joe Hochevar 42535

See attachment

Joe Kasel 54680

See attachment

Joe Knaeble 40871

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, or the appropriate person to take public comment on the PolyMet Mining Inc. Proposal. From: Joseph P Knaeble 2533 Colfax Ave South Minneapolis, MN 55405 612 644 9412 HYPERLINK "mailto:joeknaeble@usfamily-net"joeknaeble@usfamily-net I am a Certified Master Water Steward, a contributor to the development of green building standards for the MN GreenStar Program and have been actively involved in the development and operation of several green business over the past 20 years including The ReUse Center, a Project of the Green Institute. I am partial owner of several properties in Itasca County and a property in Lutsen MN. I have several questions regarding the permitting of the proposed PolyMet mine on the Mesabi Iron Range, 6 miles south of Babbitt, MN I also have several comments that I would like to be on the public recoRd Questions regarding the SDEIS Document. First questions are in regards to Section 1-1-1 in which the following figures are given of approximate outputs of the mine. 15 million tons of waste rock annually; 11-3 million tons of tailings from the Beneficiation Plan annually: 313,000 tons of residues from the Hydrometallurgical Plant 131,000 tons of copper concentrate, 18,000 tons of mixed nickel/cobalt hydroxides and 500 tons of PGE precipitate annually 1- Would you please identify the toxicity or danger levels of the 15 million tons of waste rock, the11-3 million tons of tailings and 313,000 tons of residues. What are the time estimates of how long these 3 outputs would need to be monitored in the designed storage ponds, pits or piles before they would not create pollution problems that would exceed environmental standards if they escape from the pits, piles or storage ponds. 2- How would the financial assurances be structured to cover failures that exceed environmental standards while PolyMet is still mining, if they occur decades or centuries after PolyMet has closed the mine or if PolyMet has gone out of business. My next questions relate to the answers given in my first series of questions. In Section1-3-2- subsection 1-3-2-1 Project Purpose and Needs are addressed. The 2nd bullet point states that a purpose and need of PolyMet Inc. is "To extract metals in a safe, environmentally responsible, energy efficient, and economically feasible manner subject to mitigation measures designed to avoid or minimize environmental effects to the extent practicable". 1- Is it possible and even probable that to extract metals in a safe, environmentally responsible manner at some point becomes in contradiction with extracting them in an economically feasible manner. To leave it up to PolyMet to define the extent practicable of balancing what could easily be opposing criteria does not seem to be in the public interest nor does it provide protection for the environment in the Cloquet Watershed and for Lake Superior. 2- Mitigation measures are designed to avoid or minimize environmental effects to the extent practicable. Does the State of MN or any other governmental body have a say in defining the extent practicable. Comments 1- According to my research the past track record for sulfide mining in an environmentally sound way is very poor and mitigation efforts have been inadequate approximately 64% of the time and this includes modern mining operations. An organization called Mining Truth claims that mining companies often either do not have the financial resources to clean up the pollution caused by their mines or have gone out of business while financial assurance have not been adequate to cover the costs of clean up. How is PolyMet's proposal different from past sulfide mining operations that have become a liability to the public and have done damage to the environment. Due too the past track record it seems PolyMet needs to guarantee complete clean up for as long as any failure of waste containment from its operation creates problems that exceed en

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Krenzelok 41625

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Joe Krenzelok Minneapolis, Minnesota

Joe Magda 44273

We need the jobs, we need the business, I'm in favor of mining. Joseph Magda 17063 242nd ave nw Big Lake Mn 55309

44289

I'm in favor. We need the jobs, we need the business

Joe Marino 54523

See attachment

Joe Martin 54196

I strongly disagree with your stance towards sulfide mining. I believe you are just looking for profits at the expense of the environment and peoples lives. Sure this would create jobs, but it would just be temporary and would cause major pollution our lakes and rivers. We do not need my mines in our beautiful state, and if it's not broke don't fix it.

Joe May 6372

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Who will pay for the clean up when Polymet has exhausted the resource, then files bankruptcy . PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would d Sincerely Joe May 10533 W. River Rd Brooklyn Park, MN 55443 651-334-4199

10012

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: One question When Polymet has pulled everthing out of the ground or it's proven to be a huge polluter, they probably file bankruptcy as so many mining operations have done in the paSt If it even could even be cleaned up, WHO will pay for it MY answer the state, us. Sincerely yours, Joe May Joe May 10533 W. River Rd Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

18756

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: One question When Polymet has pulled everthing out of the ground or it's proven to be a huge polluter, they probably file bankruptcy as so many mining operations have done in the paSt If it even could even be cleaned up, WHO will pay for it MY answer the state, us. Sincerely yours, Joe May Joe May 10533 W. River Rd Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe May 50830

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: One question When Polymet has pulled everthing out of the ground or it's proven to be a huge polluter, they probably file bankruptcy as so many mining operations have done in the paSt If it even could even be cleaned up, WHO will pay for it MY answer the state, us. Sincerely yours, Joe May Joe May 10533 W. River Rd Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

Joe Nasvik 42894

Please accept my attached letter for inclusion to the public record against the Polymet Sulfide Mine Application. Sincerely, Joe Nasvik

46053

My address is: Joe Nasvik 3934 Earlston Rd Downers Grove, IL 60515 HYPERLINK "mailto:jnasvik@sbcglobal-net"jnasvik@sbcglobal-net From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 3:36 PM To: Joe Nasvik Subject: RE: Proposed Polymet mining permit Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Joe Nelson 43816

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The resources that would be obtained from this mine are necessities, if we don't mine them someone else will. Sure there are negatives to the environment but what about our economy and the jobs that we are giving away. As far as the global environmental impact, most countries have much worse environmental regulations and will cause a larger impact to the environment if they produce these metals. I APPROVE the proposed PolyMet mine Sincerely, Mr Joe Nelson NO shoreview, MN 55126 (612) 581-1154

Joe Padden 44704

Dust is sure a problem in mines what dust control for sulfides Sent from my iPhone

44709

What is the hardest rain fall The site is designed to handle. Duluth, mn Was recently Inundated Sent from my iPhone

Joe Quincy 58138

While I appreciate the fact that Polymet has attempted to work within the guidelines and regulations provided them in their endeavor to begin mining 3 MILES AWAY FROM THE BOUNDARY WATERS, feet away from streams and other waterways that lead into the BWCA and surrounding area, I find it absolutely ridiculous that this proposal has gotten this far. The single point that this is a 500 year agreement along makes it an impossible decision for us to make; there are concerns for the next 20 years as regards water, air and soil quality – how could Polymet possibly believe themselves competent to predict/mitigate effects for the next 500 years? I believe it would be best to let nature function as it has for the past billions of years; obviously the pre-existing system works and the proposed amendments to this system – mining – are iffy at best.

Joe Scherer 18118

My name is Joe Scherer. I am from Embarrass, Minnesota. Thank you guys for your time coming here. I appreciate everything you have done, standing up getting ridiculed by some of these people. I'm not going to do that. You have done a great job. Your employees have done a job. I live in Embarrass, Minnesota. I live six miles away from the gate to this plant. I was born and raised here. I hunt, I fish right in the back of this plant that they are proposing. (Inaudible) nobody has these problems with waters. They're monitoring and taking care of them. We are stewards of our area. I fully believe that our government agencies will make sure this area will remain intact and pure. We can having mining. We can have tourism. So with that being said, again, thank you guys very much. Job well done. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joe Thorne

40029

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Joel

41727

To the Department of Natural Resources in Minnesota, I have a few words. Please consider the harm involved with allowing the PolyMet mine to come to northern Minnesota. Jobs come and go. Our planet does not. This mine would set a negative precedent for our state. Water pollution is serious. Thank you, Joel

Joel Aslanian

46132

Please protect the BWCA watershed and spare all of northern MN the inevitable legacy of mining pollution. Thank you. Joel Aslanian Principal Meriwether Partners LLC 1191 Second Avenue, Suite 1570 Seattle, WA 98101 Ph: (206) 816-1573 Cl: (206) 799-4783 HYPERLINK "mailto:jaslanian@mericap-com"jaslanian@mericap-com

Joel Bryan

14923

Hello, I am contacting you today in regards to the copper and nickel mining that is being proposed near Hoyt lakes. I am adamantly opposed to opening a mine there. In the past companies that have opened mines like this one have failed to keep the environment adequately during the operation and avoided cleaning up the site after the operation is over. I do not believe current mining techniques can safely remove the copper and nickel without causing great harm to the environment. I have enjoyed the boundry waters many times over the years and with the projected scarcity of water over the next few decades why would we poison our water supply. This mine is irresponsible and the potential benefits are short sited at beSt Joel Bryan Rosemount, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joel Clasemann

40473

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joel Hanson

41017

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joel Hoffman

44764

March 13, 2014 MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 To Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing to comment on the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Based on the NorthMet SDEIS, the proposed project would result in large-scale disruption and degradation of forested wetlands in the headwaters of the St Louis River. The project also represents a serious threat for heavy metal leaching into surrounding ground and possibly surface waters to an area that is already recognized by the state for persistent mercury pollution. These impacts are not adequately addressed in the SDEIS. While the executive summary highlight the direct impact to wetlands (~900 acres), Chapter 4 provides a much more complete picture of the wetland impact. As the SDEIS notes, there will be likely be a much broader affect on wetlands in the region owing to activities associated with the mine pit that would negatively affect wetlands adjacent to the operations (exemplified by the high percent of low quality wetlands adjacent to other facilities in the region) and changes to the underlying water table and hydrology. In the SDEIS, this broader impact is identified in the analysis of Areas 1 and 2 (above and beyond the Northmet project area and Mine Site). The NorthMet Project area includes 177 wetlands (66% rated as moderate or high quality) covering 1,584-9 acres. The Mine Site area includes 87 wetlands covering 1,297-8 acres. According to the SDEIS, these are essentially pristine wetlands: "The vegetation types located at the Mine Site are indicative of pre-settlement conditions and lack hydrologic disturbance." Area 1 encompasses 465 wetlands covering 11,201 acres. Area 2 contains 373 wetlands covering 8,621-9 acres. In essence, the project will severely impact about 6,000 acres and potentially impact about 20,000 acres of wetlands, including pristine wetlands and high-value forested wetlands whose functionality could be severed degraded by changes in hydrology associated with the mining operations. Nevertheless, the mitigation target is far less (<2,000 acres), and would not necessarily restore the lost functionality to headwater streams or to the St Louis River watershed. This is a severe shorting-coming of the NorthMet SDEIS. The resultant changes in hydrology and ecological function of these wetlands represent a significant impact to the watershed, and would add to the cumulative stress placed on the St Louis River. The SDEIS does not adequately address these downstream impacts. The wetland loss is unacceptable at this scale, especially in light of the large expense committed by the federal and state government to restore wetlands in the lower reaches of the St Louis River. As the executive summary notes, mercury pollution in the St Louis River is of particular concern and potentially represents a serious public health threat. There is already a fish consumption advisory (owing to high mercury concentrations in tissue) posted for fish in the region of the proposed NorthMet project. Although the water quality model developed for the project suggests a net decrease in load of mercury to the St Louis River, these models are reliant on two critical assumptions: a lack of groundwater leaching from the pit and tailings basin, and successful water treatment. It seems likely that at least one failure in the applied technologies will occur during the operational period of the mine. This potential is not evaluated in the SDEIS. Moreover, the mine pit will require a large load of electrical power, likely causing an increase in power generation in the region. Presuming the power will come from a coal-fired power plant, this would likely add to the atmospheric mercury loadings to the region. In conclusion, the SDEIS details substantial environmental impact to the region but fails to adequately consider the full effect of t

Joel K Hoelz

54890

See attachment

Joel Kelly

39225

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Joel Kelly PO Box 181 Montrose, MN 55363-0181 (763) 269-6165

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joel Kelly 41932

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr joel kelly 111 Center Ave N Montrose, MN 55363-8549

Joel Mamedov 17330

I am absolutely oppose to this project. It should not be granted to go forwaRd The main selling argument for this project is a “job” creation. Yes, it will create some jobs. But, the people who earned some money will spend that money to their cancer treatment or treatment of their children. And that money will not be enough anyway. When you poison an environment there will be some winners (corporations, some employees) but, there will be a lot more losers. Our children will be a biggest losers. So, ask yourself. Do you really love your child.

17331

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am absolutely oppose to this project. It should not be granted to go forwaRd The main selling argument for this project is a “job” creation. Yes, it will create some jobs. But, the people who earned some money will spend that money to their cancer treatment or treatment of their children. And that money will not be enough anyway. When you poison an environment there will be some winners (corporations, some employees) but, there will be a lot more losers. Our children will be a biggest losers. So, as yourself. Do you really love you child. Joel Mamedov 5611 bimini dr Minnetonka, MN 55343

Joel Roberts 42887

Ms Lisa Fay: I am attaching a copy of my comments on the PolyMet Mining NorthMet Project SDEIS. Sincerely, Joel Roberts 1150 Ivy Hill Drive Mendota Heights, MN 55118 651-690-5889 roberts@math.umn.edu

Joel Vlaminck 40742

I'm concerned about the mining proposal being put forth. I don't want our state's water sources being polluted for generations to come. Without a plan in place for proper clean-up, I'm concerned of the irreversible damage that will be done to the surrounding ecological systems For the benefit of current and future Minnesota residents, please insist on a more thorough plan for keeping the waters safe and clean. If it isn't possible or feasible to keep the waters clean with this mining project, then it shouldn't be done. Respectfully, - Joel Vlaminck, DC, MS [HYPERLINK "mailto:drvaminck@gmail-com"](mailto:drvaminck@gmail-com) drvaminck@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joel Weisberg

19432

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to much longer. Ninety days are not enough to digest and comment upon the enormous document. Water Legacy, which has looked at the document, states the following reasons for lengthening the comment period. They all look reasonable to me. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Joel Weisberg 105 Winona St Northfield, MN 55057 507-645-9112

45191

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing to you to urge you to stop the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine because it will violate numerous health and environmental standards. Specifically I am asking you to reject the SDEIS and to deny permits to begin it. It is especially unrealistic to expect that the polluted water flowing from the site will be environmentally monitored and treated "in perpetuity," or even "for 500 years," which would be required according to numerous studies (eg DNR Fish and Wildlife). The SDEIS environmental study suggests a number of practices that would be harmful to the environment, including dumping the enormous amount of wastes into unlined pits that would leach dangerous chemicals into the water, harming streams, wetlands, and fisheries; while containing insufficient detail in other cases to determine whether or not the proposed practices would be harmful. Thank you. Sincerely Joel Weisberg 105 Winona St Northfield, MN 55057 Joel Weisberg 105 Winona St Northfield, MN 55057 507-645-9112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joey Phillips

38787

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Johann Chemin

9752

Hello, thanks for letting me know if my comments are logged: 1- 500 years of pollution legacy is not worth 20 years of labor 2- Who will foot the bill for the 500y of cleanup when the company folds (because it will, like everything): Minnesotans. 3- No work is worth the pain and suffering that will ensue from people dying from the pollution of our drinking water 4- Nobody would put their glass of water by the urinal. Yet, this project would allow more than just that: the dirty water will go into the biggest reserve of fresh drinking water in the world 5- There is more money and jobs to create by promoting tourism than by polluting. Also, who will want to visit the area if it is polluted, what are going to do the people working off tourism. 6- If Polymet wants some rare minerals, there are in higher concentrations on dump sites: mine there. Sincerely Johann Chemin-Danielson 6039 Beachwood Road Mound, MN 55364

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Johannes Donaubaauer

46097

Dear Minnesota Even if I love you a lot, and especially your northern territories are my most loved areas about you, there is something I need to talk with you about. You dear, who do you think you are. What sacrifices are worth trading them for money, short term jobs and resources you can get from recycling processes. Don't you think its time to change our idea of development. Development that creates such amazing things like the selfish capitalism we are living in. The whole thing where I am coming from might be a little bit too big to hang it up just on the polymet story, but if this is goes through its one more big stab to the idea we as human beings, due to our intelligence and power responsible for the worlds health, should treat our environment.. I mean the facts are clear. Everybody who does just minimum research in these mining processes sees the big risks. And everybody who sees clearly understands who the mining will benefit. And everybody who trusts polymet should consider the fact that as fast this company appeared to make that amazing deal, as fast it will disappear if it comes to cleaning up the mess Governments are there to protect people and environment and to regulate institutions and companies. Not the other way around If Minnesota doesn't understand that, who will AGAINST SULFIDE MINING IN NORTHERN MINNESOTA Thank you for listening Minnesota. Your dear friend, Johannes Donaubaauer

John

36772

To paraphrase a well known quote: "Ye canna change the laws of chemistry." Exposing sulfides in a moist environment produces acids, which acids in the water, besides being polluting in and of themselves, also leach heavy metals from the surrounding rock, which poisonous metallic compounds also enter the runoff waters. And the process continues as long as the exposure remains. ie for at least centuries, until all exposed material has been fully extracted. Containment, even for relatively short time spans is difficult and expensive, if not impossible, and over the many years of continued hazard the possibility of continuous containment is merely wishful thinking. All permits for this destructive activity in such a vulnerable environment should be denied. Thank you for your attention. John Kronholm 442 Bear Avenue South Vadnais Heights MN 55127

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John & Carol Eding

16103

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John & Carolyn Forney

38739

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. None of us will be around in two or three hundred years but we can make sure that this mining effort does not become like the "taconite tailings" problem for future generations. Let's make sure all the facts are known and the extent of the possible damage is clearly spelled out. Only then can a good and responsible decision be made. Sincerely, John and Carolyn Forney 12913 Jorissen Rd Hopkins, MN 55343-4102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John & Debbie Woerheide

10407

Dear Minnesota State and Federal partner links for the preparation of this DEIS: Unfortunately we were not able to attend the public meetings for various reasons beyond our control, including the weather, and resulting road conditions. So our comments need to be expressed in this email. As residents of the Minnesota Arrowhead country, we certainly hope that these comments are considered. We are full time residents of the Minnesota north country, living at Lutsen for the past 26 years, at 5171 Highway 61, and 103 Caribou trail. The very things that attracted us to this gorgeous country include the beautiful boreal forest, clear streams and inland lakes, and of course the unequaled beauty of Lake Superior during all seasons of the year. We didn't come here enticed by new jobs being offered by any resource gobbling industries. We came here and created our own jobs, offering services that the people living here, or coming to visit needed. We have all lived in various parts of the country, such as south central Missouri, southern Illinois, the mountains of New Mexico, the mountains of Colorado, and the spectacular coast of Alaska, So we have seen other beautiful parts of the country, but none to top the Minnesota Arrowhead, Lake Superior country. The father/grand father of this family, John Woerheide served the US Forest Service for 35 years. Various jobs included preparing proposals for designating Wilderness Areas, lands and minerals management, timber management, silvicultural research, recreation resource management, and public affairs. The whole family has witnessed the results of metals mining for such metals as lead, zinc, copper, gold, silver, and many other metals as well. We lived on various National Forests, mostly in remote back country areas. When we lived in Southern Illinois on the Shawnee National Forest we often visited the fluorspar/lead/zinc mines of that area. such as Minerva Number One, and the Crystal mine. At many of these mines the fluorspar was the retained ore mineral, and the lead, zinc, and other metals often made it into the tailings of these operations. That was back in the late 1950s, and of course the people of the area could only see the benefit of the jobs the mines provided. As a result of the careless surface disposal of metal ores, there is now a great deal of water pollution at and around disposal sites, leading to health alerts for such areas as the Minerva No 1 site (see www.atsDradc.gov. Minerva Mine No1) When we lived on the Santa Fe National Forest at Pecos, New Mexico we used to make many trips up the Pecos River to the site of the old Terrero Min about 12 miles north of Pecos . This was an old deep mine under ground where zinc , copper, lead, gold and silver were mined in the past, There were about a dozen other trace minerals involved as well. Waste rock material was spread out in an area about 20 acres in size at the mine site. Higher grade ore was sent by tramway to the Alamitos Mill at Pecos, New Mexico, where the ore was processed, and waste tailings were fed into tailings ponds. Both of these sites have been discovered to be highly polluted. Unacceptable levels of pollutants present in surface areas, and extreme pollution of ground waters are present all the way as far south as Carlsbad on the Pecos River. Water at camp grounds along the Pecos River has been polluted. A person can not even go near the old mine site, or the mill site. There are chain link fences and keep out signs around the areas. As a reference see - New Mexico Geological Society guidebook, 52nd Field Conference, Geology of the Llano Estacado, 2001 = Long Term monitoring of the Geochemistry Of Surface Water, and Stream-Sediment Samples from the Southern Pecos Wilderness to Brantley Dam North Of Carlsbad. Eastern New Mexico - Year Nine. It is absolutely amazing how long this pollution has held on, and how many parts per million there are of the different metals in the water. At Silver City, New Mexico, we lived in c

John Aamodt

38910

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We in Minnesota take great pride in doing what is right for our state and often lead the nation in many endeavors. If we approve PolyMet to move ahead, we will be condoning a business that could do immeasurable damage to the health of the people, environment and tourism in the northeast region of our state. That will reflect poorly on the leadership of our state who approved such a foolhardy business to operate in such a pristine region. Our wildlands and water is what Minnesota is noted for why would we ever risk it's ruination. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, John Aamodt 35617 County 39 Laporte, MN 56461-4051 (218) 224-3562

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Amren 3668

Hi Really I just can't imagine this proposed mining project will be allowed .. OK sadly in our misguided way and value system disorder effecting humanity on this earth I can imagine this and it's sad .. Please use logic and shut this insanity down. John Amren 1940 Minnesota Ave Duluth MN 55802 Sent from my iPad

John and Barb Bottger 40658

The facts are clear. This proposition is neither environmentally or financially feasible. It is a huge wake up call to Minnesota to support US companies that are engaged in technology using renewable resources. Let the real work of building a future that we can be proud of passing on to our grandchildren. Barb Bottger 61 Bunn Trail Grand Marais, MN 55604

42277

Dear State Leaders from our Dept. of Natural Resources, our US Forest Service and our US Corps of Engineers, Dear Representative David Dill and Senator Tom Bakk, The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement proves that we are setting ourselves up for one of the most irresponsible decisions for the future of Minnesota's natural resources for this and future generations. Is it still possible to appeal to your basic sense of what is right and wrong. Should I copy and paste the exhaustive lists of holes in the impact statement. Should I appeal to your philosophical, emotional and spiritual selves. What kind of impact statement can I make that will equal the power of PolyMet. It is this: My husband and I live on the Gunflint Trail in Cook County. We work with you to safeguard the water quality of our watershed. You have taught us this truth - "everything that happens on the land, ultimately ends up in the water". We've had to confront you with your own truth more than once when the offer to trade land overrode your understanding of this truth. It was a small scale battle but ironic in that we have to defend the land from the same people who are teaching us to protect it. It would be so easy to throw in the towel and sacrifice it all. But we do not live in a third world country where international goliaths can leave us with no choice but destroy the land for the wealth of a few. Be the leaders you have chosen to be, make a decision based on what is right for the future not on what is best for a few for awhile. The cost is just too great. I do hope you have ears to hear and the wisdom to listen and the heart to protect the land and safeguard those who inhabit it. Sincerely, Barb Bottger 61 Bunn Trail Grand Marais, MN 55604 218-388-0868 [HYPERLINK "mailto:jbottger@boreal-org"jbottger@boreal-org](mailto:jbottger@boreal-org)

John and Barbara Edgar 57276

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

John And Eleanor Lynn 24064

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, RE: PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is NOT in the public interest and the damage CANNOT be reversed. Do not change protection for private economic gain. Sincerely, John And Eleanor Lynn 1215 Crestline Dr Santa Barbara, CA 93105-4604

John and Karen Legenhausen 40804

Please think of our future for our grand children and vote against copper mining in northern MN. Encourage recycling electronics to get the minerals we need for our greedy lifestyle and save our waters. Karen Legenhausen

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John and Kay Buzza 4782

We are unalterably opposed to the PolyMet NorthMet Mining Project. Any such mining for which the clean-up might take hundreds of years is unacceptable. Please reject this project. John and Kay Buzza

John and Patricia Telfer 54841

See attachment

John And Robin 43507

Here are my public comments. I sent it to the wrong address. Thank you. ---Original Message--- From: John And Robin <jandrbellamy@aol-com> To: "info <info">@dnr Sent: Thu, Mar 13, 2014 2:12 pm Subject: public comment for Polymet Mine To whom it may concern: As a Minnesota citizen and taxpayer, I protest the Polymet Mine project and don't want it in Minnesota. I am worried about the toxic pollution (sulfuric acid) that the mine will create and the long-term effects of this pollution, such as the ongoing costs to generations of Minnesotans for its clean-up, as well as the damage to the animals and plants in the area. I think it is a foolish way to use our resources in this way, since tourism is a huge industry for northern Minnesota. Destroying natural resources for only 350 jobs doesn't seem wise. What happens to the tourism industry, if this project goes through. What about water quality to nearby rivers and eventually to Lake Superior. I'm not sure that all angles have been explored, such as effects on our health, particularly cancer. Please do not grant a permit to something that could forever ruin this part of the state. Sincerely, Robin C. Bellamy

43557

To whom it may concern: As a Minnesota citizen and taxpayer, I protest the Polymet Mine project and don't want it in Minnesota. I am worried about the toxic pollution (sulfuric acid) that the mine will create and the long-term effects of this pollution, such as the ongoing costs to generations of Minnesotans for its clean-up, as well as the damage to the animals and plants in the area. I think it is a foolish way to use our resources in this way, since tourism is a huge industry for northern Minnesota. Destroying natural resources for only 350 jobs doesn't seem wise. The relatively small number of jobs created does not off set the 200 plus years of toxic run off and clean up that will need to be done to mitigate the damage th emine will do. What happens to the tourism industry, if this project goes through. What about water quality to nearby rivers and eventually to Lake Superior. I'm not sure that all angles have been explored, such as effects on our health, particularly cancer. Please do not grant a permit to something that could forever ruin this part of the state. Sincerely, John H. Bellamy 1641 Highland Pkwy Saint Paul, MN 55116

John Anderson 15726

See attachment

John Arachikavitz 42005

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, John Arachikavitz Rochester, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Badger

15644

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I personally would like to see the issues above resolved and responded to in regards the Impact Statement and how this will be addressed . I thought wetlands can't be destroyed. Digging a pond somewhere else is not the same biodiversity and it's not in the same area. How will the tailing pond protect ducks from landing on it. Hasn't been addressed. What about floods and accidents . There has to be zero tolerance for pollution. I want to see a impact statement on wildlife and moose by a non Polymet third party. The study indicates no nesting eagles but a local person who lives there says there is. Is there endangered plants or animals living there. Need 1-5 million a year for the 500 year time span . IRRRB has to be 100 percent back up to the company's financial assurances. Zero taxpayer liability should be written in. The mining industry must provide like banking and insurance a pooled liability coverage if the company goes out of business. All DNR or MPCA staff who have ever worked for mining needs to exuse themselves from this study and permitting due to conflict of interest . All permit and water violations have to have meaningful fines but also mean immediate shut down until remediated and fines paid. Not gonna see over 300 violations go unenforced like we had with LTV. St Louis River watershed, partridge ,and embarrass rivers can't have any decrease flow from loss of wetlands and their natural ability to clean water. I don't see any plan for tailing pond failure. Needs to be addressed. River flow at the site and down River needs to be redone . It's a big deal . Every model changes with different flow data. Needs re-work. Also put in EIS about planned expansion limits due to existing site limitations and address new mines accumulative effects. Sincerely, Mr John Badger 1341 Valley View Dr Cloquet, MN 55720-2979 (218) 348-3386

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Becker

43589

Lisa Fay, This may be a great opportunity for PolyMet; it may also be a great opportunity for the Iron Range and Minnesota, however, there are still pitfalls ahead. I've read most of the EIS and attended the meeting of January 28 in St Paul. I talked to someone at every table, learned some new things, and came away with some impressions: the people at the tables knew their material and presented it soundly, without taking a stance on the project itself; the people at PolyMet were less engaging. Going forward, the Partridge River analysis should be redone prior to any permitting process. Without it, that oversight may be indicative of the way the entire project will be managed. While that analysis is being reexamined, I would ask that the following issues be considered and addressed. What is the breakdown of the cost analysis used to arrive at the figure of \$200 million for the 200 to 500 year (perpetuity) water monitoring and treatment cost. The DNR will also need to explain how they are going to manage those funds for "perpetuity". Current climate models indicate a warming climate trend; what criteria will be used to address the remediation of the landscape, not just when the mining project is finished and shutdown in 20 or 25 years, but so the landscape plantings are viable at the 50 year mark and beyond. If severe drought were to affect the region during the time span of the mining project, depleting the available water resources required, what is the secondary resource and how does that affect the existing treatment plan. Conversely, how is excessive groundwater runoff to be managed in the event of two consecutive years of exceptional snowfall with one 500 year rain deluge in between. Since this project is a site renovation, becoming a mining operation, and reverting to a site remediation, why is there no mention of any effort to achieve a LEED certification. Not only would LEED certification demonstrate a commitment to the environment, it would serve as an example of how the mining industry and environmentalists can work together in a non-adversarial relationship. A project of this scope, with a twenty plus year life span, will have a high energy consumption. Why has no effort been made to incorporating solar and/or wind energy produced on site, as well as a minimum requirement for the use of Minnesota produced bio-diesel. If you are going to produce local, then use local. This is not just an opportunity to benefit the Iron Range, but also greater Minnesota. It's disappointing enough when PolyMet misses this opportunity to develop goodwill state wide, but when a state building and construction trades' representative and the Mn Chamber of Commerce ignore it completely, it's not difficult to figure out where the marketing dollars are being spent. In the past few weeks, recent studies on sulfate pollution have come to light regarding the impact of sulfates and hydrogen sulfide on wild rice and the surrounding aquaculture. Since the MPCA announced yesterday, March 12, that further studies and analysis are necessary before new sulfate standards can be applied, it would be in everyone's best interest to delay the permitting process for the PolyMet project until those standards are enacted, so that PolyMet can alter their manufacturing processes accordingly. Until these issues, and others that I may have overlooked, are addressed, I cannot support the permitting process going forward at this time. Sincerely, John Becker
Roseville MN

John Brainard

40096

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, John Brainard 519 3rd Ave SE Apt 205 Minneapolis, MN 55414-1654

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Buschette

18230

My name is John Buschette, that's B-U-S-C-H-E-T-T-E, and I just want to say it makes no sense at all, it's really short-sighted to try to create 50 to 100 jobs or even a couple hundred jobs that will last for 20 years and then destroy the environment to the point where it loses thousands of jobs in the tourism industry, destroying fishing, camping, hunting, other kinds of tourism activities, so that thousands of jobs there will be destroyed for 500 years, and the mining companies have had the same track record everywhere they've been where they set up a subsidiary, give most of the money to their overseas parent companies, and then when they're close to the end of the mine, they spin it off as an independent company, that company declares bankruptcy and the people who live there are stuck with hundreds of years of bills in the billions of dollars trying to pay for the cleanup. So the only one who wins are the fat cats in other countries who come here and pillage our land and leave us with the bill and land that's not safe to live in, fish that are no longer safe to eat and waters that we can't have recreation in. They're laughing all the way to the bank and everybody else is stuck with the bill and stuck living with the consequences. And it's also fitting to remember that the CEO of PolyMet is the same guy who was the CEO of BP when they had their Gulf of Mexico oil spill and his response to the oil spill is, "I just want my life back." Nothing about the people who were affected, nothing about all the harm that was done, nothing about the environment that was damaged and is still damaged. He just wanted his life back. He wanted to just leave everybody else to pay for the consequences of his actions, and he created the environment that when that drilling platform blew up, 11 people died. Nobody's ever had to answer for that. So how many Minnesotans may end up dying in a mine here because of the environment he creates while trying to put profits ahead of everything else? They get rich, we pay the price, and everybody except for a handful of people suffer.

john case

40118

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I am opposed to the proposed PolyMet because of the risks to the lake Superior watershed. The cost of being wrong is too great. Subsequent mines will affect the BWCAW and Quetico watersheds with sulfide mining runoff over many years unless everything works "perfectly." Again the risks are too great. The history of this type of mining is full of environmental damage. Minnesota has a unique resource in those watersheds that is far more important and valuable than the minerals under them. Thank you John Case, 2830 Gale rd, Wayzata, MN 55391 Sincerely, Mr john case 2830 Gale Rd Wayzata, MN 55391-2624

John Clifford

2101

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources RE: NorthMet Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) - Proposed PolyMet Mining, Inc. project (Project) Dear Ms Fay: The SDEIS clearly shows that the Project will impose enormous, long-term financial and environmental risks on the people of Minnesota, while providing only meager, short-term benefits. In exchange for "up to" 360 mining jobs lasting "up to" 20 years at the most, we the people would be burdened with at least 500 years of polluted water (not to mention land and air) in an area whose pristine lakes and rivers are a world-class treasure, and a source of long-term income, pride and enjoyment for all Minnesotans. The concept of "financial assurance" is absurd and meaningless in the context of pollution on the scale expected to be generated by this Project. How can the DNR, or anyone, even begin to guess how much it might cost to carry out 500 years of remediation in the interconnected waterways of Northern Minnesota. Is the DNR aware of any example of financial assurances made in the year 1513 that are still operative and sufficient today. How many private enterprises, governments, nations, and peoples have disappeared from the face of the earth since that time. In effect, we are being asked to accept the permanent destruction of one of the few remaining pristine wilderness areas in the world, in exchange for a few hundred temporary jobs. No deal. The Project should not be allowed to go forward Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS. Sincerely, John S. Clifford 1088 Pike Lake Drive New Brighton, MN 55112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Coleman (GLIFWC)

48559

Modeling in the SDEIS appears to be of a fatally flawed and discarded tailings basin design, not the currently proposed basin design. The 2014-03-10 Response 4 from ERM re: the Plant Site MODFLOW modeling identified Attachment A of the Water Modeling Data package of March 2013 (SDEIS reference Polymet 2013j) as the documentation of the tailings basin flow modeling for the SDEIS. That response led me to do further research into just what was modeled for the SDEIS. Careful examination of the scant information in the above referenced Attachment A (2011) indicates that the modeling done in 2011 for that attachment was not of the basin as currently proposed. The footprint modeled for attachment A is the footprint of an early basin proposal from 2007 (2007 basin footprint attached) that was supplanted by the basin design developed during the "Mitigation Options" process of 2008- The mitigation basin design was adopted in 2008 (2008 mitigation design footprint attached) and is the current basin footprint assumed in the text of the SDEIS (SDEIS Fig. 3-2-23). In addition to using an old flawed basin design footprint, the modeling in Attachment A also used a crude representation of bedrock that was supplanted by a more refined bedrock representation during the modeling of the 2008 mitigation design (RS13B Draft-01, 2008). The 2007 basin design, that is modeled in Attachment A (2011) of Polymet 2013j, was deemed to be "fatally flawed" by the DNR (Mitigation Table, Arkley email of 2008/12/09) and was replaced by the "mitigation" design developed in 2008- The diagrams and model files supporting Appendix A (2011) further demonstrate that the modeled footprint is of the early flawed basin design (see footprints in layer 1 of 2007 and 2011 models, attached), instead of the mitigation basin design (see footprint in layer 1 of 2008 model, attached). It appears that the SDEIS Goldsim modeling is based on MODFLOW modeling of an old basin design that was deemed fatally flawed and is not modeling of the currently proposed basin design. I am interested in getting feedback on this issue since the complex history of this project makes identification of supporting materials difficult. If I have miss-identified or miss-understood any SDEIS support documents please let me know. Thanks, john - John Coleman, Madison Office of the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission U.W.-Madison Land Information and Computer Graphics Facility 550 Babcock Drive, Room B102 Madison, WI 53706 608-263-2873 or 265-5639 HYPERLINK "mailto:jcoleman@glifwc-org"jcoleman@glifwc-org Johnson, Bill H (DNR) wrote the following on 3/10/2014 10:31 AM: All, attached please find the follow-up items assigned to ERM coming out of Session IV (03/03/14) of the ongoing water model discussions. Specifically: File: "ERM response to March3 Cooperating Agency Meeting Action Items w Att 3-10-14-pdf" This file contains the responses. Note that Response #1 references the next attachment, which is an Excel spreadsheet. File: "NMetSW002_SW-005_NS data analysis_030714-xlsx" This is the file referenced in Response #1- Please forward this to other staff in your agencies as warranted. That's it. Bill J. for the Co-lead Agencies Project Managers (Bruner; Jimenez; Fay; Johnson) Bill Johnson, Mining Section Lead Environmental Policy and Review Unit MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Box 25 500 Lafayette Road St Paul, MN 55155 651-259-5126 HYPERLINK "mailto:Bill.johnson@state.mn.us"bill.johnson@state.mn.us From: Johnson, Bill H (DNR) Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 2:13 PM To: 'Bruner, Douglas W MVP (HYPERLINK "mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil"\"Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil\"); 'Jimenez, Michael -FS (HYPERLINK "mailto:mjimenez@fs.fed.us"\"mjimenez@fs.fed.us\"); 'Ross Vellacott (HYPERLINK "mailto:Ross.Vellacott@erm-com"\"Ross.Vellacott@erm-com\"); 'David Blaha (HYPERLINK "mailto:David.Blaha@erm-com"\"David.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Crampton

39091

---Original Message--- From: jcramp@comcaStnet [mailto:jcramp@comcaStnet] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:54 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of carbon pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include an updated 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin under increasingly violent weather patterns. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. Repeats of the 1999 Straight Line Windstorm with winds over 90 mph in Northeast Minnesota could also destroy critical wastewater treatment facilities. The constant alteration of drought and flood conditions caused by climate change in Minnesota could put strains on the whole water treatment process which wasn't even taken into account in the SDEIS's water modeling (which didn't even take into account the seasonality of flows in the rivers, streams, wetlands and groundwater) The model which put the flow of the Partridge River at 1/3rd of its actual flow is not fit to be the basis for predicting needs to treat water pollution under climate change scenarios for the next 500 years. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. Make the starting figure \$400,000,000 and keep it out of the hands of the IRRB I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. I camp in North East Minnesota and the Boundary Waters. I fish in the St Louis River and Lake Superior. This SDEIS has serious flaws that need

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Crampton

43036

To: Lisa Fay, MDNR, Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers, Tim Dabney, US Forest Service RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Below are my comments about the PolyMet SDEIS. I am John Crampton of 1401 W. 102nd St, Bloomington, MN, 55431- I am 66 years old and have lived in Minnesota all my life. My wife and I raised our two daughters in Bloomington, and we have spent a great deal of time at the North Shore, Ely, Jay Cooke SP, and Boundary Waters areas camping, fishing, canoeing, hiking, skiing, snowshoeing and bird watching. We value the natural beauty, plants, wildlife, clean air and clean water of Northeast Minnesota. Our oldest daughter went to YMCA Camp Menogyn and to Vermillion Community College where she concentrated in environmental biology and outdoor recreation. Our youngest daughter takes frequent camping trips with her friends to the Boundary Waters and Superior National Forest I am the President of the Bush Lake Chapter- Izaak Walton League of America with over 160 members, the largest chapter in Minnesota. We value the strong longtime connection our league has had with the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Northeastern Minnesota over the past 90 years. The purpose of an environmental impact statement is to clearly communicate the environmental impact of a project and to explore possible alternatives and mitigations to lessen these impacts. I believe the PolyMet SDEIS was written to deliberately mask the many terrible and perpetual environmental impacts of the proposed PolyMet sulfide mining project. The flaws in the PolyMet SDEIS are many and very serious as described below. The PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate because hard rock mining has never been done in an environmentally-acceptable and safe manner in a water-rich environment such as the proposed site near Hoyt Lakes and the tributaries of the St Louis River. Almost all of the examples of technologies that PolyMet provides are from dry climate hard rock mining in Utah, Arizona and Montana. There are no actual real life examples of sulfide mining being done in an environmentally-safe manner in water-rich environments. However, there are many catastrophic examples which serve to show that it as an environmental disaster wherever it is attempted at water-rich sites. The surface water flow calculations for the Partridge River underestimate the baseflow conditions by a factor of 3- This is a fatal flaw since the computer model calculations of water flow are at the heart of hydrological estimates of the flow through the mine, tailings ponds, pipelines, water treatment facilities. Will PolyMet need to make the water treatment facilities bigger. Will they have to treat the water for 1,000 years or 2,000 years or forever. We can't tell because all the calculations are derived from a water flow model based on inaccurate data. The SDEIS should be completely redone or rejected for that reason alone. The PolyMet SDEIS itself foresees the need for perpetual water treatment of 500 years or more requiring continual monitoring, maintenance and high levels of continuous performance by highly complex engineering controls that have never been proven to work in a large scale applications. Think about it 500 years ago Balboa was looking for the Pacific Ocean. Martin Luther was alive and a practicing Catholic. Once hard rock mining is done on a large scale there is no way to stop the heavy metal leaching. PolyMet is proposing to mine for twenty years and then leave to the next 20 generations of Minnesotans the task of keeping its Rube Goldberg collection of technologies running at a high levels of performance (and without any financial assurances) in order to ward off disastrous acid mine pollution dumping into the Partridge, Embarrass, and St Louis Rivers and ultimately Lake Superior, the world's largest body of fresh water. The risk of this is far too high. For this reason alone, the PolyMet project should be

John Denk

40121

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr John Denk 17456 Parkside Ave Tinley Park, IL 60477-3045 (708) 357-0211

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Doberstein

18364

Thank you, Rick. I am John Doberstein. That's J-O-H-N, D-O-B-E-R-S-T-E-I-N. I am from Duluth. I am a volunteer with the Sierra Club. Very happy to be here. And I want thank all the regulatory agencies, all the volunteers, everyone who is working not only long term but short term to make tonight happen. It's pretty exciting. And I want to commend everyone pro, against who has had the courage to come up here and speak this evening. I do feel like this SDEIS is inadequate. And I would please ask that we reevaluate the 500 years of proposed water treatment needs to be addressed. And it is not adequate. It says that it will happen. It does not say how that will be funded, how it will be paid for. And even though we have the minute amount of sulfate in our rock, according to the company, it's a big enough amount to require at least 500 years of treatment according to the modeling. And there is also no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type. Mishaps such as pipeline spills and accidental releases, failures of water collection, and treatment systems, tailings and basin failure. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated to the public so that we have confidence in the company's ability to respond to these crises and potential crises. And I would just ask that we do a little bit better job in the next round. During operations 6.2 million gallons of polluted water a day will be treated. The mining plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. And I would like to see more addressed in that realm. And going back to the financial assurance, I do ask -- I'll reiterate I feel that should be part of this supplemental draft so that the public, the potential entity that will shoulder the responsibility of this cleanup, the public, that we have a chance to comment directly on what the plan is and the cost. How much is this going to cost? What is the dollar amount? How can we do it? I grew up in Two Harbors, Minnesota. I was an Army brat. I moved to Two Harbors at the age of eight from Georgia. And all my family is from Minnesota. I have roots. Even at eight years old I knew that Minnesotans look at the environment different. We don't litter. We protect our environment. We care about it. Everyone in this room here will agree with that statement. I do ask that the regulatory agencies -- I don't envy your position. I know it's really hard. You guys have to protect the environment and distribute the minerals and figure out how to do that. Thank you.

John Dregni

42874

See attachment

John Eckfeldt

39757

Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Dear Mr Bruner, I am a professor of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, past chief of staff of the University of Minnesota Medical Centers' hospital, and former Chief of Clinical Chemistry and Toxicology at the VA Medical Center Minneapolis. I also own a home in Isabella, Lake County, MN which is now my permanent legal address. I would strongly recommend that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected for multiple reasons. In my mind, there is no question that sulfide mining will bring great risks to the water quality and lands in northeast Minnesota. In my mind there will be associated risk to the health of those living in the area and those downstream in the watershed, but I will not dwell on the potential risks. PolyMet's pollution mitigation proposals are vague and very well may not work as planned. The mining industry has a record worldwide of polluting an environment and then leaving it for the local citizens and their governmental to deal with the cleanup. I believe that the only way to assure containment of this potential pollution is to require PolyMet to put funds in escrow or supply bonds for potential cleanup costs. I am not a mining engineer, but from what I've read the annual operating costs for some of the proposed water purification systems (reverse osmosis) might be several million dollars per years and cleanup costs should a containment system malfunction could run in to tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, I have read that is estimated that protection from leakage of toxic waste metals from tailings might be required for hundreds of years. If PolyMet want to mine in Minnesota, which will clearly put Minnesotans at risk if their containment schemes fail to work as expected, require them to provide concrete financial assurances before they start, not after they pollute the groundwater and watershed and "skip town." Sincerely yours, John H. Eckfeldt 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 phone: 651-482-0930 (home/mobile) e-mail: eckfe001@umn.edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Eckfeldt

39760

Lisa Fay SDEIS Manager, MN DNR Dear Ms Fay I am a professor of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, past chief of staff of the University of Minnesota Medical Centers' hospital, and former Chief of Clinical Chemistry and Toxicology at the VA Medical Center Minneapolis. I also own a home in Isabella, Lake County, MN which is now my permanent legal address. I would strongly recommend that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected for multiple reasons. In my mind, there is no question that sulfide mining will bring great risks to the water quality and lands in northeast Minnesota. In my mind there will be associated risk to the health of those living in the area and those downstream in the watershed, but I will not dwell on the potential risks. PolyMet's pollution mitigation proposals are vague and very well may not work as planned. The mining industry has a record worldwide of polluting an environment and then leaving it for the local citizens and their governmental to deal with the cleanup. I believe that the only way to assure containment of this potential pollution is to require PolyMet to put funds in escrow or supply bonds for potential cleanup costs. I am not a mining engineer, but from what I've read the annual operating costs for some of the proposed water purification systems (reverse osmosis) might be several million dollars per years and cleanup costs should a containment system malfunction could run in to tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, I have read that is estimated that protection from leakage of toxic waste metals from tailings might be required for hundreds of years. If PolyMet want to mine in Minnesota, which will clearly put Minnesotans at risk if their containment schemes fail to work as expected, require them to provide concrete financial assurances before they start, not after they pollute the groundwater and watershed and "skip town." Sincerely yours, John H. Eckfeldt, MD, PhD 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 phone: 651-482-0930 (home/mobile) e-mail: eckfe001@umn.edu

47791

From: John Eckfeldt [mailto:eckfe001@umn.edu] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:01 PM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: FW: Comment on PolyMet SDEIS
Richard Periman Deputy Forest Supervisor Dear Mr Periman, From an auto-reply email, I understand that Mr Dabney has retired from the USFS as of March 4 and that my comments on the SDEIS should be sent to you instead. Sincerely, John H. Eckfeldt 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 phone: 651-482-0930 (home/mobile) e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:eckfe001@umn.edu"eckfe001@umn.edu
From: John Eckfeldt [mailto:eckfe001@umn.edu] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 9:40 PM To: 'TDabney@fs.fed.us' Subject: Comment on PolyMet SDEIS
Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Mr Dabney, I am a professor of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, past chief of staff of the University of Minnesota Medical Centers' hospital, and former Chief of Clinical Chemistry and Toxicology at the VA Medical Center Minneapolis. I also own a home in Isabella, Lake County, MN which is now my permanent legal address. I would strongly recommend that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected for multiple reasons. In my mind, there is no question that sulfide mining will bring great risks to the water quality and lands in northeast Minnesota. In my mind there will be associated risk to the health of those living in the area and those downstream in the watershed, but I will not dwell on the potential risks. PolyMet's pollution mitigation proposals are vague and very well may not work as planned. The mining industry has a record worldwide of polluting an environment and then leaving it for the local citizens and their governmental to deal with the cleanup. I believe that the only way to assure containment of this potential pollution is to require PolyMet to put funds in escrow or supply bonds for potential cleanup costs. I am not a mining engineer, but from what I've read the annual operating costs for some of the proposed water purification systems (reverse osmosis) might be several million dollars per years and cleanup costs should a containment system malfunction could run in to tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, I have read that is estimated that protection from leakage of toxic waste metals from tailings might be required for hundreds of years. If PolyMet want to mine in Minnesota, which will clearly put Minnesotans at risk if their containment schemes fail to work as expected, require them to provide concrete financial assurances before they start, not after they pollute the groundwater and watershed and "skip town." Sincerely yours, John H. Eckfeldt 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 phone: 651-482-0930 (home/mobile) e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:eckfe001@umn.edu"eckfe001@umn.edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Eckfeldt 48902

Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Mr Dabney, I am a professor of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, past chief of staff of the University of Minnesota Medical Centers' hospital, and former Chief of Clinical Chemistry and Toxicology at the VA Medical Center Minneapolis. I also own a home in Isabella, Lake County, MN which is now my permanent legal address. I would strongly recommend that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected for multiple reasons. In my mind, there is no question that sulfide mining will bring great risks to the water quality and lands in northeast Minnesota. In my mind there will be associated risk to the health of those living in the area and those downstream in the watershed, but I will not dwell on the potential risks. PolyMet's pollution mitigation proposals are vague and very well may not work as planned. The mining industry has a record worldwide of polluting an environment and then leaving it for the local citizens and their governmental to deal with the cleanup. I believe that the only way to assure containment of this potential pollution is to require PolyMet to put funds in escrow or supply bonds for potential cleanup costs. I am not a mining engineer, but from what I've read the annual operating costs for some of the proposed water purification systems (reverse osmosis) might be several million dollars per years and cleanup costs should a containment system malfunction could run in to tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, I have read that is estimated that protection from leakage of toxic waste metals from tailings might be required for hundreds of years. If PolyMet want to mine in Minnesota, which will clearly put Minnesotans at risk if their containment schemes fail to work as expected, require them to provide concrete financial assurances before they start, not after they pollute the groundwater and watershed and "skip town." Sincerely yours, John H. Eckfeldt 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 phone: 651-482-0930 (home/mobile) e-mail: eckfe001@umn.edu

JOHN EDSTROM 38895

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr JOHN EDSTROM 4120 204th Ln NW Oak Grove, MN 55303-8465

John Engel 42835

See attachment

John F Miller 47618

From: John F Miller 844 Pioneer Road, Red Wing, Mn 55066 I am in full support of the Polymet Mining project. It will provide a much needed economic impact to the Iron Range communities. My wife and I have many relatives in the region and they have felt the downward spiral of available skilled jobs and the lower pay scales. We also have property in the area and would consider relocating to the Range for our final working years with intent to retire there. Lack of jobs has created dependence of residents on programs, an increased attitude they will never get ahead, increased crime and drug and alcohol use. We have seen the negative changes in the last decade. I am confident the Polymet Corporation will be diligent in following the proper guidelines spelled out to comply with the environmental regulations.

John F Wetzel 42872

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Fahey

52215

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, John Fahey 8787 Borden Rd Muir, MI 48860

John Fedo

18092

My name is John Fedo, F-E-D-O. For 22 years I've resided on a two-and-a-half-acre lot on Big Sturgeon Lake in Side Lake, Minnesota. I draw my drinking water from a well 30 minutes from the proposed plant site. I'm the former mayor of City of Duluth, former Hibbing City Administrator and a long-time advocate of job creation in Northeastern Minnesota. But more importantly, I am a father of eight and a grandfather of 9, unfortunately, none of whom live on the Iron Range. A mechanical engineer, a biochemical engineer, an attorney, two healthcare professionals, a business degree graduate, a publisher and a law enforcement officer that have been well educated to unfortunately be employed elsewhere. Over 30-plus years, I've participated in many processes such as this. I've heard advocates and critics that site opinions as fact when it suits them. Last week, I attended the previous hearing in Duluth and listened to testimony that I respectfully acknowledge was very long on biased conclusion and very short on science. I heard an individual ascribe stupidity to anyone that wanted to agree with the issuance of a permit to proceed. Not because of the fact that the science was wrong, but because their conclusion was wrong and from her perspective, she did not agree. The point of this EIS procedure, as I've come to understand, is to gather facts and base a permitting decision on the best science and a criteria that does not inhibit the project but, in fact, guides it. I've worked on many job-creation and community-improvement projects in my time, creating many hundreds of jobs in Northeastern Minnesota. A paper plant, a drill plant, hotels, road and freeway projects, apartment buildings, college expansions, commercial projects, tourism projects, bike paths, airport projects, industrial projects, all of those projects involved well-meaning, dedicated community advocates, investors and elected officials. But the most consistent element in those projects was the sense of community improvement and a desire to leave the area better than when we came into it. More jobs, more investment, cleaner water, a better environment, more opportunities and a better life for our children and grandchildren. My whole point tonight is to speak in favor of the moving the PolyMet Project forward and to advocate based on the science and the facts that can make this project viable and not be deterred by well-funded opponents that are ironically funded, in some cases, by the wealth created by the very industry they now claim they oppose. Opponents who, coincidentally, have the very same personal environmental footprint that demands these metals to service their cell phones, clean technology vehicles, et cetera, almost all of which currently comes from third-world providers, with no environmental oversight, and ends up negatively affecting our local environment on a long-distance basis. Terms like financial assurance and 200-year modeling are misstating the true nature of the project and are meant to be a distraction away from the orderly analysis are engaging in. This is not say that those issues will not be addressed, because they will, but as factual resolution as the law prescribes. Finally, we live in the environment that this plant will operate in. We are not going to advocate for a job that will pollute the wells we draw our water from. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Finazzo

39065

---Original Message--- From: johnfinazzo@yahoo-com [mailto:johnfinazzo@yahoo-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 9:57 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, John Finazzo 1070 North Shore Drive W, Orono, MN Mound, MN 55364-9726

40021

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr John Finazzo 1070 N Shore Dr W Mound, MN 55364-9726 (612) 382-5772

41937

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John Finazzo 1070 N Shore Dr W Mound, MN 55364-9726

John Finnegan

42797

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Fitzpatrick

22438

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Minings proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMets project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMets plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. John Fitzpatrick 43 Ash Blvd, Babbitt, MN 55706

John Flaten

11144

Ladies and Gentlemen of The MDNR Environmental Review Unit: My comment letter dated February 3, 2014, addressed to Ms Lisa Fay, was also an attachment to an email addressed and transmitted concurrently to you. For readability I now transmit a corrected version of my earlier comment letter which is re-dated today, February 6, 2014, which simply adds the missing caption Future Financing and Joint and Several Securities Law Liability Among Controlling Person Affiliates and moves the two paragraphs pertaining to this subject without other edit to the penultimate section of my comment letter. I'm sorry for any confusion. Thank you, John P. Flaten 1375 Walsh Road Ely, MN 55731-8034 (218) 365-8801

19305

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. A technical paper of over 2,000 pages, regarding our sacred trust environment, documented by over 700 references, will take even the most diligent among us much more than 90 days to absorb and prepare to comment constructively upon. We'll also need a further public meeting to present and discuss those comments at the end of the requested extended comment period. Please don't allow Polymet to co-opt the process before all substantive public issues can be raised and scientifically considered. Thank you. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, John Flaten 1375 Walsh Road Ely, MN 55731 218-365-8801

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Gannett

40043

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr John Gannett 824 Cornwallis Ct Eagan, MN 55123-1961 (612) 239-5250

John Gappa

40282

NorthMet SDEIS Input By John Gappa March 10, 2014 I have had the opportunity to serve as a Chief Financial Officer for 20 years. As CFO, I have reviewed hundreds of millions of dollars of investments creating over 1000 jobs. My role in these investments, some of which were in excess of \$100 million each, was to develop the business case, project costs and revenues over a twenty year period, and evaluate the returns and associated risks. While most of these investments were successful, some were not. Over the years, I have learned the hard way that failed projects all have two problems – overestimated benefits and underestimated costs and risks. As I have reviewed the Polymet plan from a CFO perspective, I have struggled to figure out how the numbers can work with a model that has 20 years of benefits and hundreds of years of costs. My conclusion is that the only way the PolyMet model works is to inflate the benefits, underestimate the costs and shift the risks to someone else. For example, I believe the recent issue over the base flow rates in the Partridge River may be a troubling example of underestimating the costs to the environment in order to make the models work. For my own understanding, I wanted to try to model out what 500 years of remediation costs might look like. I attempted to find inputs for my model from the draft supplemental EIS. While PolyMet provided estimates for closing costs and annual post-closure monitoring and maintenance expenses, there was no further detail or mention of ongoing expenses such as ongoing equipment repair and obsolesce. There was also no mention of ongoing capital expenditures that will be required of an operation of this scale and duration such as equipment and facility replacement. Never the less, I built a 100 year model using assumptions derived from my experience with planning complex, capital intensive processing operations. This model produced upfront funding requirements approaching \$300 million. What I also found is that the financial assurance model is highly sensitive to very small changes in inputs. For example, · A \$1 million increase in annual operating costs results in a \$37 million or 13% increase in the future value of funding required · A one percentage point decrease in the reinvestment or discount rate used results in a \$83 million or 30% increase in the future value of funding required. · A half a percentage point increase in the inflation rate results in a \$71 million increase or a 25% increase in funding required. The point of the matter is that given the significant length of time that remediation will be required, estimating the upfront investment needed to fund the remediation is highly uncertain and very small differences in assumptions have a dramatic impact on the total funding required. Moreover, the detail behind PolyMet's estimates must be disclosed in the final EIS in order for the public to assess the viability of remediation and necessary financial assurance. Another key concern is to ensure that the remediation is fully funded, regardless of when PolyMet stops mining – either after 5, 10 or 20 years. To quote one of the many risk factors that PolyMet included for their investors in a recent filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission: “Because the price of metals fluctuate, if the prices of metals in our ore body decrease below a specified level, it may no longer be profitable to develop our NorthMet Project for those metals and we will cease operations.” The State of Minnesota would be wise to heed this risk factor as well. A key difference between PolyMet and most companies making these sorts of investment decisions is that PolyMet exists solely to develop the NorthMet project. Most companies can choose among an array of investments, acquisitions or returning cash to shareholders. PolyMet's motivation is not to pick the best project possible,

John Green

16120

Please see attached document. Name and address at the end. Thank you. John C. Green 1754 Old North Shore Road Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Grillo

12959

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for[,] information[,] that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the U.[.][S.] Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,
Mr John Grillo 3 Marsh Ln Apt 21 Orono, ME 04473-5620

John Gronquist

41742

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Gustafson

47365

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The proposed PolyMet mine for copper and other so-called precious metals brings up several issues that need to be seriously considered by the State of Minnesota before any new mining permits are considered. The proposed PolyMet mine should not be allowed in my opinion for at minimum the following reasons: 1)the lifetime of the negative environmental impacts for the proposed mine far exceeds the economic viability of the mine; 2)no human or mechanical method exists to guarantee treatment of the mine's pollution for the time beyond the economic viability of the mine. How does one guarantee that people four hundred years in the future will even know how to operate the water treatment systems, let alone will be able to afford to do so. 3)the global mining industry and particularly the global copper mining industry have earned a severely negative reputation for labor, economic, and environmental impacts over the long term. Look to the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to see the continuing pollution that is ongoing, long after the mines have shut down and vanished. The global mining industry should clean up all of their past pollution "mistakes" before new permits are considered. 4)no method exists to control the political climate that governs the mine's operations over the long term. Look simply to Wisconsin where the Walker administration has in a short time gutted environmental regulations that were thoughtfully and scientifically developed over the long term. 5)the majority of the economic benefits of the proposed mine are short term and will flow out of the State, going to entities that have no interest or personal investment in Minnesota's livelihood. 6)If the PolyMet mine is opened, it will set a sad precedent in Minnesota, perhaps leading to the opening of additional mines of questionable character. The cumulative effects of multiple sulfide-producing mines needs to be seriously considered 7)If Minnesota is to have a long term sustainable economy, Minnesota needs to promote and emphasize potentially sustainable businesses like tourism, forestry and forest products, agriculture, renewable energy resources, and valued-added manufacturing rather than the short term extractive mining of low-valued bulk minerals. The viability of sustainable businesses will be negatively affected by the proposed Polymet mine. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr John Gustafson PO Box 62 128 Kendall Road Knife River, MN 55609-0062 (218) 834-3582

John Hadesty

57573

Dear Lisa, with the current war on coal waged by our current administration, projects such as the one PolyMet are proposing need to be approved now. Delaying projects like this could risk the availability of a qualified workforce. As coal mines continue to downsize, qualified miners are retiring or being retrained to take other career positions thus leaving projects like PolyMet to be forced to hire un-qualified, inexperienced miners. Please pass this project. It will create a much needed boom to Minnesota's economy as miner's such as myself flock to your state seeking employment. Miners are the exact type of workforce you want in Minnesota: hardworking, responsible, family oriented, friendly people. Always pulling their own weight and not looking for handouts. Please say yes to creating mining jobs. Remember: If it is not grown, it is mined. Please call with any questions. I am an experienced miner of 24 years and currently responsible for the Health and Safety and training at our 8,000 acre mine here in Northeast Pennsylvania. I would be glad to work with you in some capacity overseeing and regulating this project. My son is in his third year at Penn State University studying Mining Engineering and I'm looking for a new challenge and to re-locate. This project looks very inviting. Have a great week. John J. Hadesty Lehigh Anthracite Coal, LLC 1233 E. Broad St (Main Office) 1401 E. Broad St (Mine Entrance) Tamaqua, PA 18252 (570) 645-0254 - Office (570) 645-0292 - Fax (570) 527-1554 - Mobile HYPERLINK "mailto:jhadesty@lehighanthracite-com"jhadesty@lehighanthracite-com

John Haleeska

58105

It is inconceivable that any consideration would be given to the PolyMet proposal. A [ILLEGIBLE] the people of Minnesota will have to deal with an unknowable cost for centuries vs a few jobs for a couple decades. The state would be crazy to allow this.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Hanson

40711

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Harrington

16277

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

John Helland

42941

My comments are attached below.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Herbst

33031

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Wisconsin experienced similar situations back in the 1990's when at first Exxon Minerals, and then a consortium of multinational mining interests including Rio Tinto (and others) tried to convince the state that a lead/copper mine was in the best interests of the state. When it was revealed that the best plan they (the multinational corporations) could come up with to deal with the MASSIVE amount of liquid waste from the industrial scale extraction of minerals from this ore body, was to pump it all directly into the Wolf River in northern WI near Crandon, the uproar began. Besides all the recreation done on the river, boating, rafting, kayaking, this is one of the regions premier fisheries, and also supports significant First Nations peoples traditional hunting/gathering activities guaranteed in the state's treaties with these peoples dating back to the early to mid 1800's. In addition, the tailings pile was calculated to be many times larger THAN THE PYRAMID OF GIZA IN EGYPT. This tailings pile would rupture its containment device before 100 years elapsed after mining operations ceased, and the company, if still extant, would be long gone and difficult, if not impossible, to get remedies from in a court of law to clean up and remediate the contaminated wells, groundwater, cancer clusters, and human epidemiological nightmare resulting from thousands of tons of tailings and resultant leachate percolating through the aquifer for over a 150 square mile area surrounding the tailings pile. When state law required the mine owners to come up with 3 examples of such a mine, that was successful in its execution and DID NOT cause serious environmental contamination and costly/ineffective clean-up efforts afterwards, they submitted examples which were either 1) completely different in soil type and mineral content/hydrodynamics and completely irrelevant to the task at hand, or 2) were easily shown to be an environmental disaster, with costly clean-up, and serious long-term contamination of the environment, aquifer pollution, human health and drinking water warnings, and negative impacts on the native fauna and recreation activities, for many decades after the mines in the examples cited, were shut down. Suffice it to say, all mine owners pulled out of the Crandon area and have never attempted to initiate the mine permit process in the past 15 years. Most certainly this sulfide mine will present similar, or worse contamination problems which cannot be successfully dealt with either, over the long-term. The last thing the Great Lakes region needs now is another failed attempt at siting a sulfide mine which will only give minimal assist to the local economy, and will certainly damage the regions long term economic stability due to another soil/groundwater polluting, Recreational activity spoiling mine, and the environmental wreckage and ruin which is never remedied in a court of law. Learn from Wisconsin's example and accept that the Federal land exchange of pro

John Herold

42751

See attachment

42752

See attachment

54550

Ms. Fay, Polymet's proposed mining will cost the citizens of Minnesota tremendous financial resources. For 500 years? How long do you think Polymet will pay for 500 years of water treatment? Please re-evaluate the practicality of this plan.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Hill 40140

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, John Hill 6719 34th Ave N Crystal, MN 55427-2220

John Ingham 7765

My husband, John Ingham and I, wish to register our opposition to copper-nickel mining in Northern MN. We recall the assurances that Taconite Mining would not pollute the watershed and the attempts of the mining company to deny their actions as the source of asbestos pollution to Lake Superior. Even with the best technology and state of the art methods for capturing sulfide. eventually, perhaps several generations from now, those chemicals will leach into the watershed and Lake Superior. The mining company is not going to take responsibility, even if it still exists as an entity, 100 years from now. And, even if it were to take responsibility, it would not be possible reverse the damage. No amount of money would compensate the people relying on Lake Superior for their potable water. Fresh water is going to be a necessary condition for quality of life in MN long after the miners and the minerals have come and gone. Sincerely, Mary Grove

John Ipsen 40880

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay, Please accept the attached document, PolyMet SDEIS 2014 Comments, as my official comment on the PolyMet Project Proposed Action. Sincerely, John Ipsen 3726 E. 3Rd St Duluth, MN 55804-1826

John J Weber 54717

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Kennebeck

41620

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, John Kennebeck Lake Wilson, Minnesota

JOHN KENNEDY

44317

I am writing as a "transplant" to Minnesota, having grown up near Boston. I have lived here in the Twin Cities area for 35 years. When our two boys were small, we enjoyed taking them camping "up North" venturing along the shores of Lake Superior and heading inland up the Gunflint Trail. Our travels took us into the region where PolyMet is attempting to persuade Minnesotans to allow a gigantic open pit mine to be put into operation. The idea seems to me to be on a par with suggesting that we should log Yellowstone Park or haul all of the topsoil away from the fertile valleys of California. To allow sulfide mining in the Hoyt Lakes area is a very bad idea for multiple reasons. I will focus on just one reason, which I think is very obvious to me as a newcomer to the state, and that is that it spoils the environment. We stand to lose the beauty of the area, the wildlife, the health of the watershed, the clean air, and the ability of Tribal Nations to carry out their guaranteed rights to hunting, fishing, and gathering wild rice in the region. Please listen to those of us who are pleading on behalf of preserving this area in its pristine condition: Do not allow NorthMet to go forwaRd Now is the time to say "No" to this bad idea. Submitted by Lucy Kennedy 194 Oakview Road W. St Paul, MN 55118

Alphabetical by sender's first name

JOHN KENNEDY

45451

Minnesotans have an ethical responsibility to prevent sulfide mining in our beautiful Arrowhead region. To jeopardize one of the most abundant sources of clean, fresh water in the state and indeed in the world would be a reprehensible, unforgiveable act. Those who are proposing the NorthMet mine and who stand to profit from it may not care about the devastating effects which mining would have on this area and how it would effect our children and our grandchildren, but those of us who live here certainly do. We deserve to live in a healthful environment and to pass along to future generations an environment which has been kept free of pollution and degradation. It is outrageous that this project has been allowed to progress this far, at huge expense. It has diverted attention from other pressing concerns and has caused great upheaval in the lives of all those who have had to come forward and spend hours and hours out of our lives fighting against a proposal that is so deeply flawed as to be inconceivable. It is simply unthinkable that such a hazardous mining operation could ever be compatible with the unique character of the proposed site. Simply stated, water is precious. As demand for drinking water increases due to population growth, global warming, and loss of other clean water sources, it would be unconscionable to put this source of clean and abundant water at risk. The long, drawn-out battle over the proposed PolyMet mine is pitching Minnesota citizens against each other. But this fight is not just about jobs. At the core of this battle is the issue of who gets to decide the future of our state. Who gets to make the decisions which determine what kind of an environment the citizens of Minnesota will bequeath to their children and grandchildren and all future generations. Think about it: Who at the United States Forest Service is authorized to "swap" our public land with mining companies. These lands in the Superior National Forest were purchased under the Weeks Act of 1900 in order to preserve watersheds. Open pit mining is forbidden on such lands. To open these lands to sulfide mining would be a betrayal of the public trust and is clearly illegal. Why then is the land swap being treated as something that could easily be accomplished. These beautiful, pristine lands belong to the American people, who trust the National Forest Service to be good stewards of our public lands. Where is the leadership in the State of Minnesota. Why are our Governor and legislators not taking up this issue with the federal government. Since European explorers first came to the Arrowhead area, the land has suffered the onslaughts of mining and logging interests. The indigenous people who lived here were displaced in a shameful grab for "resources." Although they were forced to cede their lands to the invading miners and loggers, the native populations are guaranteed hunting, fishing, and subsistence rights on Ceded Territories. When we look at the impacts sulfide mining would likely have on wild rice, fish, and game, we can clearly see that these guarantees are meaningless. Again, where is our leadership. Who is standing up for the rights of the Tribal Nations. Indigenous peoples around the world, including in our neighbor Wisconsin, are fighting to save their lands from destruction. Here in Minnesota, we must show good faith to all of our people. Minnesotans- all of us- deserve to have a healthy, clean, sustainable environment to pass along to future generations. Sulfide mining in the Arrowhead destroys all hope for a proud legacy. We must stop PolyMet now.

John Klein

16018

When or where do we see the \$ set aside for the environmental insurance. Thanks. John Klein 3448 10th Ave S.

Mpls.Mn. 55407

John Knudson

3166

I am excited to see the potential for bringing economic prosperity back to the Iron Range with the Polymet project. I support this project based the positive outlook of the SDEIS and the work that the company has done in the reverse osmosis water treatment. I believe that Polymet has MN best interest in mind in creating a company and project that will bring much needed revenue to the state in an environmentally conscious manner. Best regards, John Knudson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

john koch

41927

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, john koch Litchfield, Minnesota

John Kolander

47516

Please do not proceed with this mining. I am adamantly opposed to this expanded mining. Sincerely, John Kolander 222 2nd St SE. #401 Minneapolis, MN 55414

John Kolstad

47773

Dear Lisa, I cut and pasted my letter, plus I have attached it as an MS Word file. John Kolstad, President Mill City Music 3820 East Lake Street Minneapolis, MN 55406 March 9, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) Dear DNR, As a business person I understand that we need economic development and job creation. I have been following the debate and discussion on the PolyMet mining proposal. I withheld any opinion until I could learn a great deal more about this project. There seem to be three main arguments by the proponents: 1- The metals are needed 2- This will create jobs and economic development 3- It is environmentally safe and non-polluting. 1) There is a world full of these and other metals, that could be recycled but are not. If recycling got the same tax breaks mining, there would be an abundant of these metals and others. Recycling would not pollute the environment or put a region at risk of disaster. 2) This will create a minute number of jobs considering the area, the number who need jobs and the jobs projected even by the proponents. Plus there is no guarantee that any area people will get these jobs or what they will be paid. The Small Business Administration has published job statistics for over 50 years. Over 50% of all USA jobs are with small business. In the latest study by the Minnesota House Research Service, 90% of new jobs are with small business. If Jobs is the issue, then our resources should go to the small business sector. These jobs will be locally based and not be able to move the business or the jobs to China. The Fortune 500 companies have had negative job growth in the US. It is so sad to see the Union Leadership representing people in this area, siding with multi-national corporation who will come in, do what they want, then file bankruptcy and leave In all the History of Unions, they have always sided with the people and the community and never with the corporations or "Bosses". That these unions are using their rank and file members to push this project shows this is about money and power and not jobs or the economic well being of the region. 3) The study by PolyMet states that the sites will be polluted for 500 years, but jobs and the operation will only last about 20 years. Who will be here for 500 years to manage this. This is insanity. I know a number of students or young people who have large Student Loan debt and credit card debt. These people are prohibited by federal law from filing bankruptcy and be relieved of debt. So they will owe it until paid off or they die. Yet Mining Corporations, like PolyMet, created just for this project, will be able to declare bankruptcy and walk away and leave the pollution, the unemployed and a devastated community. This makes clear who writes our National Laws. I have been to many industrial or mining towns like this, out West, the Michigan UP, the Cleveland area and many more. Before this project should be considered for a second, the Financiers, stockholders, parent corporations or those receiving any benefits from this project should be permanently responsible until total recovery and liability is satisfied. No opportunity for bankruptcy and walking away scott free. Certainly the people of this area need jobs. Long time history shows that Small Business does by far the best at creating and providing Jobs. The State and Region Resources should be directed to area small business creation that is sustainable into the future and protective of the environment that all their children can grow up in a healthy world. Short term profit producing a disaster vs long term community with sustainable job. A public servant should chose the sustainable path. In my reading and research on this topic, I found stats that 75% of

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Krenn 58009

It is very important to stop Poly Met! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

John Landgraf 9550

I was glad to lend my voice last night at the Rivercenter. I was also pleased that there were so many others who gave thoughtful presentations arguing against the safety of the plan to mine copper and other metals in northern Minnesota. John E. Landgraf On 1/28/14, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: > Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land > Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses > to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If > you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or > electronic distribution of the record >>

18163

My name is John Landgraf. I am an archeologist. I lived for 15 years in the Middle East. And I studied for nine years in Germany. But I was born here in the US. I just think it would be very nice for many of our workers here, especially with all the unemployment in the United States, to earn more money; but we have an environmental impact that is too great in my opinion. But I would like to just point out where the profits of such mining might go. PolyMet is on the New York Stock Exchange, the world stock exchanges. About 40 percent of PolyMet's money is in Switzerland and the – I mean and, of course, they're at the top 1 percent that have a certain amount of PolyMet here in the United States. I'm just pointing out that most of the profits of PolyMet will go to people not in Minnesota. To the 1 percent. To the people in foreign countries. I would be more inclined maybe if it were possible to mine environmentally clear and if the money, actually the real profits the mining, went to Minnesota. But, ah, it will go to the wealthy stockholders and the foreigners. Thank you.

John Lawrow 39597

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr John Lawrow 5015 Fremont Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-1157 (612) 825-7377

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Leinen

16280

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

John Lhotka

43080

Dear Minnesota DNR - I have lived nearly my entire life in Minnesota and if there is anything I have learned during that time is Minnesota's lakes and rivers are what set us apart. Meeting people from across the country, it is not uncommon for me to get comments like "I LOVE the Boundary Waters" or "I caught my first Walleye in northern Minnesota". Our lakes and rivers are arguably one of our single most important assets, not only from a quality of life perspective, but also because tourism is a significant economic driver for northern Minnesota. I also am a property owner on a lake in the Ely area, so the decisions on the Polymet project may directly impact me, if it negatively impacts the watershed that flows through my lake. Needless to say I am deeply troubled when I hear that the Polymet project could require on-going water treatment for CENTURIES to come. While I understand the desire to acquire more mining jobs in Northern Minnesota, I urge the DNR and other decision-makers to look at the bigger picture to what extent are we willing to jeopardize our lakes and streams for CENTURIES (and the jobs that are linked to tourism that could be lost) for 350 mining jobs that might only last for 2 decades. I can give you my answer: It seems incredibly short-sighted to take that risk. Please do not move forward with this project. Kind Regards, John Lhotka 3817 Lyndale Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Lindroos

48758

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. No amount of financial profit (for companies, company executives or or hired employees) justifies or offsets the potential long term damage "sulfide mining " could have on the Northeast Minnesota environment. Any related Mining Process must be proven to be safe for employees, residents and the Environment. Good luck with that. I don't say these things for me. I'm retired, have lived and travelled throughout the country and world. I'd have no problem leaving the area when things around here "go south". I'd do so, however, with unparalleled distain for those who willfully or unknowingly, destroyed an unparalleled wilderness and unique culture. I sincerely hope PolyMet has the right answers and Government oversight will not be inappropriately influenced by self serving political or financial motivation. Much has to be done right; to get it right. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr John Lindroos 729 S 2nd Ave E Ely, MN 55731-1308 (218) 365-6887

John Linnerson

40435

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Louis

38622

John Louis 15754 Hayes Trail Apple Valley MN 55124 Short term jobs for long long term problems after all is said and done. Please review the past record of PolyMet and it's owners with other mining operations they have undertaken and think this over, is that how you would want this to turn out. Cleaning up after mining operations has a bad history and the saying goes if one does not study history one will repeat it. Bad idea for a beautiful part of our state that will be lost for generations to come. My time is limited on this earth but others that follow will have to live with this mess. Thank you allowing me to speak on this issue. I pray that you do careful consideration and let your heart lead you not your pocket book.

John Lowen

41715

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Lundquist

39413

As a longtime user of the BWCA, I am very disturbed by the PolyMet proposal. Bottom line is that the SDEIS is flawed and does not guarantee that sulfide mining can be done in Minnesota without seriously harming water and habitat. This is classic short-term thinking, ie we will have jobs now and for a relatively short time and risk one on the country's most amazing natural areas for future generations. You should treasure this resource, and not take ANY chance that it will be ruined for the chance to make some short term money. It is not worth it. This project should not go forward. Thanks for reading and taking into account my position. John W. Lundquist Fredrikson and Byron, P.A. 200 South Sixth Street Suite 4000 Minneapolis, MN. 55402-1425 612-492-7181 (direct) 612-492-7000 (main) 612-492-7077 (fax) [HYPERLINK "mailto:jlundquist@fredlaw-com"](mailto:jlundquist@fredlaw-com)jlundquist@fredlaw-com **This is a transmission from the law firm of Fredrikson and Byron, P.A. and may contain information which is privileged, confidential, and protected by the attorney-client or attorney work product privileges. If you are not the addressee, note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please destroy it and notify us immediately at our telephone number (612) 492-7000- The name and biographical data provided above are for informational purposes only and are not intended to be a signature or other indication of an intent by the sender to authenticate the contents of this electronic message.**

John M Ek

52481

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John M Ek 5076 Hermantown Rd Hermantown, MN 55811

John M Roth

54492

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Matheson

41037

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

41809

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, John Matheson 4550 Central Ave NE Hilltop, MN 55421-2482 (763) 572-2190

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Matheson

42142

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Matheson 4550 Central lot 1244 Hilltop Mn, 55421-2487, MN 55421

John Mette

42076

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, John Mette Minnetonka, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Metzner

39506

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Metzner PO Box 541 Cottage Grove, MN 55016

John Mischke

42458

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. This is too great a risk. There has to be other ways to help Northern Minnesota economically. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. I have often gone to the Boundary Waters and I want this experience for future generations. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John Mischke 821 Raymond Ave Ste 300 Saint Paul, MN 55114-1525

58128

Any cleanup is unacceptable to me. Northern MN is too precious. Only if Polymet can show past success not polluting would I sign off on mining our wilderness.

John Muehlbauer

7195

I'm a fisherman. I'm a hunter. I'm a father. I plan to live the rest of my days in Minnesota, which includes a lot of outdoor enjoyment in the Arrowhead region. I'm sure the folks up on the Range would like to do the same. Polymet has done their homework on this one. Block out the noise from the radicals who are blind to the environmental protections that Polymet has built into their plan. We can keep improving our environmental quality of life and at the same time, retain the proud heritage of the Iron Range people. John Muehlbauer 3785 Stebner Rd Hermantown, MN 55811 218-390-4898

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Mugford

38629

Sent from my iPhone On Mar 11, 2014, at 7:04 PM, John Mugford <[HYPERLINK "mailto:jbmugford@msn-com"jbmugford@msn-com](mailto:jbmugford@msn-com)> DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Mugford

38634

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage and pollution nonferr

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Munter

18086

My name is John Munter. I'm 64. I work at Delta Airlines. And if you ever need a job, you can come over to Delta. We're hiring continually there and we're one of the best res office -- actually the best res office, according to the CEO of Delta, that we have. So we'll be here for a long time. My grandfather worked at the mines and my great uncle shot deer year-round and netted fish and cut cord wood for moonshiners on county land and life was good, but my family has moved away and my siblings are gone, and my kids may also move away, but I'll be darned if I want my kids to work on a 500-acre, 20-story slag pile, superfund toxic waste site straddling the continental divide on wetlands surrounded by rivers over an aquifer at the headwaters of the St. Louis River Basin. I think this project is going to fail several reasons. One, it's like signing a nuclear waste dump in your back yard. I mean, why would we do this? Two, the SDEIS is like lipstick on a pig. Everybody likes the pork, but that pig don't fly for some underlying assumptions. And thirdly, there's too many people that are going to sue, I think. The two Indian tribes, I believe, might sue. The people downstream scared about their wells. The environmental groups may sue. One of the problems, for example, is the DNR should require PolyMet to buy, not lease, the mineral rights for the south -- the west pit so that it can be back filled from that 20-story tailing pile and so it can be under water, then, when the financial assurance collapses at some point. And secondly, plastic liners leak. This is one of the assumptions the EIS makes -- they don't leak. Well, they do. Faulty heat sealing of seams. Fluid accumulation can push fluid down, even through tiny holes, they can push it through the membranes or bumps and pressure points can cause problems. And the peak pollution won't happen in the sulfur mining -- sulfide mining for 500 years and then there's the downside of the Bell Curve after that. So it's in perpetuity, basically. This brings us to the most bizarre assumption of the EIS. You cannot guarantee financial instruments for 500 years or a thousand years in perpetuity. It's going to cost \$3-and-a-half billion -- \$3-and-a-half million to \$6 million a year for two water-treatment plants. That comes out to \$1-and-a-half to \$3 billion over 500 years, and of course, we're looking at 1,000 years. You'll need a whole new EIS after PolyMet coughs up the final financial assurance at the eleventh hour. At the 11th hour, and they're currently thinking about roughly \$200 million. That's not going to make it. The current SDEIS is a bait and switch. Okay, this is a great EIS, now, can you pay for it? And we may have to cut corners, there, but eventually, the fund will fail, the trees will grow through the plastic, sulfuric acid and heavy metals will fill the rivers. But we're right now in a runaway-global-warming climate cycle. We had a 41 billion-dollar disasters last year. And warm air is upsetting polar vortex. That's why the cold air is hiding out in our backyards. The arctic will be ice free in the summer in a couple years. Methane is already ballooning up the swamps and the lakes and the shallow seas, which is 70 times worse than warming gas and carbon dioxide. Seventy times, not percent. Insurance companies and economies will fail and you'll be trying to be fish and drink out of the polluted rivers. Mark my word.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Munter

41920

From: John M Munter 14860 Bruce Creek Rd Warba, MN 55793
Stops. By John Munter

PolyMet: What Happens When The Music

Part 1—FollyMet and Pollyanna Even if the DNR in their Copper-Nickel

mining computations in Northern Minnesota can determine how many angels can dance on the head of a pin and PolyMet can manipulate them so they don't overflow into the St Louis River Basin—there is a problem. Even if the DNR can rationalize away the implications of the water flow issues that they vastly underestimated even though they were correctly advised for years by tribal experts—there is a problem. Even if some coming lawsuit by the three tribes of the 1854 ceded territories claiming infringement upon their legal rights to harvest local foods and medicines is thrown out in court (a big assumption)—there is a problem. Even if the tremendous rock blasting at the mine site doesn't open up more and wider fractures in the underlying bedrock and the toxic leachates don't penetrate well through the underlying granitic aquifer but flow like hypnotized children of the Pied Piper of PolyMet to be sucked into the pipes and water treatment plants—there is a problem. Even if the forty-six lbs a year of airborne mercury PolyMet creates during the twenty year mine is not judged to be a burden on a region where one in ten babies born already has too high a mercury level—there is a problem. Even if the most reactive rock is back-filled into a hole and only the least reactive rock is piled two hundred feet high—there is a problem. Even if all the plastic is replaced regularly over the five hundred acre site, and all the leachate is collected from the twenty story tall reactive waste rock, and the pipe leaks are repaired quickly, and a fund is established by PolyMet to fund the two water treatment plants that will cost between three and a half to six million dollars a year—there is a problem. Even if the estimated minimum sixteen million gallons of escaped toxic seepage a year into the ground and surface waters isn't considered a problem—there is still a problem. Even if PolyMet isn't just a shell company that will grab the profits and then declare bankruptcy—there is a problem. Even if proposed PolyMet processing facility isn't re-used after twenty years to process ore from a dozen other future copper-nickel mines for a hundred years—there is still a problem. The problem is that the mine becomes a superfund site requiring perpetual treatment for the run-off of antimony (similar to arsenic), sulfates, and heavy metals. DNR admits that the Mine Site will require water treatment for more than two hundred years and the Plant Site will require water treatment for more than five hundred years. However, there is no clear rationale for why water treatment won't be needed for thousands of years rather than hundreds. Perhaps, 'progress' or 'science' will solve all of our problems for us someday but that 'pass the buck' or 'put it on the credit card' methodology hasn't worked very well yet for the problems of nuclear waste, carbon pollution, and all the other sulfide mining sites. This problem of a perpetual waste stream brings up the associated problem of devising a perpetual funding mechanism which can pay out millions of dollars a year indefinitely without spending down the principal. PolyMet seems to be thinking of spending something on the order of two hundred million dollars that would probably be set aside in some kind of a trust fund. Taking the high end of cost estimates by the DNR of six million dollars a year this would run out in about 40 years depending on how much interest was garnered. Of course, there is a limit to how much PolyMet could put into a fund and still make a profit on the mine. But, this isn't the bigge

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Munter

42229

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

John Nash, Ph.D., L.P.

21168

I support your efforts to extract important resources from this state. However, I think you've got a major trust issue; not just your company, but the mining (including oil) industry in general. Many think you're saying "Trust me, let me get the permits - and then we'll do what we please to make as much money as possible by getting around what regulations we can." Sorry for being so direct, but this is the case. Your PR campaign should focus on factual statements and demonstrations of how large mines can be operated without screwing up the environment. How did the uranium mines around Bancroft, Quebec do. I don't know, but you should. If they happened to do a good job, you could use that to say "Hey, they did it 20 years ago with radioactive waste, we've got better tech now, etc" Of course, if the whole place glows in the dark. oh well. Good luck (p.s. I'm a mineral collector, so gotta love mining, eh. Sign me up for a tour underground when you hit the mineralized zones) John - John K. Nash, PhD, L.P. Senior Fellow, BCIA, Board Certified Neurofeedback Diplomat, QEEG Certification Board President, Behavioral Medicine Associates, Inc. 4820 West 77th Street, Suite 135 Edina, MN 55435 Telephone: 952-844-0619 Facsimile: 952-844-0628 <http://www.qeeg-com> <http://www.minnesotarttherapy-com> Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, and Federal statute including HIPAA, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Norton 38832

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John Norton 307 Laurel Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102-2105 (410) 458-3380

john Oertel 42889

Attached is support letter for the PolyMet project John Oertel Numax Resource PO Box 834 Stillwater, MN 55082 Tel: 612-384-4217

John Ottis 41213

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Ottis

41214

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are there

41215

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely John Ottis John Ottis Box 609 Grand Marais, MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Ottis

41217

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Ottis John Ottis Box 609 Grand Marais, MN 55604

John P. Gorski

38866

To Whom It May Concern: I grew up on the Iron Range. My father was a mining engineer. I worked summers in the mines while I attended college. In general I support mining and have witnessed the economic benefits it can afford My father was forced into an early retirement in the 80's and his greatest hope was that the copper nickel industry would be his salvation. Despite the hardships my father endured I am glad that the copper/nickel mining did not happen. The technologies available at the time were simply not adequate to protect the environment. Few people can look back and truthfully say that they regret the delay of these past 25 years. Most can agree that had we mined those minerals with 1980's technologies great environmental damage would have been done. The landscape of Minnesota, its waters, the plants, and animals that inhabit it, and its minerals belong to all who live here today and also to those who will inhabit it in the generations to come. The technologies proposed by PolyMet are vastly superior to those of the past but probably inferior to those of the future. In just the past few years PolyMet has made great progress in its efforts to ensure that our environment can be protected. It is reasonable to believe that with each ensuing year our knowledge, and PolyMet's, will continue to improve. It is also reasonable to believe that the value of the resource will continue to grow. The Minnesota DNR, our Governor, State Representatives, Senators, and Congressmen have all committed themselves to the highest degree of environmental scrutiny. As of today that has not been accomplished. Questions persist about dust and particulates (asbestos like) drifting into the BWCAW. Questions about the accuracy of aquifer mapping and water migration persist. Lastly there is great public doubt that contaminated waters can be contained for the many years needed to protect our cherished waters. There is an old saying "near money is dear money" it talks to the very high cost, that is always paid, when cashing in quickly. Lets not make that mistake here. John P. Gorski Grand Marais Mn.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Paul Roy

19080

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, John Paul Roy 3231 37th Ave So. 3231 37th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Paul Roy

40033

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

48174

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, John Paul Roy 3231 37th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Paulson

9632

Supporting the NorthMet SDEIS: Polymet's project has rightly been contrasted against the backdrop of the waters of the State of Minnesota, which serve multiple functions, but most importantly they are the lifeblood of our environment. In contrast, the use of water for consumption, agriculture, recreation, fishing and industry have sustained human cultures for all of history. While our state is a unique entity which possesses some of the world's greatest density of fresh water lakes, streams and wetlands (and has thus been a primary emphasis of the cultures that have populated this region), what sets us apart is that for generations our environmental law and regulation have led the world when it comes to water quality protection. I believe we are leading again with the NorthMet SDEIS, the process for public input, and the ongoing open and honest dialogue related to precious metals mining in Minnesota and the need for environmental protections. In this case, I strongly believe that the State of Minnesota's Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is uniquely qualified in the world to oversee and permit this form of mining and the requisite environmental obligations that are required to protect our state's water quality. With over 100 years of active mining-related experience in the state, the Minnesota DNR has proven it has not lost sight of its multi-faceted obligation to protect the environment while helping to facilitate economic vitality. While the NorthMet project is a new form of mining and processing in Minnesota, it is with our state's unique perspective and experience (that is steeped in a lengthy history of mining regulation and water quality protection) that convinces me this project is in the right hands. As written, I support the SDEIS for Polymet's NorthMet Project and expect (as with all permits to operate within the State of Minnesota) there will be adequate requirements for operational controls that greatly limit the possibility of operational or accidental pollution. I encourage the Minnesota DNR to continue to balance the necessity of human industry and environmental regulations and protections. - John Paulson - 25 East Mankato Street - Duluth, MN 55803

John Peace

41917

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, John Peace St Francis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Peck

16822

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Peck 12299 Sauk River Rd St Cloud, MN 56301

50161

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Peck 12299 Sauk River Rd St Cloud, MN 56301

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Pegg

6101

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: One of the most profound thinkers of the 20th Century was astrophysicist Carl Sagan. In 1980, he published a book entitled, "Cosmos." In that book, Dr Sagan wrote: The Earth is a place. It is by no means the only place. It is not even a typical place. No planet or star or galaxy can be typical, because the Cosmos is mostly empty. The only typical place is within the vast, cold, universal vacuum, the everlasting night of intergalactic space, a place so strange and desolate that, by comparison, planets and stars and galaxies seem achingly rare and lovely. If we were randomly inserted into the Cosmos, the chance that we would find ourselves on or near a planet would be less than one in a billion trillion trillion (10³³, a one followed by 33 zeroes). In everyday life such odds are called compelling. Worlds are precious. And so, I write in grave concern for the effects on our environment and waters by the proposed PolyMet copper sulfide mine (and any others proposed) in Northern Minnesota. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely John Pegg 1335 Minnesota Ave Duluth, MN 55802 218-349-1786

John PERKINS

10490

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I've been told that form letter emails are not taken seriously by those in government. I hope this is not the true in this case. I am very concerned about PolyMet's plans and would ask you to seriously consider the validity of what their claiming. Get the real data and make an informed decision that is best for the environment AND the fiscal health of MN. All the best, John Perkins 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd, Deer River, MN 56636 John PERKINS 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd Deer River, MN 56636

18411

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I've been told that form letter emails are not taken seriously by those in government. I hope this is not the true in this case. I am very concerned about PolyMet's plans and would ask you to seriously consider the validity of what their claiming. Get the real data and make an informed decision that is best for the environment AND the fiscal health of MN. All the best, John Perkins 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd, Deer River, MN 56636 John PERKINS 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd Deer River, MN 56636

50530

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I've been told that form letter emails are not taken seriously by those in government. I hope this is not the true in this case. I am very concerned about PolyMet's plans and would ask you to seriously consider the validity of what their claiming. Get the real data and make an informed decision that is best for the environment AND the fiscal health of MN. All the best, John Perkins 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd, Deer River, MN 56636 John PERKINS 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd Deer River, MN 56636

50531

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I've been told that form letter emails are not taken seriously by those in government. I hope this is not the true in this case. I am very concerned about PolyMet's plans and would ask you to seriously consider the validity of what their claiming. Get the real data and make an informed decision that is best for the environment AND the fiscal health of MN. All the best, John Perkins 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd, Deer River, MN 56636 John PERKINS 49407 Mini Car Car Lake Rd Deer River, MN 56636

John Plumadore

42731

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Pugh

9343

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I grew up in northern Minnesota and lived in Babbitt for 17 years. Until recently, my parents still lived there. My father worked at the taconite mine for 30 years. I love the cool blue lakes. I often bring my family up there to canoe, camp, kayak, fish, ski, hike, and photograph its beauty. We buy local and have given to the community. Why must we support the small communities through a short-term effort (20 years or less) of copper-nickel mining, which will result in long-term loss of environment (200 years or more). Tourism is also a precious commodity, but it will be lost with the advent of sulfide mining. Our children's children should be able to enjoy this precious area. We are devastated over this environmental battle. It should be protected, not eviscerated by mining. This will impact not only the pristine waters of northern Minnesota but, over time, may impact our water quality down the Mississippi River basin. Northern Minnesotans are anxious for jobs and delusional over the possibility of mining and construction jobs. Polymet is promising high-paying jobs, but how many folks who live up there will actually be hired. The residents up there are being misinformed by Polymet. PolyMet's Water Model is Scientifically Unacceptable. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that reli

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Pugh

18500

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I grew up in northern Minnesota and lived in Babbitt for 17 years. Until recently, my parents still lived there. My father worked at the taconite mine for 30 years. I love the cool blue lakes. I often bring my family up there to canoe, camp, kayak, fish, ski, hike, and photograph its beauty. We buy local and have given to the community. Why must we support the small communities through a short-term effort (20 years or less) of copper-nickel mining, which will result in long-term loss of environment (200 years or more). Tourism is also a precious commodity, but it will be lost with the advent of sulfide mining. Our children's children should be able to enjoy this precious area. We are devastated over this environmental battle. It should be protected, not eviscerated by mining. This will impact not only the pristine waters of northern Minnesota but, over time, may impact our water quality down the Mississippi River basin. Northern Minnesotans are anxious for jobs and delusional over the possibility of mining and construction jobs. Polymet is promising high-paying jobs, but how many folks who live up there will actually be hired. The residents up there are being misinformed by Polymet. PolyMet's Water Model is Scientifically Unacceptable. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjusti

John Quimby

41314

I am quite concerned about the possibly of long-term environmental damage that would result from mining. Please use the utmost caution in approving any mineral extraction that would compromise either water resources or other environmental factors. Thank you, John Quimby former resident of Ely, MN and Deer River, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Reynolds

47520

Please accept my comments into the public recoRd The groundwater flow model is flawed and must be re-run using corrected data. The model, used to assess the impacts on water resources and how to minimize them, relies upon incorrect assumptions about the amount of groundwater at the site. The model uses a base flow estimate which significantly underestimates flow. As a result, the model likely underestimates the amount of sulfates and heavy metals carried to the Partridge River and Lake Superior. It's not acceptable to base such an important and potentially damaging project on known flawed data. Do it right or don't do it at all. Water channels which is what fractured bedrock is need to be closed to prevent the outward migration of heavy metal laden water. It's not acceptable to base decisions on flawed assumptions when we know better. We know the bedrock is fractured and pretending it isn't is not acceptable. The fractures need to be sealed or the entire basin needs to be lined with peat in adequate thickness to adsorb the heavy metals to prevent their migration from the site. Adequate monitoring and mitigation procedures need to be in place and ready to go if monitoring shows migration from the site. That will require an ironclad financial commitment that is lacking on this project. Monitoring must be part of the permitting process. The permit must require a robust monitoring plan with financial assurances to fund it. The public should be afforded an additional 30 days to take into account the new information. If mineral rights are severed from USFS land swap the project needs to assume that mining will occur on those lands and that needs to be included in this permitting process instead of permitting this as a stand alone project. There are too many flaws in this SDEIS for the project to be permitted. Do it right or don't do it at all. John Reynolds 26385 County Road 3 Merrifield MN 56465

John Richkus

42433

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John Richkus 206 Congress St Jersey City, NJ 07307-3410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Roach

39900

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I have enjoyed the Boundary Waters many times and feel a great responsibility to keep this national resource available for future generations. If there were even a small chance that the copper/nickel mining would harm this resource, it would not be worth taking a chance on losing this rare treasure for future generations of Americans. I do understand the lure of jobs for the next twenty years for citizens who live on the range. However, the Boundary Waters and Superior National Forest and all of the lakes and wetlands that are on state land in this area at risk with this mining. One needs to remember that those lands belong to all Minnesotans including future generations. We do not have the right to put these natural treasures at risk. I believe that PolyMet SDEIS's own research indicates that mining will irrevocably harm these sources for our children and future generations. We simply need to take every measure necessary to protect these treasures for current and future nations. Sincerely, Mr John Roach 8116 Zenith Ct N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-2749 (763) 566-9387

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Rookey

9603

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Rookey 1605 Wyoming Ave Superior, WI 54880

18508

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Rookey 1605 Wyoming Ave Superior, WI 54880

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Rookey

50590

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, John Rookey 1605 Wyoming Ave Superior, WI 54880

John Roth

42900

Dear Ms Fay: Please find attached by written comments on the PloyMet/NorthMet SDEIS and copies of my letters to Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Brenda Halter, Supervisor of Superior National ForeSt My comments have also been sent by US mail. John M. Roth Attorney at Law 3140 Bryant Avenue South, #3 Minneapolis, MN 55408 ph: 612-360-4054

43042

From: John Roth [mailto:johnroth2006@yahoo-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 2:18 PM To: FS-R9 Superior NF Subject: PolyMet/NorthMet SDEIS and proposed land exchange Dear Ms Halter: Please find attached my written comments on the PolyMet/NorthMet SDEIS and proposed land exchange, as well as copies of my letters to Lisa Fay, MDNR, and Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers. My comments also have been sent by US mail. John M. Roth Attorney at Law 3140 Bryant Avenue South, #3 Minneapolis, MN 55408 ph: 612-360-4054

48154

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Rust

40151

Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing because I am concerned about what the PolyMet mine site will do to the environment in Northern Minnesota. I am also very concerned about how other future mines (such as Twin Metals) may affect the environment in Northern Minnesota. Northern Minnesota is a water rich environment that supports an ecologically rich set of biodiversity, including 'charismatic mega-fauna' - wolves, bears, moose, lynx etc Northern Minnesota also supports hundreds of other species including deer, eagles, owls, ducks, bobcat, coyotes, as well as fishes, wild rice, and majestic stands of red and white pine, including conifer and boreal forests. Hundreds of thousands of hunters, anglers, and recreationists annually visit Northern Minnesota at all times of the year for recreational opportunities. My family and I are avid users of the North Woods for hiking, canoeing, kayaking, wildlife watching, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and fishing – since 1970- We have visited Voyagers National Park, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and Superior National Forest dozens of times in the last 50 years. What we have here in Minnesota is a unique destination that attracts people from all over the United States, but as well from many parts of the world. A PolyMet mine site (and other future copper, nickel, sulfur mine sites) may leak toxic pollutants into the watershed. Consequently damaging and/or destroying the recreational opportunities for thousands of people, and damaging or destroying the habitat and environment for 1000's of species living in the area. I am not against mining these precious metals – because we all use them in vehicles, and electronic devices. However, I believe that there are less sensitive locations to be extracting these metals from the earth. Places that are not so rich in water and biological diversity. Places that do not have the intensive recreational use, and tourism jobs associated with recreational visitors. Arid places like deserts that do not have the water resources, and have fewer visitors are better suited for a mine of this type. I believe that those responsible for making the decisions on the PolyMet mine cannot reasonably assure the public that the site will not be leaking pollution into the environment for 200 – 500 years. Can those responsible for making decision on the PolyMet mine know with any level of confidence that under varying political and environmental conditions that the mine site will not generate pollution for 200 – 500 years. All decisions being made are based on assumptions of the political and environmental conditions. But will they take into account such potentialities as: 1) Climate change that generates storms with torrential rainfalls that exceed 20 inches of rain in a short period of time. 2) All countries have periods of strife and uncertainty. Even the most stable of nation-states and governments experiences crisis of governance including revolution, civil war, invasion, collapse and rebirth. During these periods, the failure of proper governance can last from a year to several years. One is hard pressed to think of a single country that has not experienced some level of uncertainty of governance and strife in the last 200 years. During such periods, will maintenance of mining ponds, tailings, dikes be ongoing. One may not be able to predict. Sincerely, John Rust 9725 Oliver Ave North Brooklyn Park, MN 55444 Board of Directors – Izaak Walton League of America – Minnesota Division _____ This email is intended solely for the recipient. It may contain privileged, proprietary or confidential information or material. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this email and any attachments and notify the sender of the error.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Rust

40154

Dear Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing because I am concerned about what the PolyMet mine site will do to the environment in Northern Minnesota. I am also very concerned about how other future mines (such as Twin Metals) may affect the environment in Northern Minnesota. Northern Minnesota is a water rich environment that supports an ecologically rich set of biodiversity, including 'charismatic mega-fauna' - wolves, bears, moose, lynx etc Northern Minnesota also supports hundreds of other species including deer, eagles, owls, ducks, bobcat, coyotes, as well as fishes, wild rice, and majestic stands of red and white pine, including conifer and boreal forests. Hundreds of thousands of hunters, anglers, and recreationists annually visit Northern Minnesota at all times of the year for recreational opportunities. My family and I are avid users of the North Woods for hiking, canoeing, kayaking, wildlife watching, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and fishing – since 1970- We have visited Voyagers National Park, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and Superior National Forest dozens of times in the last 50 years. What we have here in Minnesota is a unique destination that attracts people from all over the United States, but as well from many parts of the world. A PolyMet mine site (and other future copper, nickel, sulfur mine sites) may leak toxic pollutants into the watershed. Consequently damaging and/or destroying the recreational opportunities for thousands of people, and damaging or destroying the habitat and environment for 1000's of species living in the area. I am not against mining these precious metals – because we all use them in vehicles, and electronic devices. However, I believe that there are less sensitive locations to be extracting these metals from the earth. Places that are not so rich in water and biological diversity. Places that do not have the intensive recreational use, and tourism jobs associated with recreational visitors. Arid places like deserts that do not have the water resources, and have fewer visitors are better suited for a mine of this type. I believe that those responsible for making the decisions on the PolyMet mine cannot reasonably assure the public that the site will not be leaking pollution into the environment for 200 – 500 years. Can those responsible for making decision on the PolyMet mine know with any level of confidence that under varying political and environmental conditions that the mine site will not generate pollution for 200 – 500 years. All decisions being made are required based on assumptions of the political and environmental conditions. But will they take into account such potentialities as: 1) Climate change that generates storms with torrential rainfalls that exceed 20 inches of rain in a short period of time. 2) All countries have periods of strife and uncertainty. Even the most stable of nation-states and governments experiences crisis of governance including revolution, civil war, invasion, collapse and rebirth. During these periods, the failure of proper governance can last from a year to several years. One is hard pressed to think of a single country that has not experienced some level of uncertainty of governance and strife in the last 200 years. During such periods, will maintenance of mining ponds, tailings, dikes be ongoing. One may not be able to predict.

John - Chinese (PRC) Small John Rust Cell Phone:763-202-3346 Lead Software Engineer, LOCATION Production Services Verisk Insurance Solutions – Underwriting 5353 Gamble Dr, Suite 201 St Louis Park, MN 55416 Office Phone: 952-542-1440 x214 HYPERLINK "mailto:John.Rust@Verisk-com"John.Rust@Verisk-com _____ This email is intended solely for the recipient. It may contain privileged, proprietary or confidential information or material. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this email and any attachmen

John Sayres

39766

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Furthermore, the area should not be mined at all. The limited amount of copper and minerals to be taken from the area will have a detrimental impact on the environment. The jobs it creates for the time the mine will be operating are far less important the the jobs the tourism industry creates. Sincerely, Mr John Sayres 23783 Clarissa Haven Dr Henning, MN 56551-9438

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Schmitt

46242

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr John Schmitt 5101 Park Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-1745

John Seymour-Anderson

16771

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Seymour-Anderson 3925 Pleasant Avenue South #5 Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Seymour-Anderson

47637

Dear Minnesota DNR, Among the concerns I have about the proposed sulfide mining operation are the following: • How will the costs of site management and pollution remediation be handled when the proposal shows no concrete and lasting plan for Financial Assurance. Particularly, what happens if Polymet goes out of business before the 200-500 years of water filtration and other pollution control measures have been fulfilled. • How can an estimated millions of gallons of untreated polluted water per year, if not fully captured and held in ponds and piping, be considered safe. • What calculations have been made for air pollution from the extraction of mineral-laden rock. The particulates created and borne into the air have the potential to affect workers and neighboring communities. • What provisions have been made to fully control the effects of seepage into local aquifers of groundwater, rain and snowmelt when mixed with particulates, sulfide and heavy metals exposed at the mining site during extraction. I hope you give all the concerns expressed by Minnesota citizens full consideration when weighing the merits of the plan at hand. John Seymour-Anderson 3925 Pleasant Avenue south #5 Minneapolis, MN 55409

50122

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, John Seymour-Anderson 3925 Pleasant Avenue South #5 Minneapolis, MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Sippola

19029

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Let me be blunt. I will never authorize any group to do something that could permanently compromise the largest and best fresh water system in the world. We need time to review these documents. 90 days is not enough. So, I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Rev. John Sippola - Duluth, Minnesota John Sippola 1715 E 2nd st Duluth, MN 55812 218-724-3203

John Skolte

32638

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Why are we trying to protect our forests if projects like this are allowed. For every acre of open pit mine an acre of forest will be lost forever. The potential economic boost from mining jobs is touted. Ask the people who make their living in the mines in the Sudbury region of Ontario, Canada and take their vacations in the Thunder Bay area of Ontario what they think about the environmental impact of mining. I have spoken, many years ago, with one of these miners, while vacationing in Thunder Bay. He painted a very grim picture of what his occupation did to the surrounding lakes, which was why he vacationed in Thunder Bay, far from his home. As a teenager I went to the Boundary Waters three years in a row, and I also took my wife and children there three times during the early years of my marriage. While it has been many years since I was able to go there, and I doubt that I shall ever be able to return again at my age, I consider it extremely important that this area exist in its present pristine state, and be protected, for the benefit of everyone. Sincerely, John Skolte 266 Woodland Dr Owatonna, MN 55060-3152

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Soghigian

39628

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

john sorenson

41022

Lisa Fay EIS project manager Minnesota DNR Polymet has never operated a mine before and is backed by Glencore Xstara which has a history of Environmental breaches resulting in fines. My information sources tell me that there is no known copper nickel mines in similar environments that have operated without pollution. This type of mining has never been attempted in Minnesota. Mining companies often declare bankruptcy leaving tax payers to cover costs of Environmental Disasters and only 350 jobs are expected after construction. This is too high a risk for such a small reward Please stop and take another look at alternatives, ie underground mines. Thank you for your consideration. John Carl Sorenson 12200 Roosevelt Rd S.E. Bemidji Mn. 56601 cc: Gov. Dayton Rep. John Persell

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Strand

21279

Feb 24, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I find it difficult to find the words to express how opposed I am to this proposal. Allow me a rhetorical question: In what vision of economy does a proposal like this even begin to be considered. Answer: in an economy where the profit motive overrides all other concerns, such as health (of people, animals, plants, and the larger ecosystem). I keep this short in the (possibly vain) hope that it might actually be read. I say "no," resoundingly to sulfide mining in Minnesota. Minnesota says "no." We will not be another Kentucky or West Virginia to the mining industry. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr John Strand 2112 29th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1118 (612) 824-1140

50996

Feb 24, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I find it difficult to find the words to express how opposed I am to this proposal. Allow me a rhetorical question: In what vision of economy does a proposal like this even begin to be considered. Answer: in an economy where the profit motive overrides all other concerns, such as health (of people, animals, plants, and the larger ecosystem). I keep this short in the (possibly vain) hope that it might actually be read. I say "no," resoundingly to sulfide mining in Minnesota. Minnesota says "no." We will not be another Kentucky or West Virginia to the mining industry. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr John Strand 2112 29th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1118 (612) 824-1140

John Strange

58154

I have travelled and camped in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area wilderness for 30 years. I have been there countless times. As a father, a teacher and a lifelong Minnesotan I cannot express my dismay and my opposition to Polymet's plans in terms strong enough. Allow me to make a few points.1. Every time, to my knowledge, this kind of mining has been done there has been pollution. That fact combined with the location in such close proximity to the finest lake country wilderness in the world is unacceptable.2. I interned on an organic farm 60 miles by road from the proposed mine (and much closer as the crow flies) near Finland, MN. My friends who own the farm grow vegetables and fruits for over 50 families, and they are one of the only vegetable farms on the north shore. I don't want their water polluted.3. Despite any assurances to the contrary, we know that this company will not be around to deal with the aftermath of their profiteering. Who will pay?For these reasons and so many more I oppose this proposal in the strongest terms.

John Sundstrom

57251

As sulfide mining has yet to be demonstrated that it can be done in an environmentally safe manner – Minnesota should wait until Polymet or other mining companies prove that they can do so by a mine in a less sensitive area. The metals will be there in a decade or two and technology to mine them can be tested. (somewhere else)John Sundstrom1314 East 8th StreetDuluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Sweeney

18122

Greetings everyone. My name is John Sweeney. I'm a Minnesotan, Hoyt Lakes native. I grew up here. I see a lot of members in this gym from growing up here. I am now a small-business owner in Hoyt Lakes. And I actually left the area due to the impending closure of the mining around here and the issues that were going on. I would like to see PolyMet come in and give our youth and our natives here an opportunity to choose to leave if they want to, to go out and find an education, employment in other areas, experience the world but not have to leave. Without PolyMet and other companies like PolyMet we understand that there will be no choice. And as a small-business owner in Hoyt Lakes we can see that if we don't get the industries back into town, in the area, that a lot of us small-business owners will in fact go under. So we are looking forward to having PolyMet come in. And we are looking forward to the checks and balances that are going to be provided to ensure that we do have healthy, clean water; a healthy environment. These chemicals being referred to are not actually leaching into the environment and destroying the environment as many people are claiming. That's about all I have to say. And thank you guys for coming out and giving us an opportunity to express ourself. And I look forward to seeing guys in the future. Thank you.

john syverud

42068

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine, or at the very least, develop and enforce a truly comprehensive set of regulations (along with an escrow) which will ensure when (not if) environmental damage occurs as a result of the mining, it is remediated on PolyMet's dime. I believe this project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed, but I am also realistic to understand that money talks and the pressure it is bringing to bear on the question is likely to win the day. This is why I urge you to make sure when damage is done, it is fully PolyMet's revenue which will pay for complete remediation of that damage. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John syverud 614 McKinley Pl NE Minneapolis, MN 55413-2610

john szarke

36837

I am strongly against permitting Polymet for the following reasons: 1- Health concerns raised by doctors concerning the effect of sulfate mining (Duluth News 2/28/14) 2- Environmental harm and unknown potential harm too great a risk. 3- Polymet ownership currently 28% is owned by Glencore Xstrada. Often referred to as being too large of a conglomerate to legislate. Glencore is large enough to own far more than 28% of Polymet and has a very poor environmental track record in 50 countries. 4- Risk of costly litigation because of health effects and environment concerns effecting water and accidents - 5- Not enough funds put in a Trust to offset the likely litigation that could run into trillions and trillions of dollars. 6- Future mining ownership and their responsibility to inherit fines, clean up and paying for the physical and environmental harm caused by Polymet 7- The proposal does not include the impact to the environment and health of people, fish, wild rice, etc that in addition to the Polymet site there are about 20 other sites on the "drawing board". John Szarke 5115 Wyoming Street Duluth, MN 55804 HYPERLINK "mailto:johnszarke@hotmail-com"johnszarke@hotmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Thoennes

40050

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

John Tonsager

9552

I am totally against allowing any sulfide rock mining in Minnesota. The ore will be there and the lure of making money will likewise be locked into the rock for any future mining. The risk of permanent damage to voiceless flora and fauna without even considering the harm to humans and tourism is beyond the ability of industry or government to mitigate. If and when the process is developed to deal with the runoff and contaminants it will be worth rethinking but at the present time I say stop the process and deny the permit. Sincerely John Tonsager 4364 167 Ave NE Ham Lake MN 55304

John Tourville

58159

As we consider this EIS please keep in mind some of the multiple use issues northern MN has faced over the last 50 years. When there is more mercury in the rain water than coming out of a WWT? In northern MN we need to globally address these issues. Go forward with Polymet and sustain employers and employment in Minnesota.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Velie 39338

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 300 jobs is not worth the potential for long term damage to the fragile ecosystem in the Arrowhead region. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, John Velie 4920 Bryant Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5361 (612) 789-4939

48680

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 300 jobs is not worth the potential for long term damage to the fragile ecosystem in the Arrowhead region. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, John Velie 4920 Bryant Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5361 (612) 789-4939

John W. Vennewitz 43332

Dear Sirs, I am concerned that PolyMet's mine plan lacks a comprehensive consideration of chemical contamination of fish and its impact on wetlands also the contamination of drinking water. The health of current and future residents' ride on getting this analysis done completely and competently. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Regards, John W. Vennewitz 6740 Duck Lake Road Eden Prairie, MN 55346

John walker 42430

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr John walker 4975 Andrews Pl Pleasant Hill, IA 50327-7011 (515) 210-6809

john wendt 43836

My address is 1111 105th Street West Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077 [HYPERLINK "mailto:jtwendt@gmail-com"jtwendt@gmail-com](mailto:jtwendt@gmail-com) On Thu, Mar 13, 2014 at 1:10 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record. - John T. Wendt

43847

We understand the need for jobs, but the potential downsides of an environmental disaster are just too great. We were assured by BP that everything was safe. We were assured by Exxon that everything was safe. Both those were disasters that are still with us today. The risks are just too great. We are losing natural habitats daily. We have to put a stop to it. Take pride in Minnesota and what we have and are. Protect Minnesota - John T. Wendt

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Wensman

46274

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. Not only is the science bad, but the provisions for long term clean up are financially inadequate as well. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, John Wensman 15740 Upper 34th St S Afton, MN 55001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Wensman

46275

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. Not only is the science bad, but the provisions for long term clean up are financially inadequate as well. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, John Wensman 15740 Upper 34th St S Afton, MN 55001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Wensman

46276

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. Not only is the science bad, but the provisions for long term clean up are financially inadequate as well. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, John Wensman 15740 Upper 34th St S Afton, MN 55001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Wexler

16248

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

John Wheeler

11440

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr John Wheeler 651 Huntington Ct S Saint Paul, MN 55119-6765 (651) 735-1805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

John Wheeler

58171

Discovery is always the rape of the natural world...always! Science is now our modern day belief system. And, like the medieval system before it, science is starting not to fit into the world anymore. Science has attained so much power that its practical limits begin to be apparent. Largely through science, billions of us live in one small world. But science cannot help us decide what to do with that world, or how to live. Science can make a nuclear reactor, but it cannot tell us not to build it. Science can make pesticide, but cannot tell us not to use it. (Science can make a copper-nickel mine, but cannot tell us not to dig it) And our world starts to seem polluted in fundamental ways....air and water, and land...because of ungovernable science. Scientists used to believe that prediction was just a function of keeping track of things. If you knew enough you could predict anything. That's been cherished scientific belief since the time of Newton...until chaos theory came long and threw it right out the window.(These words are taken directly from a character in the novel "Jurassic Park;" They accurately reflect my suspicions regarding the viability of the Northmet proposal)The EIS conclusions are based on predictions, on calculations with upwards of 90% confidence. Pretty good odds were not the stakes so high. What we stand to lose can never be regained. For ourselves and for future generations, we must beware that our actions may well have unintended, unpredictable, and potentially disastrous and irreparable consequences.(These words are mine. In my view, the proposal smacks of "ready-Fire_Air"! Can we be completely sure of the project's plan detail? Think Jurassic Park.)

John Wild

36421

I think it is an exceedingly bad idea to place permanent toxic waste dumps in a sensitive area. The creation of a few temporary jobs does not justify doing so. While the area is already been mined and industrialized, there is no guarantee that toxic runoff will not affect other areas that are not now polluted. Iron mining, unlike sulfide mining, does not pose big a threat to surrounding areas. Nice neat environmental reports and all the regulations in the world mean little when in actuality you know things can and will go wrong. Technology simply cannot be relied upon to solve all of the problems To sacrifice a part of our state for the benefit of international mining interests is crazy. This is a Pandora's Box we do not need to open. There is no compelling reason, other than political nonsense, to allow sulfide mining in Minnesota. John O. Wild 1123 15th AVE SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-

Johnathan Eisenberg

18138

My name is John Eisenberg. And I'm speaking on behalf of myself, my wife, and our two children. We have made extensive use of the north woods, which we love, including the resources in that area, including the Boundary Waters, the Lake Vermilion area, the area around Grand Marias, the Gunflint Trail, and other areas, state parks, natural forests, and so forth in that area. In fact, we took our honeymoon in Mike, Minnesota, which is -- it's way the heck down the Echo Trail. We bring business to Northern Minnesota. We bring paying business and we bring sustainable business to Northern Minnesota. So I just want to make that point. We're a bit appalled that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on this project got an F from the Environmental Protection Agency. I don't keep score of these kinds of things, but I don't think that happens very often. Now we have a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement only to find out that the water quality model is inherently flawed. It's going to have to be redone again. So the water quality model was a base for a lot of the other aspects of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If that has to be redone, then a lot of other (inaudible) has to be redone. So we say: Send it back and get it right. And don't advance this project until all of those flaws have been fixed and we have an environmental impact statement that actually accurately assesses the impact of this project. We're looking here at the potential for 500 years of water quality treatment, which in my mind, and I think in the mind of the law, is essentially permanent pollution to Minnesota that would require to be treated permanently. That's not lawful in Minnesota. It shouldn't be allowed. And you shouldn't advance the project unless there is some way that that can be done without that happening. As far as we know, there is no way that that can be done. If that can be done, we would like to see it in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We don't see it yet with a realistic water quality model. But we're not aware that that's been done anywhere on the planet. So we don't think it can necessarily be done in the state of Minnesota. Again, if there is a way to do it, bring it on. Let's see it. But let's get it right. Let's do it accurately, scientifically, truthfully so that we can assess it to determine the impacts and get this right. But let's not approve a project that has essentially permanent pollution impacts in the beautiful area of Northern Minnesota that we all love. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Johnna Hyde

19003

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I live in the heart of the experimental drilling area and the new SDEIS is important to me, but to date I have only made it through about 150 pages. I support the Water Legacy request as follows. Please give us more time.. I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Johnna Hyde PO BOX 188 10538 Bandana Lake Rd, Isabella (No Mail) Ely, MN 55731 218 365-3375

54732

See attachment

Johnnie Forrest

18072

I'm Johnnie Forrest and I support the PolyMet project, because according to the water legacy thing, the propaganda in 2009 they said that 84 percent of all mines were done environmentally unsafe. So that means 16 percent can be done environmentally safe. And we're Minnesota, we can make them do it right. And I'm looking for jobs for the future for my daughter. Okay.

Johnny Jones Jr

39794

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Johnny Jones Jr 3523 24th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2529

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Johnny Jones Jr

40670

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Johnny Jones Jr 3523 24th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2529

John-Paul Young

43265

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, John-Paul Young 51 Cheever place Brooklyn, NY 11231

Jolane Sundstrom

57273

From the bit of research I've done and talking to others in "the know" this company that plans to do copper-nickel mining in MN has a poor reputation for cleaning up sites where they have done mining before I.E. Sudbury Canada (a total moon scape). In conferring with an environmentalist in Finland (Europe) I was told copper nickel mining uses large volumes of H2O and brings up toxic waste from in the earth. She claims if sales of copper go down and the plant has to shut down temporarily the toxic runoff can continue to pollute the waterway – ground water, streams and lakes. Also, she said it smells terrible – she visits sites around Russia where this type of mining has been a disaster to the environment. She is a top environmentalist for the government. I feel we just have too great a risk here being the beginning of the clean water source for the nation and the quality of life we have come to enjoy here in MN. Much more research is needed it will be too late.Jolane Sundstrom1314 East 8th StreetDuluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon 45619

Dear Lisa Fay and Members of the MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit, I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed PolyMet, NorthMet Project open pit copper, nickel, cobalt and metals mine in Northern Minnesota. Despoiling our priceless ground and surface water, destroying wetlands and other wildlife habitat, and ruining natural beauty in return for mere metals is almost more than I can comprehend. Our most valuable natural resources, including clean air, clean water, wildlife, and unspoiled habitat are being sacrificed and squandered at an alarming rate. They are being squeezed by increasing populations and demand from extractive industries, industries which have a long history of exploiting people and the environment, making themselves and their investors wealthy, then moving on and leaving residents and taxpayers across the country to clean up and pay for their messes. I am originally from Missoula, Montana, and I have seen first-hand the destructiveness of open-pit copper mining. The Milltown Dam (Bonner and Milltown Montana are just outside of Missoula), was over 100 miles from an open-pit copper mine in Butte and a smelting operation in Anaconda, but the pollution from those operations caused dangerous levels of arsenic to appear in drinking water wells around the communities of Bonner and Milltown. Water from the Clark Fork River had also deposited MILLIONS OF TONS of toxic waste behind the Milltown dam that required expensive (Superfund) removal and extensive remediation efforts to clean up. The clean-up was largely paid for by taxpayers. Please see: http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Berkeley_Pit http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Milltown_Reservoir_Superfund_Site I hope that one day the DNR will become a protector of our natural world instead of a facilitator for its destruction. Sincerely, Jon Read Jon Read 1603 Berkeley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105 (651) 698-9349 mnjonread@msn-com

Jon and Kia Blumenthal 21375

I am writing to oppose the Polymet mine in Northern Minnesota. I wish there was an environmentally responsible and assured way to provide jobs to the region, but the risks to water-which may wind up being the more precious resource in the earth in the future-outweigh the potential short-term economic benefit. Until a virtually guaranteed method arises to protect water, this proven-damaging mining method is not appropriate given its proximity to vital water resources, such as the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior. The unique water resources in the proximity of the mine are worth protecting for the coming centuries. Once the mine proposal is defeated, I hope effort will be directed to developing the economic vitality of the region, which deserves access to employment opportunities. Thank you. Sincerely, Jon Blumenthal 5941 Grimes Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55424

Jon Erickson 54675

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Erie

16144

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Grinnell

16242

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Hayenga

17210

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jon Hayenga 421 2nd St NW Stewartville, MN 55976

50476

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Jon Hayenga 421 2nd St NW Stewartville, MN 55976

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Jensen

39877

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Jon Jensen 9586 Polaris Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-4414 (763) 420-9814

Jon Lee

47561

Hello. I oppose the mine. This area is too good to destroy for short-term economic gain. Leave it alone for future generations to enjoy. Jon Lee 4604 W. 39th Street St Louis Park, MN 55416

Jon Lord

40834

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Marcaccini 47179

In this day and age we all know that it is possible to mine without ruining the environment around the mine. This country needs its own precious metals If we ceded to those who say do not mine think where we would be today . I would be writing this in either Japanese of German because we would not have won WWII. This will be a showplace mine for the world, with hundreds of jobs just for protecting the environment. Jon Marcaccini Rph. President NPI 1194767798 Jon's Drug Inc. 318 Grant Avenue Eveleth, Minnesota 55734-0120 Phone: (218) 744-2774 * Fax: (218) 744-5878 Website: <http://www.jonsdrug-com> Home 4439 Lakeside Drive Eveleth, MN 55734

Jon Martin 7614

Hello, I just had a question about the schedule of the Polymet discussion in St Paul on January 28th. Your schedule say that from 6:45 - 10:00 HYPERLINK "<http://p.m.is>"p.m.is the formal presentation and public comment period. I was wondering how much time is allotted for the formal presentation and how much is allotted for the public comment period. Thank you. Regards Jonathan Martin 4125 Dupont ave s Minneapolis, MN 55409 - Jon Martin Matt Freeman for House (C) 612-212-8211 (H) 612-824-6336 HYPERLINK "<mailto:jmart1671@gmail-com>"jmart1671@gmail-com

Jon Read 44886

Message From: Jon Read Email: mjonread@msn-com Response requested: No Message: I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed PolyMet, NorthMet Project open pit copper, nickel, cobalt and metals mine in Northern Minnesota. Despoiling our priceless ground and surface water, destroying wetlands and other wildlife habitat, and ruining natural beauty in return for mere metals is almost more than I can comprehend. Our most valuable natural resources, including clean air, clean water, wildlife, and unspoiled habitat are being sacrificed and squandered at an alarming rate. They are being squeezed by increasing populations and demand from extractive industries, industries which have a long history of exploiting people and the environment, making themselves and their investors wealthy, then moving on and leaving residents and taxpayers across the country to clean up and pay for their messes. I am originally from Missoula, Montana, and I have seen first-hand the destructiveness of open-pit copper mining. The Milltown Dam (Bonner and Milltown Montana are just outside of Missoula), was over 100 miles from an open-pit copper mine in Butte and a smelting operation in Anaconda, but the pollution from those operations caused dangerous levels of arsenic to appear in drinking water wells around the communities of Bonner and Milltown. Water from the Clark Fork River had also deposited MILLIONS OF TONS of toxic waste behind the Milltown dam that required expensive (Superfund) removal and extensive remediation efforts to clean up. The clean-up was largely paid for by taxpayers. Please see: http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Berkeley_Pit http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Milltown_Reservoir_Superfund_Site Sincerely, Jon Read 1603 Berkeley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105 Classification: UNCLASSIFIED Caveats: NONE

Jon Shern 43693

1- I would like to see a job breakdown for the PolyMet mine to understand what jobs will be in state vs. out of state, and what pay range each job would hAve 2- I would like to see more thorough evaluation of the Sulfuric Acid Polution. What is value of our water resource vs. benefits of the PolyMet mine. a. Example: What if you sold that amount of unpolluted water to drought stricken California. What would come out ahead. 3- The computer model seems to make various assumptions around current conditions. 4- What happens when failure occurs. a. Is there a plan Thanks Jon Shern Software Development Lead – Max Team Cargill Animal Nutrition Office: (952)984-5690 HYPERLINK "mailto:jon_shern@cargill-com"jon_shern@cargill-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jon Stanley

41871

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jon Stanley Minneapolis, Minnesota

Jonas Dubin

41843

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Jonas Dubin Minneapolis, Minnesota

Jonathan Fribley

43309

I write to ask your consideration of the my concerns with regard to the Polymet mine proposal. Length of Hazard There is simply no precedent for maintenance of toxins for any time span remotely close to the one proposed here - 200-500 years. To make projections that far out can simply not be justified scientifically without enormous error bars. To give one example, you have a difficult time even justifying the proposition that the state of Minnesota will exist in 500 years - what percentage of political bodies are still functioning continually since the year 1514, 500 years ago. What is your contingency for the dissolution of the state of Minnesota. Apply the same awareness of the limits of our knowledge to unknowns about climate, about economics, about social stability, let alone the performance of the retaining membrane, and it seems reasonable that whatever your calculations arrive at as possible risks and costs should be increased by many multiples - truly unknown many multiples. In short, there is simply far too little knowledge to make an informed decision about the risks and costs for the time span that this mine would remain a danger. Consequences of Failure Any time one considers a proposal, one must always ask "what if I am wrong." Despite the best efforts of the DNR, it is entirely possible that time will reveal errors in thinking. This is all the more likely because of the timespan involved. In this instance, the consequence of failure is pollution of the Lake Superior watershed - too high a price for such little gain for anybody except a few Polymet stockholders. Precedent and Context As you are undoubtedly aware, this proposal is almost certainly to be the first of many more, should it be approved. Because of that, it cannot be accurately considered in isolation. The consequences of approval include enabling mining across northern Minnesota, including into the BWCA drainage. The EIS should properly consider the environmental costs of that larger condition of mining across the north of Minnesota. Because of these and numerous other reasons why this mine represents a negative trade-off for this state and its future, an irresponsible mortgaging of the future for a small payoff to the many citizens of the state. I urgently ask you to deny this permit. Jonathan E Fribley 423 16th Ave N St Cloud, MN 56303

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jonathan Green

39056

---Original Message--- From: jongreen@ameritech-net [mailto:jongreen@ameritech-net] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:03 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Jonathan Green 2310 Rose Ln Ely, MN 55731-2216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jonathan Green

39285

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jonathan Homans

47294

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“PolyMet SDEIS”) fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling.

We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests.

Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota’s Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury.

Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates.

The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate.

For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project.

We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction of the Minnesota Health Department. This Health Impact Assessment should include at least the following:

- 1- Description of the known human health impacts of all pol

Jonathan Lindfors

57221

I’m concerned about long term water pollution at the site and how its mitigation will be funded. How can we guarantee the costs will be paid for by the corporate interests that have profited by the ore extraction – for over 200 years. Also, what will be the long term impact of polluted water runoff that is not captured by the mitigation process. Thank you. Jonathan Lindfors 3320 Hill Lane Deephaven, MN 55391

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jone See

16137

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jonelle Ringnalda

16214

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Jordan Johnson

43385

To whom it may concern- You probably are have an inbox full of emails concerning the plan for mining by/in the BWCA. These emails are probably lengthy and full of very strong opinions. The BWCA has and always will, hold a special place in my heart. It is a place that cannot be described but is a place one can only experience. This place taught me what I wanted to do with my life, Ecology, as well as showed me who I was as a person. I understand the need for more jobs in the Arrowhead region, but something unsustainable and not permanent should not be put over something that will forever be here if we continue to manage and sustain its virginity. Jobs are temporary, land is forever. Please do not allow mining in the BWCA region. Sincerely, Jordan Johnson 320 469 0960

Jordan Leslie

11342

HYPERLINK "https://docs.google.com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1zr3ZlR281G3eLSRz3FRoK0v-hDWy9rzK6JZpW4J8lfA/edit.usp=drive_web" Copper Mining

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jordan Wente

18189

Hi. I'm Emma Zapchenk. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota-Morris, and I'm going to give my time to Jordan Wente. Hello. My name is Jordan Wente, J-O-R-D-A-N, W-E-N-T-E. Now, I go to school at Morris. I'm a student, much like Natalie -- we actually go to the same school -- and I'm thinking about our future. Now, I don't have a career. Like, I'm a student, I'm going into this new world -- I'll be graduating next year -- into this new economy looking for work, and I'm really glad that the tradesmen are here and the unions are here. I think that's great, and I think this is really great we're talking together and I'm really, really thankful to our agencies for putting this on. But PolyMet is a foreign company. This is not a Minnesota company, and as an economic student and a statistics student, I tend to follow the numbers, and I follow the money, and it is not in the economic self-interest to reinvest this money into our local economy; it is not in their economic self-interest to model accurately; and it's not in their economic self-interest to clean up this mess for 500 years. This project is expected to last 20 years. I'm 20 years old. That's my life-span. I was born in 1993. You might look at me and think, "Oh, this guy is talking -- he's naive, he's young he's this college kid," or whatever, but that's not very long. That is not a time that you could have a job and raise a family with, and I'd like to stay in Minnesota. I'd like to live here. I caught a 26-inch northern in the Boundary Waters last summer. Now, this is my home, and this is our home and we need to protect it, and I just cannot -- I cannot believe that this project -- this project will end well. So I guess I'd urge you all to keep pressuring these agencies, to keep pressuring -- keep talking to your neighbors, talking to people who don't agree with you. I would love to go have a couple beers with you guys, like the guys who work over there, but I got to wait for three months. We all want what's best for our state. We want jobs, we want a healthy environment, and I think we can find compromise. Sometimes there are things that just don't make very much sense, and I think this project is one of them. Thank you.

jose melo

41610

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, jose melo bloomington, Minnesota

Joseph Afrhein

18187

My name is Joe. It is an emotional night here. It's really good. Well, I think I wanted to say is, as Minnesotans, I mean, we are better than this. You know, I used to be a union member myself for 20 years, and it's kind of insulting to have these union people here. It's the blind leading the blind, and that's from my heart. But as far as the jobs that people have been talking about that are being sent overseas, well, you could -- why don't you work on ending the tax benefits for the jobs that are in -- the manufacturing instead of worrying about a couple of hundred jobs. That's really nothing on the large scope. Now, I wanted to say, too, that -- oh, yeah, the NorthMet Mining Project, they said they're going to recreate wetlands and they're going to do all these things, but of course, they don't know what the impact will be until they start. Now, that's a lie. I mean, they know what the impact will be. They're just not telling you because they want approval, and then we'll be over our head in problems. Now, there's a survey of the top 10 most cleanest cities in the world, not the United States, the world, and Minneapolis was in the top 10 for clean cities. So what do we think about the tourism, the people coming here to go to a cleaner environment as opposed to an environment we're going to pollute? And I don't think it's fair for these people making these decisions. This is Minnesota's -- the people of Minnesota's land. It's not necessarily these people that are making decisions for us -- against us. And I also want to say I think Governor Mark Dayton's a wonderful governor. We should be really proud of him. We need to carefully -- I want to say, listen, if we can pass gay marriage, we can vote against this.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Bauer

40763

Joe Bauer 11010 Pawnee Ave N. Stillwater, MN 55082 612-817-5487 After review of the information on the Poly-met proposed project/mine I support denying a permit to the company and all involved. I am a stock holder in ALLETE and feel the economic benefit is not sufficient to take the risk to our Minnesota environment. The technology proposed is not sufficiently proven for the proposed project. For these reasons please deny the PolyMet Mining Inc Project permit. Thank you, Joe Bauer

Joseph Buglione

16191

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Cook

39324

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please remember the literature, foresight, leadership and conservatism of Minnesotans like Oberholtzer and Olson. The work that they and so many countless other organizations and individuals accomplished to preserve the little that this great land has remaining would be for naught should this be allowed to transpire. What side will you be on in regards to legacy for our children and our children's children. I know that probably sounds cliché, but it is very true. If those individuals like yourselves do not incorporate sound scientific data and research along with the valuation of listening to the voice of the people--all people who work in and around and enjoy in their free time the Boundary Waters Area--our country is in for a world of hurt, the price of which will be paid ten-fold by future generations. As an avid canoeer of the Boundary Waters and northern Minnesota for the past 30 years, I urge you to listen to the voice of the people, follow the science, and think about those Minnesotans who have gone before and who have left a sustainable legacy for all of us to be proud of and in which to believe. Respectfully Joe F. Cook N8962 Hwy 162 Mindoro, WI 54644 Sincerely, Mr Joseph Cook N8962 Hwy 162 Mindoro, WI 54644 (608) 487-3808

Joseph Dahmen

18251

My name is Joseph Dahmen. D-A-H-M-E-N. I live in Aurora, Minnesota. I have property on Partridge River. I work on the Partridge River. I've lived on the Range. I was born on the Range. I hunt, I fish. Am I environmentalist? Yes, I'm an environmentalist. Do I work for a place? We make power on the river, you know, a power company. I am able to kayak home from work sometimes, I'm able to ride my bike to work sometimes living up there. For these people that complain about the pollution, if I live there and play there and work there, I'm sure not going to close my eyes to a company that would pollute. With that, some of the people that come there to visit and they see one little area and say it's beautiful, there's more than one little area that's beautiful. It's more than just the Boundary Waters. It's more than -- I kayak. I probably go down the river 40, 50 times a year, and I maybe see one other person. All these people complaining about mining and that, how come I don't see them on the river kayaking with me? How come they're not there enjoying how beautiful it is that it's a river that flows from the area of the mining. So I've been lucky enough to be able to live, work and enjoy that area. My parents retired from mining. They both -- my father and mother were able to work out there, made a good living, put us through school. I was able to put my three kids through college, through school. One out of the three is able to live up north, a police officer in town, and it would be nice if all three would have good-paying jobs to live up there, but it doesn't work that way. They enjoy to come to visit. They all three hunt with me, up on the Range, right next to the river, but there's more than one area that's beautiful on the Range than just Boundary Waters, and that's where I'm saying we're all watching the PolyMets there. We're not going to just stand by and let them pollute things. We're watching things. Everybody's watching. That's it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Foss

39059

---Original Message--- From: josephrfoss@gmail-com [mailto:josephrfoss@gmail-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:32 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Joseph Foss 359 66th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55432-4402

Joseph Hann

54557

As a native Minnesotan I am very concerned that our natural resources in Northern Minnesota. Polymet's plan for mining sulfide-bearing ore will be detrimental. 500 years is NOT possible to treat. You must extend the SDEIS to 180 days. You must take measures to delay this ridiculous attempt at mining.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Merz

18897

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Joseph Merz 111 W. Lincoln Ave, #305 #305 Fergus Falls, MN 56537 2189983145

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Mitchell

46955

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I have been coming into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for 20 years, bringing 1, 2, or 3 groups of youth and adults each year into an area that is as close to true wilderness as is accessible in the United States, particularly for canoeing. When we've spotted soap suds on a shore, or campers got careless and dumped something into the lake, it has been a teaching moment about pollution and care of wilderness. I've asked them to dip a cup into the 'sudsy' water and consider drinking it. I remind them of the over 200,000 campers going through the BWCAW each summer. If a mining company, who has a HUGE vested interest in the facts and assumptions used in compiling an SDEIS, and making decisions on a mining operation upstream from the BWCAW is permitted to be even more careless, or intentionally negligent in its supposedly honest SDEIS statement, I will understand that the EPA, USFS, MNDNR, and the Corp didn't protect the Boundary Waters from profaning this wilderness. This Federally protected wilderness area will no longer be the wilderness area that I, and over 200,000 have enjoyed annually, and I for one, will not be back. The economic development of mining in NE Minnesota is GREAT. Yet not even with zoning restrictions is one landowner allowed to adversely effect a neighbor's property. As a Federally protected Wilderness Area, the BWCAW belongs to all the people of the United States as a very special area of particular significance and value, AS A WILDERNESS AREA. It is not the dumping ground for the likely consequences of mining operations that will almost certainly significantly degrade the wilderness. I would welcome mining around the BWCAW, IF they do not harm or alter the wilderness. Let those who have the power of decisions about this, including those with the mining companies draw all their water for drinking, eating and living from downstream of the mining operations, like the mining company is asking canoers to do if the mining is allowed to move forwaRd Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streaMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Mitchell

46957

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I have been coming into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for 20 years, bringing 1, 2, or 3 groups of youth and adults each year into an area that is as close to true wilderness as is accessible in the United States, particularly for canoeing. When we've spotted soap suds on a shore, or campers got careless and dumped something into the lake, it has been a teaching moment about pollution and care of wilderness. I've asked them to dip a cup into the 'sudsy' water and consider drinking it. I remind them of the over 200,000 campers going through the BWCAW each summer. If a mining company, who has a HUGE vested interest in the facts and assumptions used in compiling an SDEIS, and making decisions on a mining operation upstream from the BWCAW is permitted to be even more careless, or intentionally negligent in its supposedly honest SDEIS statement, I will understand that the EPA, USFS, MNDNR, and the Corp didn't protect the Boundary Waters from profaning this wilderness. This Federally protected wilderness area will no longer be the wilderness area that I, and over 200,000 have enjoyed annually, and I for one, will not be back. The economic development of mining in NE Minnesota is GREAT. Yet not even with zoning restrictions is one landowner allowed to adversely effect a neighbor's property. As a Federally protected Wilderness Area, the BWCAW belongs to all the people of the United States as a very special area of particular significance and value, AS A WILDERNESS AREA. It is not the dumping ground for the likely consequences of mining operations that will almost certainly significantly degrade the wilderness. I would welcome mining around the BWCAW, IF they do not harm or alter the wilderness. Let those who have the power of decisions about this, including those with the mining companies draw all their water for drinking, eating and living from downstream of the mining operations, like the mining company is asking canoers to do if the mining is allowed to move forwaRd Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete pre

Joseph Oman

42556

See attachment

Joseph Pratte

54201

My name is Joseph Pratte, I am a student at Como Park Senior High in St. Paul. Paul Danyser[SPELLING] an activist from the Friends of the Boundry Waters organization came to talk to us last Friday in our AP Environmental Science class. Of course as you may guess he ridiculed and criticized the building of the mine. Although I see the economic benefits of this mine and the boost it will bring to the local economy. There are no words to describe my utter disgust and disappointment for the proposed construction of this mine. Since I was in seventh grade I have been visiting the boundary waters every summer. As I have gotten older my love for the outdoors has grown as has my admiration for the north shore. I acknowledge that mining is a necessary and vital part of our economy, but at what cost? I cannot go back to the places that I love in twenty years with my children and see the kind of degradation that this mine will create. I know you will make the right decision and decide to not approve this monstrosity.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph W. Hejny

6078

MN DNR, 01-16-14

The PolyMet Mining environmental review / supplemental EIS and Executive Summary was well thought out and informative. I support the PolyMet Project. I believe PolyMet will operate a modern mine that will meet or exceed all regulations, safe guard the environment and produce quality jobs and long term tax revenue for the State of Minnesota.

I have children in Minnesota colleges and have children who have completed studies at Minnesota colleges. It has never seemed fair that my children have to pay more for a Minnesota college education than in near by states. If the state would promote natural resource development such as PolyMet, my kids student loans and my college debt load would be less.

The EIS demonstrates long term impact to the lands and waters of Minnesota will be protected. One of my son - in - law's is a UMD graduate chemical engineer who is employed by General Electric. He has looked at the EIS and believes that reverse osmosis is the best method to treat mine discharge water and that there will not be a down stream impact to Minnesota waters. I have a lake cabin on South Twin Lake, a few miles south of Aurora, MN., I do not fear that my lake will be impacted by PolyMet mining. I work in the explosive manufacturing industry and many of our employees live in the communities of Hoyt lakes, Aurora, Lakeland and Biwabik. Everyone of our 30 employees are for non ferrous mine development, none of us fear PolyMet will harm the environment.

I am a PolyMet investor and proud my investment will provide quality jobs for future generations of Minnesotans. I am the father of eight children, all of them live in Minnesota. My children and grand children will need jobs, Polymet Mining could very well be my child's employer. Enough already, PolyMet will meet every regulatory concern, provide taxes and provide employment.. Please permit this mine to move ahead with development. Every employee of PolyMet will be watching out for the Minnesota way of life, PolyMet will be watched by its employees 24 / 7- What more could you ask for.

What better place than the former LTV property for a new open pit mining operation. The roads, utilities, RR, water, mill, crusher and tailing basins are all ready to be used again. Hundreds of former LTV employees are ready to go to work, the state needs tax dollars and the EIS shows mining, tourism and recreation can co-exiSt It makes perfect sense to move this mine forward, please approve the mining permits to PolyMet Mining.

Best regards, Joseph W. Hejny General Manager / Iron Range Dyno Nobel Inc. A business of Incitec Pivot Limited 2795 East Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, Utah 84121, USA Office: +1 218 865 6341 | Fax: +1 218 865 4439 | Mobile: +1 218 290 3633 mailto:joe.hejny@am.dynonobel-com HYPERLINK "http://www.dynonobel-com/"http://www.dynonobel-com Groundbreaking Performance Through Practical Innovation

Joseph Wenzel

16617

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joseph Wenzel 33 Larpenteur Ave E Maplewood, MN 55117

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joseph Wenzel

50011

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Joseph Wenzel 33 Larpenteur Ave E Maplewood, MN 55117

Joseph Wilson

54217

To Who it may concern, I do not think you should build a mine near the boundary waters. They should be preserved people love to go there. If you build that mine then a lot of people are going to be really mad. And if a lot of people it won't be good for you. You will destroy a very wonderful and thriving ecosystem. You will kill alot if not all aquatic life in the area. Think about all the buisnesses you could potentially ruin. All the people you could end up putting out of a job. Or even the homes you would wreck. You may believe the ecosystem will rebuild itself, which is true but take into consideration how long that would take. There are other places you can build the mine – somewhere else. Please take my opinion into high consideration.

Joseph Woods

38880

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Joseph Woods 5511 Waseca Industrial Rd Duluth, MN 55807-2148 (218) 624-4040

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh Capistrant

16143

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh G

42973

Josh Gregorich 5217 5th Ave N Grand Forks, ND 58203 March 4, 2014 To Whom It May Concern: I would like to start by saying thank you for the cooperative effort by the co-led government agencies and teams that have dedicated their time and effort in creating the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). You may ask yourself, why I've decided to write and comment on the SDEIS. I was born and raised on the Mesabi Iron Range, but currently do not live there due to my current job. Most of my family still resides on the Iron Range and I frequently travel back to visit and enjoy the outdoors. Regardless of where I reside, this area will always be home. It is very important for us, the public to be able to voice our opinions and concerns surrounding projects of this magnitude. After spending time reviewing the SDEIS I have some questions, concerns, and comments which are addressed in the following text. In doing so, I've grouped these by category for easier reading and navigation.

Process and Methods Associated with the NorthMet Project The SDEIS mentions that PolyMet will be responsible for monitoring and measuring of air and water quality to ensure compliance to all environmental standards. Will there be oversight from government agencies, such as the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), Minnesota Environmental Protection Agency (MNEPA), or others. Will there be random sampling of water and air within the direct area of the Mine Site, Pit Site, and surrounding areas to guarantee compliance. Next in this category, the proposal is to have PolyMet collect only 90% of the water seepage from the tailings basin and treat the water at a Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) at the Mine Site. Why was 90% of the water seepage used as the basis. Why wouldn't this rate to be higher. Why should any seepage into the environment be accepted. A higher/increased rate of collecting and treating this water will only mitigate downstream effects. How long will the liners at the tailings basin protect the environment. During construction and mine operation, an open pit proposal would remove wetlands and other parts of the ecosystem. Once mining ends after approximately 20 years, part of the reclamation process is that PolyMet would restore parts of the Mine and Plant Sites and the surrounding ecosystem to native habitat. Why wait until mining ends. This would then be approximately 20 years that the ecosystem is not active in removing and/or filtering out environmental contaminants, ie CO₂, NO_x, and SO_x. Even with the proposed Land Exchange, there would be a net loss of wetlands, river habitat, forests, and plant life within the state of Minnesota. Currently the land in the proposed Land Exchange is doing the same, but we still also have the land at the Mine site as a functional wetland. To compensate for the net loss, PolyMet should actively restore displaced habitat even if they help fund restoration elsewhere in the NE portion of the state. During and up until the time which the East Pit would be backfilled, the proposal is to store category 2 – 4 waste rock on liners. What is the potential impact of these high concentration sulfides interacting with the oxygen in the atmosphere throughout this time. Is the only impact that there can be seepage through the waste rock via water and then it would be caught by the liner(s). Also, the category 1 waste rock should be stored on liners to alleviate any seepage. How would the different category waste rock be separated successfully at the Mine Site. What are the environmental consequences if they are not properly separated. During and/or after the 11th year of mining operations, the proposal is to backfill the East Pit with category 2 – 4 waste rock (highest in sulfide concentration). With the idea that this will mitigate sulfates and metals from entering the environment. Why is backfilling the East

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh G

42988

Josh Gregorich 5217 5th Ave N Grand Forks, ND 58203 March 4, 2014 To Whom It May Concern: I would like to start by saying thank you for the cooperative effort by the co-led government agencies and teams that have dedicated their time and effort in creating the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). You may ask yourself, why I've decided to write and comment on the SDEIS. I was born and raised on the Mesabi Iron Range, but currently do not live there due to my current job. Most of my family still resides on the Iron Range and I frequently travel back to visit and enjoy the outdoors. Regardless of where I reside, this area will always be home. It is very important for us, the public to be able to voice our opinions and concerns surrounding projects of this magnitude. After spending time reviewing the SDEIS I have some questions, concerns, and comments which are addressed in the following text. In doing so, I've grouped these by category for easier reading and navigation. Process and Methods Associated with the NorthMet Project The SDEIS mentions that PolyMet will be responsible for monitoring and measuring of air and water quality to ensure compliance to all environmental standards. Will there be oversight from government agencies, such as the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), Minnesota Environmental Protection Agency (MNEPA), or others. Will there be random sampling of water and air within the direct area of the Mine Site, Pit Site, and surrounding areas to guarantee compliance. Next in this category, the proposal is to have PolyMet collect only 90% of the water seepage from the tailings basin and treat the water at a Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) at the Mine Site. Why was 90% of the water seepage used as the basis. Why wouldn't this rate to be higher. Why should any seepage into the environment be accepted. A higher/increased rate of collecting and treating this water will only mitigate downstream effects. How long will the liners at the tailings basin protect the environment. During construction and mine operation, an open pit proposal would remove wetlands and other parts of the ecosystem. Once mining ends after approximately 20 years, part of the reclamation process is that PolyMet would restore parts of the Mine and Plant Sites and the surrounding ecosystem to native habitat. Why wait until mining ends. This would then be approximately 20 years that the ecosystem is not active in removing and/or filtering out environmental contaminants, ie CO2, NOx, and SOx. Even with the proposed Land Exchange, there would be a net loss of wetlands, river habitat, forests, and plant life within the state of Minnesota. Currently the land in the proposed Land Exchange is doing the same, but we still also have the land at the Mine site as a functional wetland. To compensate for the net loss, PolyMet should actively restore displaced habitat even if they help fund restoration elsewhere in the NE portion of the state. During and up until the time which the East Pit would be backfilled, the proposal is to store category 2 – 4 waste rock on liners. What is the potential impact of these high concentration sulfides interacting with the oxygen in the atmosphere throughout this time. Is the only impact that there can be seepage through the waste rock via water and then it would be caught by the liner(s). Also, the category 1 waste rock should be stored on liners to alleviate any seepage. How would the different category waste rock be separated successfully at the Mine Site. What are the environmental consequences if they are not properly separated. During and/or after the 11th year of mining operations, the proposal is to backfill the East Pit with category 2 – 4 waste rock (highest in sulfide concentration). With the idea that this will mitigate sulfates and metals from entering the environment. Why is backfilling the East

Josh Greenwood

18069

My name is Josh Greenwood. And from what I learned I guess from all the showings and some of the stuff I've learned I would like to see PolyMet go through as long as everything is clean and what they say it is. And I don't have a whole lot to say on the subject. But as long as they follow through with their permitting and everything I think it would be a good thing. I'm from Duluth. I actually worked in the mine once before when they demoed it. And they did a very good job at that time under different ownership. So it would be a good thing to see for the economy and for the future of mining and everybody around it.

Josh Hoban

47017

I just wanted to give our full address, sorry I forgot. I get quite fired up talking about this and thinking about the future devastation. Josh and Tara Hoban 1429 N 7th Ave E Duluth, MN 55805 On Wednesday, March 12, 2014 11:29 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh Hoban

47023

Hi my name is Josh Hoban, I live in Duluth, MN. 4 years ago my wife and I bought land up North of Isabella. We chose this area because of the beauty, wildlife, water, and quietness. We have spots to go watch moose, deer, birds, and fish for walleyes. These things will all be greatly impacted if this goes through. I know you guys have heard it all, but I just don't understand why you would ever let this project move forward. Big businesses all over the country and world are devastating our lands everyday. Whether it is an oil spill in Michigan, coal sludge contamination in North Carolina, Coal extraction chemical in West Virginia's waters, air pollution in Texas from fracking, water pollution in Pennsylvania from fracking, and the list goes on and on. The list of Sulfide mines also is long whether it is in Montana, Colorado, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Idaho, and of course this list also goes on and on. I don't know why anyone would ever believe this is going to be done safe. They all same the same thing, new technology, this time it will be different, but it is the same result time after time. This project will ruin parts of the North and it will never be the same. The clean up moneys is always about a 1000th of what is actually needed. The pollution fines are just drops in the bucket, never even making them change their practices. O yeah and all that about the jobs and community, of course this will be the usual boom and bust 20 good years of a couple thousand jobs and forever in bad years and billions in cleanup after Polymet makes their money and moves on. Those resources most likely will not even benefit the US, just sell them to the highest bidder, polymet cares nothing about Minnesota or the US for that matter. It is all about the money who will pay the most. That's just like the Keystone pipeline saying their minerals are staying in the US. We all know that is laughable, just like Polymets minerals. I don't know why people would even consider 20 years of money for a private company, vs endless years of tourism to a beautiful place and money going directly into the economy and forever making it stronger. I don't believe one word that Polymets say and how can we this practice has never been done safely before, why test it in Minnesota on such a large scale. Why use it anywhere in the world. These companies will cut every corner just to save a buck and we all know that's been proven. Thanks a lot for your time, Josh and Tara Hoban Duluth, MN 55805

Josh Northey

47038

Lisa Fay, I do not have strong opinions on whether the PolyMet project goes forward or not. I trust the state agencies responsible for evaluating whether the proposal meets all applicable environmental standards will do so to the best of their ability. The main thing I want to put a word in is what I feel is fear mongering and hysteria from some opponents of the project. I repeatedly hear claims, privately and in the media, that this project might "ruin the environment of NE MN", or "destroy the northwoods tourism economy", or "pollute the whole of Lake Superior" (all actual quotes). As far as I am aware there is zero chance the project will do any of these things in a meaningful way. It has a small footprint, and is using relatively safe low impact technologies, compared to what was done over the past century on the iron range. Moreover, much of that previously mined land is now used recreationally. The majority of the debate concerning the PolyMet project seems to be less about the actual risks/costs/benefits and particulars of the project, and more about giving people a chance to philosophically stake out a position as to whether they value the environment or the economy more. They decide what camp they are in first, and then go looking for arguments/information, rather than the reverse. Certainly, if any large project like this is mismanaged, or willfully flouts the rules, there could be negative impacts. But only focusing on extreme (and at times entirely fanciful) worst case scenarios is not productive. Neither is worrying about what will be going on in the area environmentally 500 years from now. 500 years ago our ancestors were mostly still serfs in Northern Europe without access to plumbing. With the rate of technological change worrying about what people will be doing even 200 years in the future seems obtuse, much less 500 years. If our descendants value the pristineness of this particular patch of land in 500 years, they will be able to clean it up much more easily and cheaply than we can imagine. As someone who grew up in Duluth, but now lives in Saint Paul, I am struck by how much of the opposition to the project comes from people living in the metro area who might use the northern part of the state as a recreation destination, if at all. The idea behind environmental regulations is not that some subset of society should get land use veto on land use decisions in the whole state. Instead it is that you set up a set of rules and requirements, and to the extent projects can meet those, they are allowed to proceed. The northwoods is very big, and this particular project is not going to significantly impact 99-9% of it. Maybe there are real concerns relating to pollution control, or project planning, or management/monitoring infrastructure, I leave that for your experts to decide. In the end the decision here doesn't matter. There is only so much copper and nickel in the world, and eventually humanity will extract this patch of it, as well as the Manganese under Emily, MN. When just depends on how quickly scarcity drives up the value of the resources, and how quickly technology drives down the cost of extraction and environmental remediation. Joshua Northey
1256 Watson Avenue Saint Paul MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh Pelkie

39345

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Josh Sarver

54354

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I do not support the PolyMet mining project. It could affect multiple wetlands, lakes, and rivers, including: Mud Lake, Yelp Creek, and the Partridge River. It could also cause a decrease of 11 different plant species in the area. Yes, it could make more jobs, and it could help with our mineral capacity, but I still think that wildlife is more important, but that's just me. I think that PolyMet has a plan that is good, but can be improved. They have planned out the area and what would happen to that area, but they ignored that they could damage land areas, maybe permanently. I don't think that the mining of copper-sulfate will benefit Minnesota. Copper-sulfate can kill roots, bacteria, plants, and other organic things. If anything goes wrong, then lots of animals could die. Copper-sulfate could also affect the water, killing many organisms, in the water and otherwise. Certain cultural resources can be affected. The Mesabe Widiu (or Laurentian Divide) would be affected, and Beaver Bay would also be affected. Areas given to the Bands, (multiple Native American Tribes), would be affected. I do not agree with the land exchange offers. It occurs in a National Forest, which should be left alone. It also only benefits one company. I do not think that the mining would affect me, because I live far away from where the mining is taking place. If something went wrong, and the lands were polluted, then it could cost my family a lot of money to help the state clean it up. Sincerely, Josh Sarver

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh Skelton

18145

My name is Cory Anderson. C-O-R-Y, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. I want to give my time to Josh Skelton. Hi. My name is Josh Skelton. I'm from Coleraine, Minnesota, but I originally grew up in Hoyt Lakes. So thank you to the agencies for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS. Appreciate the hard work your staff that they've completed, and the commitment to better quantify and qualify the environmental impact of this project. I fully trust the review process your agencies have sponsored to best protect our natural surroundings. I'm a licensed professional chemical engineer in the state of Minnesota, like a number of your staff that have contributed to this report. I understand the rigors to obtaining that professional license and the obligation we carry in our work to uphold the integrity. In reviewing these documents supporting the SDEIS, I can appreciate the application of these principles that were used in this compilation and completion. It also gives an insight into as to why the model assumptions are subjected to such rigorous sensitivity analysis and stretched to ensure they cover major areas of concern regarding public health and environmental impact. While not perfect these models identify the impacts and assure that we have the ability to maintain our resources to the standards of today and well into the future based on best engineering practice. I have two general areas I would like to address regarding water quality modeling done as a part of this SDEIS. The first relates to the executive summary and whether water quality standards could be met with this project, and that mechanical water treatment as part of the model of the PolyMet proposed action for the duration of the simulations in 200 years for the mine site and 500 years for the plant site. The intent of the statement and the modeling was not to predict the actual duration of water treatment but rather to determine the impacts of water quality at key points in the watershed over stated periods of time in the model. 200 and 500 years, respectively. The outcome of the model actually is stating that water quality standards will be met well into the future, not defining the timeframe for treatment. A second area of address relates to the recent measured deviation in water quality models for the Partridge River. The baseline assumptions groundwater (inaudible) CFS for a monitoring point 17 miles from the mine site. More recent information is showing that closer to 1.3 to 1.8. Instead of distracting from the validity of the model of the sulfate, more credence should be given to the sensitivity analysis done with the model. Simulations were run with flow as lower in the basin than 0.5 and as high as 2.4 CFS, and they still showed water quality standards will be met. And the new measured data was well within the range of analysis. I feel fortunate (inaudible) Northern Minnesota where I grew up. We are close to losing the passion of the generations that built the communities we live. Without these types of jobs for our young families to build lives and careers, we only face further erosion. The culture of the Iron Range is not seeking a life of luxury by meaning of salary, it's grounded by the ability to work hard and be fairly compensated to earn a living. The luxury is in the neighborhood, schools, and recreation the region offers. (Inaudible) we have high standards of ourselves and others. That's why I believe there's no better time to do this project, no better place to do this project, and no better people to assure it's done right. Thank you.

18351

My name is Josh Skelton. I would like to give my time to Nancy Norr.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josh Williams

43103

For the record, my full name and address: Joshua A. Williams 4453 45th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406 Also, I have made a minor addition to my comment. Feel free to disregard my previous email. Sorry for the trouble. Full, amended comment below: In order to adequately evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project, the SDEIS needs to consider the financial feasibility of remedial activities at and around the mine site. As the project proposer will, of course, be financially responsible for the remedial activities, the SDEIS therefore needs to evaluate whether or not NET profits from the mine (eg. after all capital, labor, operating expenses etc are covered) will be sufficient to cover remedial costs, and how the required financial assurances for remedial activities will be structured. To be adequate, this analysis needs to consider a wide range of scenarios for mine output, metal prices, and start-up and operational contingency costs. The analysis also needs to consider, in sufficient detail to allow evaluation of feasibility, the mechanism by which sufficient funds for remediation will be held (or access to sufficient funding otherwise secured), how continued access to sufficient funds to covers costs of remediation over time will be ensured (given the potential for hundreds of years of remedial costs), how and at what rate funds will be set aside during the projected 20-year operational life of the mine, and how this last relates to projected profit during the period of mine operation. I believe this might be termed a probabilistic analysis. Put another way, engineering controls, no matter how well designed, will not work if they are never put in place, or if they are not maintained. The mine will operate for 20 years, and the impacts to water coming of the site will last 100s. Any evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project needs to include consideration of how control of these impacts will be paid for when the mine-and the company that wants to develop it-is long gone. An EIS that fails to consider costs of mitigation-in the form of engineering controls for site remediation and short and long term water quality treatment-as a function of projected project profits would not achieve the statutory purpose of environmental review to inform permitting. As part of permitting once environmental review is completed, permitting agencies will need to ensure that sufficient financial assurances are in place to cover the cost of mitigation measures identified by the EIS. Such considerations will be of sufficient complexity that they will be impossible to adequately evaluate during a time-constrained permitting process without a thorough analysis, as outlined above, during environmental review. Best, Josh ----- Forwarded message ----- From: Josh Williams <HYPERLINK "mailto:josh.a.williams@gmail-com"josh.a.williams@gmail-com> Date: Thu, Mar 13, 2014 at 3:48 PM Subject: SDEIS comments To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us In order to adequately evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project, the SDEIS needs to consider the feasibility of remedial activities at and around the mine site. As the project proposer will, of course, be financially responsible for the remedial activities, the SDEIS therefore needs to evaluate whether or not NET profits from the mine (eg. after all capital, labor, operating expenses etc are covered) will be sufficient to cover remedial costs. To be adequate, this analysis needs to consider a wide range of scenarios for mine output, metal prices, and start-up and operational contingency costs. The analysis also needs to consider in sufficient detail to allow evaluation of feasibility the mechanism by which sufficient funds for remediation will be held (or access to sufficient funding otherwise secured), how continued access to sufficient funds to covers costs of remediation over time will be ensured (given the

43229

In order to adequately evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project, the SDEIS needs to consider the feasibility of remedial activities at and around the mine site. As the project proposer will, of course, be financially responsible for the remedial activities, the SDEIS therefore needs to evaluate whether or not NET profits from the mine (eg. after all capital, labor, operating expenses etc are covered) will be sufficient to cover remedial costs. To be adequate, this analysis needs to consider a wide range of scenarios for mine output, metal prices, and start-up and operational contingency costs. The analysis also needs to consider in sufficient detail to allow evaluation of feasibility the mechanism by which sufficient funds for remediation will be held (or access to sufficient funding otherwise secured), how continued access to sufficient funds to covers costs of remediation over time will be ensured (given the potential for hundreds of years of remedial costs), how and at what rate funds will be set aside during the projected 20-year operational life of the mine, and how this last relates to projected profit during the period of mine operation. I believe this might be termed a probabilistic analysis. Put another way, engineering controls, no matter how well designed, will not work if they are never put in place, or if they are not maintained. The mine will operate for 20 years, and the impacts to water coming of the site will last 100s. Any evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project needs to include consideration of how control of these impacts will be paid for when the mine-and the company that wants to develop it-is long gone. Best, Josh

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joshua Borchardt

44359

Good morning, I am strictly apposed to new mining operations near the BWCAW in northern MN. The area is home to the richest wildlife in MN, and major parts of the upper US. The uniqueness of the clean water, solitude, and low populations helps to improve the habitat there, as well as the overall impact in the area. As the US, and MN, continue to increase in population, we need real solutions using alternative energies, recycling programs, and the like- that limits our impact on the environment. It would be quite the contradiction to have one of the most pristine and protected wilderness areas on the planet, surrounded with a perimeter of mining. That is NOT the message to be sending to our young people. I have seen in western ND the impacts of the oil country literally drunk, high people driving around in cars and shooting off guns near hiking trails with significantly increased violent crimes. The sort of community fostered by a materialistic desire for Earth's minerals is not the kind of community that such a beautiful and pristine place deserves. Please, MNDNR, do not allow this mining to continue, we need to say "No," and make better investments for the future of Minnesotans, and the rest of the country. Much appreciated, Josh Borchardt Space Studies MS Student John D. Odegard School of Aerospace Sciences University of North Dakota, Grand Forks B.S. Biology, NDSU 2012 763-516-0561 To those devoid of imagination, a blank place on the map is a useless waste; to others, the most valuable part." - Aldo Leopold TED video of the week: [HYPERLINK "http://www.ted-com/playlists/27/to_boldly_go.html"](http://www.ted-com/playlists/27/to_boldly_go.html)http://www.ted-com/talks/chris_mcknett_the_investment_logic_for_sustainability.html

Joshua Houdek

42482

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Joshua Houdek 2820 37th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1718

Joshua Knieff

41925

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Joshua Knieff Litchfield, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joshua Sparber

18253

Hi. My name is Joshua Sparber, S-P-A-R-B-E-R. Two comments. One, I have concerns with the macro understanding of an economic impact on a region driving a singular project. This project is not going to impact the entire -- as the mayor of Hoyt Lakes indicated, empty region, economically-depressed region. Another comment was the entire population of, you know, Tower, Ely, Virginia, Biwabik, the major Iron Range cities, would not currently reach the capacity of the Excel. Well, 400 jobs isn't going to make an impact on such a diverse problem. The environmental possible impact is not worth the minimal economic return to that region. The company is a Canadian company. The majority of the profits will leave the state in terms of reinvestment. Yes, you would have short-term environmental -- excuse me, economic improvement for a very limited amount of people, and there would be a generational -- a one-generational benefit, but as the closing of the taconite mines has shown, you've sustained four generations on those taconite mines, and that built, over many generations, an area. One very small generational window is not going to improve that area, and the amount of economic impact is astronomical. The other similar point I would make is that if you added up, my assumption is of the average wage, if every one of those 400 workers made on average \$75,000 a year, you still would get less money over a 20-year period of time, gross, than it's going to cost to build the Vikings stadium. And the Vikings stadium is not going to have a 2- to 500-year environmental possible impact. There is no clean way to mine these resources. If there was more than a 20-year window to do it, I would be more supportive. Such a short window does not equate with such a long impact. Thank you. And a short addition is my impression of the majority of proponents for the project are lobbyists and paid advocates in the industry, and the majority, I would imagine, have already made their comments placed on the record, so they used quite a bit of time to reiterate comments on the record that are well documented. Thank you.

Josiah Loeffler

38501

I find it disturbing that the opposition to PolyMet's project keep bringing up failures from the paSt Technology and information is constantly changing. We can use this new technology and past mistakes to learn from and improve our processes. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Sincerely, Josiah Loeffler Josiah Loeffler 900 5th Ave SW Little Falls, Minnesota 56345 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Josie Kindred

40870

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Josie Kindred PO Box 518 Hurricane, UT 84737-0518 (208) 881-6816

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Josie Lilly

40396

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Josie Lilly 1111 Harrison Ave Apt C Astoria, OR 97103 US

josie nelson

45166

Please do NOT allow the polymet mining project to go forward I am very concerned that the SDEIS is flawed, and that this project will seriously harm water that we all must have to live. I am also saddened that it will destroy a beautiful resource in our state and habitat for animals. Native people will also likely be harmed, since wild rice is sensitive to sulfur. The jobs created by this project will be temporary, but the project will harm generations to come. It doesn't cost anything to leave the minerals in the ground, but we may all pay a tremendous amount to clean up after the potential disastrous results. One small miscalculation could lead to consequences that cannot be reversed. If we allow this to move forward, we are sacrificing the good of all for jobs for a small segment of our population. Thank you for your time. Josie Nelson 239 Peninsula Road Medicine Lake, MN 55441 763-540-6884 <https://mail.google-com/mail/u/0/images/cleardot.gif>

Josie Winship

10761

Hello, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed PolyMet Northmet copper-nickel mining plan. I am not at all convinced that the short term goal of mining is at all worth the inevitable pollution it will cause. Nor am I convinced that that PolyMet will be able to reverse the damage to water and land to its original healthy state. I vacation every year on Lake Superior, the largest body of water in the world. I cherish it and am proud to live in a state that boasts this gorgeous treasure of a lake. Please think of what is good for the earth and its people and stop this dangerous plan. Thank you for reading this. Sincerely, Joanna Winship 2909 E. 22nd St Minneapolis, MN 55406

Joslyn Hugger

14967

https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/171ApxhNZbUKhnujfevxGS4rOiLEuki9j_F-cHEs9y7M/mobilebasic Sent from my iPad 20618 fenston Ave north forest lake mn 55025

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Journey Roberge

15453

Katy Olson: 2345 Woodbridge St Roseville, MN 55113 Copper Mining in Minnesota, Why We Shouldn't Allow It. Copper mining is a process where geologists find the richest deposits of copper that they can locate. Miners then separate the rock with the deposit in it away from the earth, break it all up, then separate the valuable materials from the rest. Once they do this, they concentrate the metals from the deposit. Using a hydro-metallurgical process in a pressure cooker is how the metal is concentrated. This is called sulfide mining. This process is very similar to mining for iron ore. Minnesota is considering mining for copper because there is an estimated 4 billion tons of copper deep under the ground in the Duluth Complex. It is worth far more than one trillion dollars. Copper mining in Minnesota is a dangerous thing and should not be allowed to take place. To start, sulfide mining for copper should not be allowed in Minnesota because of the mining company that would be operating the copper mine, PolyMet, has never operated a mine before. They are going to use unproven techniques to extract the copper from the ground. That to me, is not a reliable process and could prove to be harmful. Because something could go wrong and put the whole mine in jeopardy. This is one reason why we should not allow the sulfide mining to take place in Minnesota. The second reason the copper mining should be allowed to start in Minnesota are the environmental concerns. When it rains on sulfide ore waste, sulfuric acid is produced. Unlike iron ore mining, where, when it rains on iron mining waste, it creates runoff. Sulfuric acid can contaminate lakes, rivers, and groundwater but also harm human life, aquatic life, wildlife and damage whole ecosystems. Even though companies claim that sulfide mining has minimal environmental impacts there has been destroyed wildlife around the world, contaminated drinking water, and much more pollution. Sulfuric acid being produced and harming the environment is the second reason why copper mining shouldn't occur. The final reason sulfide mining for copper shouldn't occur in Minnesota is that mining companies often abandon their mines and leave the cleanup to taxpayers. Even though Minnesota requires companies to provide financial assurances for the cleanup, many mining companies go bankrupt and cannot help with the aftermath of the mines. This poses a large problem because many families don't have much money to start with so paying for the cleanup is a problem. That is my final reason why copper mining in Minnesota should be out of the picture. In conclusion, sulfide mining for copper should not take place in Minnesota because of the environmental concerns with water pollution, the fact the PolyMet has never operated a mine before. Also, most mining companies abandon their mines because they go bankrupt, thus forcing taxpayers to have to pay for the cleanup. My opinion should be considered because I have included the three large reasons why sulfide mining for copper is a bad thing. Sources: Source #1 <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/volunteer/julaug12/nonferrous.html> Source #2 <http://www.miningtruth-org/minnesotas-environment/#.Uu64uGRDtSS> Source #3 <http://www.friends-bwca-org/issues/sulfide-mining/>

Joy Barth

28695

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The Great Lakes is too large an area to experiment and have the likelihood of an enormous consequence that can't be remedied. For instance they give the figure of 500 years before the water would be salvaged again and that is likely questionable since we don't have a period of time that length to presently prove that. At this rate we won't have any pristine water and we'll all depend on the expensive process of desalination. It's a life and death risk. Sincerely, Sister Joy Barth Sincerely, Joy Barth 1001 14th St NW Rochester, MN 55901-2590 (507) 282-7441

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joy Schochet

19089

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. This document is enormous and the issues are extremely complex. One needs a great deal of time to examine the information and to comment on this information. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Joy Schochet 828 W. George Street Chicago, IL 60657 773-327-6592

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joy Schochet

46208

Dr Jonathan Green Dr, Joy Schochet 2310 Rose Lane, Ely, Minnesota 55731 828 W. George Street, Chicago, IL 60657 March 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit Re: Proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Citizen Comments on Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) Dear Ms Fay: We wish to make the following comments regarding the PolyMet/NorthMet SDEIS. We find that the SDEIS does not address or does not address adequately many of the issues pertinent to the evaluation of this proposal. Among these inadequacies are the following. 1- Copper According to Gavin Mudd (International Journal of Sustainable Development, 2013), the price of copper has steadily declined since 1900- He states in an email to the journal Science: "The critical issues already constraining the copper industry are social, environmental and economic issues. Any process intended to extract a kilogram of metal locked in a ton of rock buried hundreds of meters down invariably raises issues of energy, water consumption, pollution, and local community concerns. And such environmental and societal constraints are getting stronger" (Science, 343:722-724, 2014). Thus, the consequences of copper mining in an environmentally-sensitive and economically-fragile area are such as to preclude such mining activities, particularly in a downward-trending market for the metal. Under such circumstances, copper mines are a risky investment, and mining companies could well close or fail to undertake remediation and restoration as promised, leaving the mining site environmentally compromised at best or destroyed ecologically. 2- Environmental Issues The Superior National Forest (SNF) covers 3-9 million acres, of which over 445,000 acres are water, some 2,000 lakes and rivers and more than 2,000 miles of streams It is a national treasure in that, while it is only 0-2% of the contiguous USA land mass, it is home to a disproportionately large fraction of the US's fauna and flora. In addition, it hosts a great number and variety of transient species and provides them with sustenance, shelter, and breeding areas. Moreover, the diversity of landforms in the SNF, compared to its area, is unmatched. The impact of mining on the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters, as well as the Quetico Park and Lake Superior, would be substantial and detrimental. The environmental degradation, water and air pollution, the local, national and worldwide impacts of this proposal have been neither adequately appreciated nor discussed in the PolyMet SDEIS. Most significant of all is for us to recognize the value of a scarce ecosystem. Wilderness areas are continually decreasing in size and quality throughout the world, no less here than in the "developing" world. In an increasingly degraded and crowded world, must we not preserve the inherent value of these scarce environments, both for their own sake and for the health of the planet. Not only do they provide innumerable "ecosystem services" to us (and other species), but they provide unexcelled recreation and enjoyment for many and other non-quantifiable benefits. The BWCAW and its surrounding forests are invaluable to our planet, but the BWCAW cannot survive as an isolated "island" amidst ceaseless exploration and exploitation. Its loss will accrue to us all; as we will have sacrificed an irreplaceable resource for the short-term economic gain of others. One of the major impacts of the PolyMet mine would be on wetlands, of which nearly 1000 acres would be completely destroyed. While PolyMet states that they will convert other (distant) areas to wetlands, it has been established by many scientific studies that such "restitution" wetlands are not at all the same as natural wetlands. They are much less biodiverse and provide much less habitat, nutrition and water services than natural wetlands. Therefore, no amount of reconstitution will suffice t

Joy Windseth

43086

I am strongly against and opposed to allow copper mining in Minnesota. Please do not permit this atrocity. To compromise the quality of health and life for all living creatures due to the ramifications of copper mining would be not only a disaster but also an injustice to all future generations. Joy Elizabeth Windseth-Zerr

Joyce Blomquist

41789

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. It is crucial to protect Lake Superior, the watershed and Superior National Forest from toxic pollution. Unless there are proven methods that prevent this, the risk is too great. If this happens I'm concerned that we can never restore the damage. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Joyce Blomquist 1980 Skillman Ave W Roseville, MN 55113-5403 (651) 631-0688

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joyce Harrington

33155

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is forbidden in Wisconsin. Up to now it has not been done in Minnesota. There are reasons for those two facts: sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams where it is done. In Minnesota, that includes all across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. For almost a century, generations within my family have enjoyed the wilderness in this part of northern Minnesota. My Father-in-law went fishing there every year for years. My husband grew up near there and took his canoe into the area with friends as a teen. Together, my husband and I went many summers up into that area, all the way from Indiana, to enjoy the canoeing as well as the botany and wild life of the area, which included black bear, moose, wolves, and nesting bald eagles. My son and daughter both enjoyed several long canoe trips into the area as teens. And now, last summer, one of my grandchildren, a teen, went on a long canoe trip there with the girl scouts. She hopes to do it again next summer. Her younger sister also hopes to do it next summer. I would like their children to be able to have their wilderness trips in northern Minnesota, too, as generations of the family have. However, I am concerned that that might not happen if sulfide mining is done in the area, for Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Inevitably, it would happen in Minnesota. I have grave concerns beyond the impact on my immediate family. This project's potential impacts on that region's natural resources and public health are many, including: 1- risks to water quality 2- loss of wetlands 3- harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations 4- many cumulative impacts from mining. There is no doubt that the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Please do not allow it. Sincerely, Joyce Harrington 1604 Hoover Ave South Bend, IN 46615-1313 (574) 288-8811

Joyce Klees

54484

See attachment

Joyce Malwitz

46290

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joyce Malwitz 4137 bridgewater circle Vadnais Hts, MN 55126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Joyce Malwitz

46291

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Joyce Malwitz 4137 bridgewater circle Vadnais Hts, MN 55126

JP Lerner

42230

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr JP Lerner 2222 Harriet Ave Minneapolis, MN 55405-4200

Jr. Evans Connelly

4708

Good Afternoon- I support PolyMet in their efforts to regain the ability to mine and produce products to help build this country. Obviously they have to do it cleanly and an eye to the future and they should be treated fairly by the groups doing the evaluations. Regards- Evans Connelly, Jr. Evans "Chip" Connelly, Jr., CRPC®
Connelly Family Wealth Consulting and Management Senior Vice President-Wealth Management Wealth Advisor Chartered Retirement Planning
CounselorSM aUBS Financial Services Inc. 444 Cedar Street, Suite 2200 St Paul, MN 55101 651-229-6070/800-444-0582 ext. 6070
HYPERLINK "<http://financialservicesinc.ubs-com/team/connellyfamilygroup/index.html.start=/fa/evansconnellyandfawAppID=740andsiteName=Evans%20E.%20Connelly%20Jr.andsiteType=IND>"Connelly Family Group Website HYPERLINK "<mailto:evans.connelly@ubs-com>"evans.connelly@ubs-com The highest compliment we can receive is the referral of your friends, family and colleagues.

Jspence3

21986

I support the PolyMet Mining project in Minnesota. It will be environmentally neutral and will provide numerous jobs. It's time to move forward and do something positive and important for the state and nation. John S. Stephens 13829 Hidden Lake Lane Sugar Land, Tx 77498 281-491-2395 Jspence3@aol-com Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Jt Haines 18376

My name is JT Haines. I'm from St. Paul. I would cede my time to Bob Tanner.

juan cruz 40428

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, juan cruz 2440 Young Ave Bronx, NY 10469 US

Juan M 54224

Dear Lisa Fay: I'm writing this letter to you in regards of the Polymet sulfide mine. We have reviewed the maps as a class and came to conclusion that they should be redrawn and re-looked at because of the bogus scaling and drawing that took place. The map should be carefully looked at, and re-examined because there is a creek connected to the swamp that leads to the boundary waters, and it will pollute the water and diminish the cleanliness of it. Also the water should be tested to make sure that if this event were to happen, we would be able to fight it. Therefore, this should all be looked at and reviewed so we don't have to face this in the future. Lots of economical problems could happen without all this being taken seriously. I am just a student at Humboldt Senior High, but I'd hate to see my economy get destroyed over some bogus scaling. Sincerely, Juan M. [ILLEGIBLE]

Juanita Nelson 47514

I agree with the Northland Doctors, They say sulfide mining releases toxic pollutants known to cause dangerous health effects like cancer, lung and heart disease. Don't we have enough health hazards and pollution all ready. I don't think we need more. I have read they will be here for 20 years but it will take 50 years to clean up, That is not worth it Juanita Nelson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi 44357

As lifelong residents of this wonderful state, we would like to express our concern over the proposed PolyMet mining in northern Minnesota. We are getting to that retirement age soon and would love to move up north but are concerned about this project and the impact it will have on not just northern Minnesota but the state as a whole. We have put off retiring and moving until we know who's side of this issue Minnesota will land. We really don't want toxic waste in "literally" our backyaRd Minnesota would be "penny wise and pound foolish" to give up so much for a couple hundred jobs for 20 years. It's not worth the risk involved when PolyMet packs their bags and moves on to rape and pillage another wilderness area, leaving Minnesota taxpayers with the cost of cleaning up their mess. The fact that this type of mining has never been done cleanly anywhere in the world without leaving a toxic waste dump should be a giant red flag. Why would we take that chance. It saddens us to think that there are people in this state that think this is a good idea. A few hundred mediocre paying jobs. Really – we're ready to pollute the Boundary Waters, of which there is no other place on the planet like it, for a few hundred jobs. This mining has NEVER been done without leaving toxic waste in river, streams and lakes EVER. We sure hope Minnesota is smart about this and tells PolyMet no. As life-long residents and hoping to stay that way, we would be sad to see this state go down into a dump full of toxic waste. Judi and John Vitek North Branch, Minnesota

Judi Mikolai 45123

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: After reviewing the PolyMet proposal and attending the St Paul comment meeting, I have serious reservations about PolyMet mining in northern MN. There are numerous problems I see. Anyone who has a basement in MN can testify how difficult it is to not have water find its way where it is not wanted. You simply cannot contain water. It seeps into the smallest crack and follows the path of least resistance. Until we have the technology to truly contain water, we cannot produce contaminated waters that endanger our ecosystems, groundwater and surface waters. There is a lot of blind faith and wishful thinking going on with the PolyMet proposal. While we all would like to rely upon such empty hopes, we have to be realistic. When other mines show they can run a clean operation, then, let's consider it for MN, too. PolyMet should have to show proof that the mining can be done without contaminating the site the minerals are, the millions of gallons of water that would have to be used to extract the target products, and the storage ponds that would be used to try to hold the water until it can be cleaned. Other mining sites where the same processes are used are described as a "moon-scape." We love to go to northern MN. We love to camp, canoe and recreate in the quiet and beauty of the wilderness. But, I have to say, if the wilderness WERE to be damaged, we would not be visiting there like we do now. The landscape is anything but a barren wasteland now. The solitude, the extensive forests, the potable lake water, the rugged topography draw us in. If there water were contaminated, if the trees were removed, the land leveled, the wildlife harmed, or the silence replaced by the noise of a 24x7 industrial mining operation, we would look for an alternative site. And it is senseless to mine in northern MN now anyway. From what I understand, there is a surplus of copper and some other substances that are to be mined by PolyMet in Northern MN. The company would greatly, because of the high prices they could get for the minerals and metals, but the price of MN's wilderness is too high a price. The company is not even MN-based - most of the money would follow the company. There would be some taxes paid to MN, but the profits would go to another country. There would be some local jobs, but are the locals going to land the jobs. Miners jobs aren't unskilled labor as they used to be; unless the But, even so, the cost to MN is too great. We can't afford to sacrifice our water. We have to make hard choices and not be lured by money when it has irreconcilable costs. We cannot replace wilderness; we can recover ground, but not water. Where do we find a new source of water. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judi Mikolai 2080 Long Lake Road New Brighton, MN 55112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi Mikolai

45145

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: After reviewing the PolyMet proposal and attending the St Paul comment meeting, I have serious reservations about PolyMet mining in northern MN. There are numerous problems I see. Anyone who has a basement in MN can testify how difficult it is to not have water find its way where it is not wanted. You simply cannot contain water. It seeps into the smallest crack and follows the path of least resistance. Until we have the technology to truly contain water, we cannot produce contaminated waters that endanger our ecosystems, groundwater and surface waters. There is a lot of blind faith and wishful thinking going on with the PolyMet proposal. While we all would like to rely upon such empty hopes, we have to be realistic. When other mines show they can run a clean operation, then, let's consider it for MN, too. PolyMet should have to show proof that the mining can be done without contaminating the site the minerals are, the millions of gallons of water that would have to be used to extract the target products, and the storage ponds that would be used to try to hold the water until it can be cleaned. Other mining sites where the same processes are used are described as a "moon-escape." We love to go to northern MN. We love to camp, canoe and recreate in the quiet and beauty of the wilderness. But, I have to say, if the wilderness WERE to be damaged, we would not be visiting there like we do now. The landscape is anything but a barren wasteland now. The solitude, the extensive forests, the potable lake water, the rugged topography draw us in. If there water were contaminated, if the trees were removed, the land leveled, the wildlife harmed, or the silence replaced by the noise of a 24x7 industrial mining operation, we would look for an alternative site. And it is senseless to mine in northern MN now anyway. From what I understand, there is a surplus of copper and some other substances that are to be mined by PolyMet in Northern MN. The company would greatly, because of the high prices they could get for the minerals and metals, but the price of MN's wilderness is too high a price. The company is not even MN-based - most of the money would follow the company. There would be some taxes paid to MN, but the profits would go to another country. There would be some local jobs, but are the locals going to land the jobs. Miners jobs aren't unskilled labor as they used to be; unless the But, even so, the cost to MN is too great. We can't afford to sacrifice our water. We have to make hard choices and not be lured by money when it has irreconcilable costs. We cannot replace wilderness; we can recover ground, but not water. Where do we find a new source of water. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judi Mikolai 2080 Long Lake Road New Brighton, MN 55112

Judi Poulson

10027

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judi Poulson 1881 Knollwood Drive Fairmont, MN 56031

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi Poulson

18769

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judi Poulson 1881 Knollwood Drive Fairmont, MN 56031

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi Poulson

41304

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi Poulson

41665

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judi Poulson

50843

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judi Poulson 1881 Knollwood Drive Fairmont, MN 56031

Judie Carlson

57949

There is already evidence that privately held land is being destroyed and the owners are suffering the effects of the noise and pollution. This is appalling. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Judith Derauf

54673

See attachment

57966

I believe that water--clean water--is our greatest resource in Minnesota. The value of water will only increase with time. To squander this resource for future generations by contamination now is shortsighted! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Haglund

40372

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Judith Haglund 935 N. Beneva Rd Sarasota, FL 34232 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Krause

16077

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Judith M Swenson

54703

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Martell

15778

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

21475

thank you. I would appreciate more information on what PolyMet is saying to justify even thinking of opening a mine here. From: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 7:03 PM To: HYPERLINK "mailto:jlee41@q-com"Judith Martell Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avaSt Antivirus protection is active.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Moe 25483

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The only thing more precious than water on this planet, is our children. If we risk our water with acid mining, some may find considerable profit, buy Things for our children one day, as the water of the planet becomes more and more polluted, irreversibly, and we stand there and think, we were sure this wouldn't happen, what will our children drink. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Judith Moe PO Box 12141 Omaha, NE 68112-0141

Judith Pryor 54825

See attachment

JUDITH SANDSTROM 16198

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Schiller

17072

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judith Schiller 16747 N Mitchell Lake Road Fifty Lakes, MN 56448

50342

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judith Schiller 16747 N Mitchell Lake Road Fifty Lakes, MN 56448

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Screaton

39556

Judith Screaton 2474 Oakgreen Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082 651-439-7860 [HYPERLINK "mailto:rjscreaton@gmail-com"rjscreaton@gmail-com](mailto:rjscreaton@gmail-com) Dear Ms Fay, There are still so many unanswered questions about the PolyMet Mining proposal that I believe it can not go forward without significantly more questions being answered. 1- How is it possible to sacrifice many, many acres of precious National forest for a commercial venture of questionable benefit to Minnesotans. 2- How many of the 350 proposed jobs would be filled by local residents rather than specialists brought in to run the mine. 3- What has been proposed by the mining company to control pollution in the area. Who would pay for the cleanup. 4- Is it significant that this mining company has NEVER operated a mine before, is run by a foreign company and financed by another foreign company. How is it possible to hold them responsible for the massive pollution that will result from their venture. 5- Safe unpolluted water is one of the most valuable resources we have in Minnesota. We must preserve this important resource, or it will quickly disappear. 6- Other departments of the DNR have recently been cited for not being good guardians of our water supply. Wouldn't it be odd for part of the DNR to work on preserving our water, while another part of the DNR is complicit in possibly creating massive pollution. 7- How many tourists will this displace, and what would be the effect of massive pollution on our tourist industry. I am anxious to hear from you, Sincerely, Judith Screaton

Judith Straub

10086

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judith Straub 6221 Idylwood Lane Edina, MN 55436

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Straub

18828

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judith Straub 6221 Idylwood Lane Edina, MN 55436

50902

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judith Straub 6221 Idylwood Lane Edina, MN 55436

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judith Sweno 42685

See attachment

Judith Weir 41849

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Judith Weir St Paul, Minnesota

Judith Zetting 29956

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm a 77 year resident of two GREAT LAKES STATES and I would like the GREAT LAKES to CONTINUE TO EXIST till the end of the world. I do not want to see Lake Superior, Lake Michigan or any of the others to dru up, become a sewer, or a blight on this earth. THIS GREED to squeeze any and all of anything from the world around us HAS TO STOP, OR THERE WILL BE NOTHING LEFT Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Judith Zetting 6229 W Villa Ln Brown Deer, WI 53223-3454

Judy Ament 16668

I would like to go on record Not to allow this for the sake of preserving the water resources I have been reading pro's and con's- it would be a short term benefit but there are too many concerns for the long term survival and preservation of water. Judy Ament 804 Chestnut Ct St Cloud MN 56303

Judy Baxter 45412

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am really seriously concerned about the quality of the analysis of impacts of the mine in the PolyMet SDEIS. How can you propose destroying 900+ acres of irreplaceable wetlands and damaging 7000 without looking into alternatives. These wetlands protect and maintain the area waters, and replacements outside the watershed will not do. Fish in the area already contaminated with mercury so that consumption warnings are issued. Adding more sulfide mining pollutants will make this worse, and is unacceptable. The idea of putting tailings and waste heaps in an unlined tailings basin, designed in the 1950's on top of streams IN ORDER TO LEAK, is totally ridiculous. This is an example of cavalier disregard for preventing or reducing pollution. Of course it would leak acid,sulfate, and toxic metal processing waste. They say for 500 years. Are we supposed to believe that they will mitigate that for so many years after the mine closes. I can't. This SDEIS is totally inadequate - please reject it and deny the permit to mine or a Section 40 wetlands permit. Sincerely, Judy Baxter 1425 W 28th St, Apt. 301 Minneapolis, MN 55408 6128715125

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Bjork

44579

---Original Message--- From: Richards, Jess (DNR) Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 8:32 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: FW: PolyMet mine ---Original Message--- From: *Commissioner (DNR) Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 5:54 PM To: Richards, Jess (DNR) Cc: Hunt, Debbie (DNR) Subject: FW: PolyMet mine FYI ---Original Message--- From: Doug Bjork [mailto:bjork2@comcast.net] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 5:04 PM To: *Commissioner (DNR) Subject: PolyMet mine Dear Mr Landwehr, We hope you will do whatever you can (which is considerable we're sure) to prevent PolyMet from soiling northeast Minnesota (or anywhere) with their open pit copper/nickel mining. Having been to the BWCA we fear for its well being if this company should be allowed to operate. Up North is a destination we've been to often and had hoped to return to. We realize the issue of jobs has been put forth as a reason to operate this mine but we believe that PolyMet will do more to diminish, rather than enhance the overall quality of life for the people in this area. Minnesota deserves the best Sincerely, Judy and Doug Bjork Pam Christoferson

Judy Busse

47493

There are two critical reasons why my husband and I are opposed to giving PolyMet what it wants: first, there is no way PolyMet can assure citizens there won't be grave environmental consequences somewhere down the line and while there might be some jobs created for a time, that number could pale in comparison to damage done to people as well as to the land; second, if we don't want PolyMet's project we don't have any reason to want them to receive financial assistance on any level. Sincerely, Judy and David Busse 110 Bank St S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55414

Judy Dickerson

16794

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Judy Dickerson 15641 Dunberry Way Apple Valley, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Dickerson

50140

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Judy Dickerson 15641 Dunberry Way Apple Valley, MN 55124

Judy Galbraith

9558

To: MN DNR From: Judy Galbraith 832 Meadow Lane So Golden Valley, MN 55416 I am writing to express my complete opposition to the proposed PolyMet Mine. This mine will pollute not only Minnesota waters, but the relatively pristine waters of Lake Superior. It would also destroy 900 acres (or more) of wetlands with toxic contamination. There's no way PolyMet can contain or effectively treat contaminated water, which would remain polluted for hundreds of years. Anything they claim to the contrary is defied by past mining records and disasters. They are about one thing and one thing only, and that's making money with little regard to the environment (and the animals and people who depend on it for survival). In addition, the PolyMet mine would have a serious long term negative impact on a large part of the Superior National Forest which is the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. This area attracts many tourists and residents who value their beauty and environment they live in. Are a few thousand temporary jobs really worth the destruction of one of Minnesota's most valuable natural resources — our clean water and beautiful wilderness. The logical and common sense answer is no. Arguments have been made that we need more and more copper, nickel and mercury. But the absolute truth is that with more comprehensive recycling efforts the demand for these minerals would seriously diminish. Also, many jobs could be created if we developed more recycling programs Please deny any and all permits for this proposed mine. Sincerely, Judy Galbraith

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Galbraith

16263

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

40732

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The short-term job gains are not worth the long-term and permanent environmental damage this mine would cause. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Judy Galbraith 832 Meadow Ln S Golden Valley, MN 55416-3419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Gribbin 31877

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest WE ALREADY HAVE POLLUTION IN THE GREAT LAKES WHY WOULD WE ADD TO IT BY ALLOWING THE POLYMET'S MINE COMPANY TO OPEN AND DIG A MINE NEXT TO THE PROTECTED AREAS AROUND SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, AND HAVE THEIR DRAINAGE TO FLOW INTO THE SMALL STREAMS THAT LEAD INTO BIGGER AND BIGGER STREAMS AND INTO OUR GREAT LAKES AND THEN TO OUR WHOLE WATER SYSTEMS THAT LEADS TO OHIO AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHEDS THEN DOWN TO THE GULF AND OUT TO THE ATLANTIC. THIS IS UNPRODUCTIVE THINKING. THERE IS ALREADY TOO MUCH CONTAMINATION IN THE SEAS. PLEASE RE THINK WHAT YOU ARE DOING ALONG THESE SAVED AREAS AND HAVE SOME THOUGHT TO OUR WILD AREAS AND OUR ANIMALS IN THESE FORESTS THAT HAVE NOWHERE ELSE TO GO, AND CAUSE HAVOC IN THE SMALL CITIES AND FARM AREAS, THEN THEY BECOME PESTS IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS, AND HAVE TO BE RELOCATED, BUT SEEM TO RETURN TO THE AREAS THAT THEY WERE BORN INTO. THIS ALSO COSTS OUR TAXPAYERS TO PAY MORE IN TAXES. THIS IS A ROUND ROBIN THOUGHT. STOP AND THINK THIS OVER AGAIN DO WE NEED THIS HEADACHE . THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. Sincerely, Judy Gribbin 820 N Main St Niles, OH 44446-5139 (330) 978-9969

Judy Helgen 48157

See attachment

54794

See attachment

54858

See attachment

Judy Kreag 47536

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: March 8, 2014 To: Waterlegacy-org re: PolyMet Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Douglas W. Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney, US Forest Services From: Judy Kreag, Citizen of MN and USA Re: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS I sometimes feel that as just one citizen I have little power to make a difference, but when it comes to the water that my children and grandchildren will be drinking I need to speak out. This is big. Polymet's open-pit sulfide mine plan should be rejected for many reasons but the biggest is that it will pollute the largest freshwater lake in the world, possibly forever. The company has no concrete plan that will make my statement false. It may bring a few jobs to the area for a few decades but will leave us an unheard of problem for anywhere from 300-500 years or more. I live in Duluth. I drink Lake Superior water. My daughter and grandchildren do too. We all deserve clean, fresh water. This earth is all we have When the water is no longer drinkable, then what. I read the news with sadness. Many accidents pollute the earth, water and other resources and those large companies that cause it do not take responsibility to correct it. Who suffers. The people close by and in many cases others who are not even that close. I am close by this project and I do not want it to be approved. I hope you will listen to the people who would be the ones to suffer. Life on this planet is not all about money. It is able integrity, compassion, love and care for our earth, the only home we have Thank you for listening. Judy Kreag 5127 Wyoming St Duluth, MN 55804 Judy Kreag 5127 Wyoming St Duluth, MN 55804 218-525-0630

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Lane

38437

Mar 6, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. There are too many variables involved. At what cost are you willing to pay with Minnesota lives to have PolyMet in Minnesota. I feel money being the ultimate player here. This is not Vegas, where if Minnesotans lose, they can just walk away as PolyMet would do if they did not get their money from investments. Will they invest in CLEAN-UP AND RECOVERY PROGRAMS should they arise. Why is it greed that drives every gold-digger (in example) to our state. Our natural resources is the crown jewel we have Not those in the ground you cannot see, but the hills, the forest, the lakes, the forest animals, but mostly the people who make this state great. But others love it to death and will not be happy until MN is dead and void. No reason to come back. Use us up and spit us out. For what .for a mine. Think about the responsibility you have Department of Natural Resources. Not to exploit but to hold for generations to come. To be enjoyed, not by corporate greed, but by those who can appreciate Minnesota's beauty. Have you been to one of their mines. Go and see what they do. Talk to the people. Is PolyMet a good neighbor. Many corporations ARE NOT. They strip the land and contaminate the water. But the people want to have a job, so they say nothing. Department of Interior , BLM , is selling out to corporate greed in the Western states for mining, big oil, welfare ranching, all in the name of progress, and is exterminating the Wild Horses and Burros from the land. Then there became a law to protect them and now the law cannot even protect them. Don't let that happen to Minnesota. Become informed. Sincerely, Mrs Judy Lane 2400 Timberidge Ln SE Rochester, MN 55904-8601

Judy Nordeen

42203

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Judy Nordeen 303 Scott St Ukiah, CA 95482-4319 (707) 367-1465

Judy Ostendorff

54747

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Judy Urban 28951

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. My family has fond memories of many camping trips to the Boundary Waters area. To think that our state is willing to irrevocably change the pristine nature of this very special area for the benefit of a multinational corporation whose only goal is profits is unconscionable. No government entity has the right to make decisions that would negatively affect the health, and economic well-being of people for the next 500 years. Do not approve this threat to our state's greatest natural asset. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Judy Urban 1007 Cliff Rd Eagan, MN 55123-1908 (651) 454-3834

Judy Young 52182

To whom it may concern, I am concerned: we do not have sufficient information to guarantee environmental protections to land and water safety for wildlife and people. I lived twelve years on the Range and I also vacation many times a year near Ely. Before allowing consideration of mining proposals, I urge decision makers to be certain that the following clean water and environmental protection principles can be guaranteed: 1- BWCAW waters remain safe and clean; potential impact on health and safety of residents and visitors be studied. 2- Strong safeguards are in place in the event anything goes wrong – for centuries in the future. 3- Mining companies must leave the site maintenance free (in accordance with existing MN mining rules) I strongly urge careful scrutiny of proposals that have the potential to disturb and/or pollute the BWCAW; to disturb habitat for deer, wolves and other mammals and birds; to disturb the fishing climate of anglers of all ages and species. This eco climate and geography is precious to the well-being of future generations; wilderness cannot be replaced with museums of what used to be. Judy Young 6711 Lake Shore Drive S. #503 Richfield, MN 55423 612-821-3789 A

Jukka Kukkonen 863

I just wanted to bring your attention to a story of the Talvivaara mine in Finland that can be used as an example what we can expect to happen here in Minnesota with PolyMet. The Talvivaara mine was opened in Finland in 2008- It turned out to be an environmental disaster and the company is now facing bankruptcy. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talvivaara_Mining_Company It is pretty easy to make a comparison between these projects. Nickel mining, similar climate, etc The environmental disaster was caused by waste water and treatment pond leaks in 2012 and 2013- When we think about the heavy downpours and flooding that Duluth experienced last summer, there is no (financially sustainable) way to build levies that could handle that kind of extra stress. Jukka Kukkonen Highland Park, St Paul

Julaine Heit 20162

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate. It does not provide any reassurance that this mining will not result in irreparable harm to the environment in Northern Minnesota. Polymet's proposed mine threatens our clean water and public health. Please do not allow this to proceed. Julaine Heit 5205 Upton Ave S Mpls, MN 55410

Julia Billmeier 18268

My name is Julia Billmeier. I am 11. I think that they shouldn't mine because it -- because there is a very, very high risk. 20 years of mining is not worth 500 years of cleaning up and 500 years of nobody being able to use it or have fun or do anything there. And I'm only 11 and I only went there a couple of times and I want to go there a lot more times, and I think if they mine, I won't be able to. Please, please, please do not mine because then it won't be wild anymore.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julia Hupperts

20132

Feb 27, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Do not allow this sulfide mining in Minnesota. I do not want even the slim possibility of our great state's water being polluted. Please think of future Minnesotans and keep this mining out of Minnesota. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Julia Hupperts 7 Sunset Ln Saint Paul, MN 55127-6455

49595

Feb 27, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Do not allow this sulfide mining in Minnesota. I do not want even the slim possibility of our great state's water being polluted. Please think of future Minnesotans and keep this mining out of Minnesota. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Julia Hupperts 7 Sunset Ln Saint Paul, MN 55127-6455

Julia Kleppin

23409

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is clearly a threat to the water quality and environmental status of large natural areas PLUS Lake Superior. Open pit mining is the most environmentally destructive form of mining and considering that this impacts a large part of a NATIONAL PARK, how can any such permission be given to this project. Also, what is Polymet's history in care of the environment. What will the company be charged for this privilege to destroy a large tourist attraction and public water supply. Who could allow such destruction. It's pure madness - or bribery. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have huge concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This project is so harmful to our state. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not at all in the public interest. Sincerely, Julia Kleppin 7038 N Lincolnshire Cir Milwaukee, WI 53223-6343

Julia Kloehn

47429

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a student, I am very concerned about the future environmental and public health of our state. The Polymet mine would reach the end of its useful life within my lifetime, and I think it's unfair that my generation as well as many generations to come would have to suffer the negative consequences of sulfide mining. Minnesota has a lot to lose in terms of precious cultural and natural resources, and it is not in the interest of the people in our state to make such a sacrifice. It's seen over and over again that even when people assure/expect systems to work, systems fail, and when considering the pristine natural resources of our state, this isn't a risk we should be willing to take. Finally, I don't believe it is morally right to destroy irreplaceable natural beauty, clean water, wild rice areas, and animal habitat for the sake of temporary profits. Nor can it be economically right either - taxpayer funded cleanup for hundreds of years is just as shortsighted. Please maintain our state's vital natural resources for my generation and generations to come. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Julia Kloehn 4036 Xerxes Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1146 (612) 926-9968

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julia Kloehn

48585

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a student, I am very concerned about the future environmental and public health of our state. The Polymet mine would reach the end of its useful life within my lifetime, and I think it's unfair that my generation as well as many generations to come would have to suffer the negative consequences of sulfide mining. Minnesota has a lot to lose in terms of precious cultural and natural resources, and it is not in the interest of the people in our state to make such a sacrifice. It's seen over and over again that even when people assure/expect systems to work, systems fail, and when considering the pristine natural resources of our state, this isn't a risk we should be willing to take. Finally, I don't believe it is morally right to destroy irreplaceable natural beauty, clean water, wild rice areas, and animal habitat for the sake of temporary profits. Nor can it be economically right either - taxpayer funded cleanup for hundreds of years is just as shortsighted. Please maintain our state's vital natural resources for my generation and generations to come. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Julia Kloehn 4036 Xerxes Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1146 (612) 926-9968

Julia Nelson

41455

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I'm concerned about several things with the PolyMet mine. Too many to list in a single comment, as far as I can see. So I'm picking a couple of the major ones. My overall concerns is with the possible contamination of the groundwater and what that means. There are several parts to this. 1- The tailings are destined for unlined pits, including using an existing pit that is known to leak. That doesn't just create the possibility of leaking, it essentially guarantees it. 2- This is the part of the drainage into Lake Superior. The Great Lakes represent 20% of the fresh water in the world. Not the US or even North America, the world. All of the projections are that water is going to be a precious resource this century and probably after. Taking any sort of chance on contaminating that large and important a resource is frankly insane. While the Great Lakes are large, poison is poison and there are already sources dumping in there. Don't add to it. The importance of the cumulative effect should be considered. 3- Effects on the local biota is also a concern. There has been a recent study (University of MN at Duluth was involved) that shows even low levels of sulfides have a notable and long-term effect on wild rice. There is no reason to think that would be the only effect, and even that is going to affect the living and the finances of the population in the arrowhead region. Plus any effects on the wildlife. 4- Climate change is happening. Even aside from the cause, it's happening and there is going to be continuing change through the century and beyond. One of the predicted effects is a greater frequency of severe rains. The SDEIS does not address this, despite the fairly recent experience in the Duluth area, which is clearly not far away. My preference is to simply not allow the mine. I don't see enough potential advantages to offset the risks. But at a minimum the final EIS should address A. The effects and mitigation of heavy rainfall (of at least the 100-year severity), including having something of that intensity at least on a decadal basis. B. Better control in any case of the tailings and drainage from them. Line the pits, start the reverse osmosis immediately, and impose a significant fine if the standards are not met. Sincerely Julia Nelson Julia Nelson 812 Queen Av N Minneapolis, MN 55411 612 588 8910

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julian Sellers

43024

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: This comment pertains to the effects the proposed NorthMet mine would have on two avian species: northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) and Boreal Owl (*Aegolius funereus*). The habitat requirements of these two species are similar, and the proposed mine would affect them similarly. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the status and outlook for these species in Minnesota. Section 4-2-5-1-2, Species of Greatest Conservation Need, of the SDEIS contains the following: Mature upland and lowland forest is the most common habitat type at the NorthMet Project area (primarily at the Mine Site). Section 4-2-4 provides a more detailed discussion of vegetation cover and habitat types. Northern goshawk, spruce grouse, black-backed woodpecker, and boreal owl were observed in these forests (ENSR 2005). These species represent a group that generally requires large forested blocks and/or minimal human intrusion. Section 4-2-5-1-3, Regional Forester Sensitive Species, misstates the status of northern goshawk and boreal owl in Minnesota. That section states: Four of these RFSS species are state-listed ETSC species (ie, gray wolf, bald eagle, wood turtle, and eastern heather vole) and are discussed above. Seven other species are on the SGCN list and are discussed by habitat type in Table 4-2-5-1- These species include the boreal owl (*Aegolias [sic] funereus*), . And: The northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) is not federally or state-listed. In fact, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources added both species to the list of Special Concern species in August, 2013- The Minnesota DNR defines Special Concern species, in part, as follows: A species is considered a species of special concern if, although the species is not endangered or threatened, it is extremely uncommon in Minnesota, or has unique or highly specific habitat requirements and deserves careful monitoring of its status. Both the northern goshawk and the boreal owl meet this definition. In fact, when the DNR proposed this listing, Audubon Minnesota objected, stating that both species should be listed as Threatened rather than Special Concern. Here is Audubon Minnesota's justification for the Threatened status of both species: Northern Goshawk – Audubon Minnesota believes that the Northern Goshawk should be listed as Threatened. Listing this species on the Special Concern list, as proposed by the DNR, does not properly reflect the current status of this bird and will not provide an appropriate degree of protection to ensure its future in the state. As noted on the Species Status Sheet, there has been an average of only 29 territories found in MN annually in the recent past, in spite of intensive surveys by the DNR and the US Forest Service. Additionally, as the SONAR shows, the Minnesota population has lower productivity than found in populations in other parts of the country. While we recognize that the species habitat needs are not fully understood in this part of North America, there is strong evidence suggesting that large patches of mature forests are very important to the Northern Goshawk. This habitat is currently in decline in Minnesota, and recent land management decisions are likely to exacerbate this slide. There are no plans to increase this habitat type in the future. Boreal Owl – Audubon Minnesota believes that the Boreal Owl should be listed as Threatened. The proposal by the DNR to list this species as Special Concern does not adequately address the needs of this species in the State nor ensure its survival. It is reasonable to believe that this species has never occurred in high numbers in the State, and the decline in numbers over the past decade indicates that the population is in danger

Juliana Day

42047

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Juliana Day st louis park, Minnesota

Julie & Brigg Backer

33924

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, It's not worth the risk for 360 jobs. Sincerely, Julie and Brigg Backer 5336 Ewing Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-2011

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie A. Vennewitz

43952

As a lifelong Minnesota resident, I do not support the copper mining proposal. The negative environmental impact will long outlast the temporary boost to the economy. It threatens to do permanent damage to Minnesota's recreation and tourism industries. Recreation and tourism could continue to provide jobs for decades to come, much longer than the proposed mining jobs. If the project causes long-lasting damage to our natural resources, especially our water, the tourism and recreation industries could be destroyed. As we have seen in the past, companies come and go, and the promises a company makes disappear when it goes out of business or changes ownership. In the meantime the state, its people and wildlife will suffer the consequences for decades or even centuries to come. Julie Vennewitz Sent from my iPad

Julie Anderson

40367

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Cahoy

39689

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement(SDEIS). In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. My first concern would be the details of the proposed water treatment systems, specifically is there a system that has been tested that is capable of handling six million gallons a day. Have they tested the systems, how about a back up system, if they have to switch to a back up, can it handle six million gallons a day. How long will the system last, and what are the plans to replace it at regular intervals. What are the contingency plans for mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, and failures of water collection and treatment systems My second concern is how this water treatment system is going to be paid for, and maintained and monitored for up to five centuries. The mining industry is responsible for the largest and cost costly environmental clean-ups in our nation. I would expect at a minimum Minnesota taxpayers are protected. What are the financial safeguards that are proposed. What happens when the company goes out of business, either bankrupt or closed because its useful life has ended. Are they putting up earnest money, if so what percent of the typical cleanup are they putting up, who is going to manage the funds and safeguard them for the general public. Are they buying insurance policies, if so how do we know they will be around in 100 or 200 years. What is being proposed could potentially and negatively effect one of Minnesota's most precious resources, water. Please do not jeopardize Minnesota's water resource in exchange for a short term profit of copper, nickel and other metals unless water is protected for all Minnesotans for 500 years and beyond. Respectfully, Julie Cahoy 16501 30th Ave North Plymouth, MN 55447
HYPERLINK "mailto:jacahoy@hotmail-com"jacahoy@hotmail-com

Julie Greenwood

16265

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Howard

40723

Dear Lisa Fay, I am strongly opposed to the copper, nickel, paladium, and gold mines propped by Twin Metals and Polymet that would be located south and west of Ely, Minnesota. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is America's most visited wilderness area and one of the oldest designated wilderness areas in the nation. Despite what proponents of the copper-nickel mines say, creating new mines within 50 miles of Ely would be extremely detrimental to our local economy. The mines will not only be an eyesore, they will also increase rail and truck traffic, which would negatively affect tourism in the area. The noise from drilling and moving material destroys the wilderness experience on the southern end of the Wilderness area near Spruce Road and Birch Lake. Most importantly, there is no evidence that our most precious resource, the interconnected system of pristine waterways, will adequately be protected. Acid mine drainage in our waters is unacceptable. Sulfide-bearing rock brought to the surface will turn into sulfuric acid and leach into our waterways, resulting in irreparable damage to our biotic community. **DO NOT ALLOW ANY HARD ROCK MINING WITHIN 50 MILES OF ELY MINNESOTA.** Thank you for your time. - Julie Howard Native Fisheries Biologist Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Moab Field Station 1165 S Hwy 191 Suite 4 Moab, UT 84532 [HYPERLINK "mailto:juliehoward@utah-gov"](mailto:juliehoward@utah-gov) juliehoward@utah-gov 435-259-3781 (office) 435-630-1066 (cell)

JULIE HURLBUT

41054

Greetings, It has come to my attention that use of land in northern Minnesota is being considered for the Polymet sulfide mine. I have done my best to educate myself on the issue, being a person who spends nearly all of my vacation time in the far north of the state. The land there is a true treasure for the whole nation. No price can be put on the resources of beauty, serenity, renewal and unspoiled land that is offered in the currently protected areas. We know from so many sources that mining is a dirty, dangerous and negatively transforming activity, that the cost of clean up is high and the time for ecosystems to return to a healthy state is quite long .and sometimes they don't recover completely ever. There is too much at stake to allow Polymet to despoil the land and water of Minnesota. Many people are dependent on well water in the proposed area, and if, as in many other parts of the nation, the wells become toxic, how will they ever be restored. What will the people do. There are some things at this point in history that are too valuable to be jeopardized. Water is one of them. We stand at a point in history where even in this nation there quite likely will be unrest over the issue of water. California, Nevada and other places are coming up against severe shortages and where will they look for additional water. To the aquifers and the Great Lakes, that's where. As water is shared more and more, the need for clean ground water becomes greater and greater. We simply cannot take a chance on the water resources of the northern Minnesota wells. It seems in every quarter, the most basic requirements for human health, clean water and clean air, are being sacrificed in the name of profit and a relatively small number of jobs. When will we begin to take seriously the needs of future generations for these resources. What's the sense of having a job if it means ravaging and polluting the environment which in term leads to the damaging of your children's and your grandchildren's health. Please, please have the decency and courage to stand up for the health of the people and the resources entrusted to you of the beautiful state of Minnesota. Sincerely, Julie Hurlbut 2433 Davisson Street River Grove, Il. 60171 [HYPERLINK "mailto:JULS60171@yahoo.cpom"](mailto:JULS60171@yahoo.cpom) JULS60171@yahoo.cpom

Julie Jeatran

38729

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am asking that you reject the exchange of Superior National Forest land that would allow PolyMet to move forward with its proposed open-pit mine for the following reasons: 1) It would conflict with the forest plan for the Superior National Forest which is your primary responsibility and my and my family's heritage to our children. 2) It would violate Federal statutes and laws to create a windfall of profits for a private company, while causing harm to the resources and wildlife in the area. You cannot put a price on this land. 3) The people who are being affected should have a say in over 6,000 acres being given away and traded for what parcels of land. Will they be accessible to us, useable by us for recreation, hunting and fishing, as valuable as what is being traded away, etc. 4) A separate environmental impact statement by law needs to be done investigating the impacts of this exchange. I have the right to see this and comment on it. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Julie A. Jeatran Julie Jeatran 2121 E. Third Street, #1 Duluth, MN 55812 218-525-4595

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Jeatran 38738

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Sir/Madam: After researching and studying Polymet's SDEIS, I ask that you reject it as inadequate and INACCURATE. The PolyMet SDEIS is an expensive boilerplate document full of fake science. It's size is daunting but it does not deceive if you just consider the following: 1) An independent geological study shows fault lines directly below the (unlined) tailings basins. This means that the amount of seepage that PolyMet estimates has to be inaccurate. I would like to see more studies about this. 2) No studies have been done on the impact of arsenic, mercury, nor asbestos-like fibers that will be a by-product of this open-pit mine on human or animal health. Already endangered moose populate this area. 3) It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution our Northland's most precious resource: WATER. What are the mine's effects on drinking water, surrounding wetlands and/or the rivers and streams we love to fish from (not to mention the contamination of the fish we then eat from them).. 4) Stating that pollution from the mine would need to be treated for 500+ years and saying that they would responsibly do this is pure science fiction. Where would the money come from and where are the guarantees. We can be more creative. There is more copper in our landfills ('mining' which would use much less energy and produce much less waste) than that which is estimated in this mine. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and concerns. Again I ask that you reject PolyMet's SDEIS. Sincerely, Julie A. Jeatran 2121 E. Third Street, #1 Duluth, MN 55812 218-525-4595 Julie Jeatran 2121 E. Third Street, #1 Duluth, MN 55812 218-525-4595

Julie Klassen 58006

Wild Rice, fish, & all living creatures need clean water not polluted water from the mine for 500 years. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Julie Lochowski-Haney 47223

Mar 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. PolyMet's study of the impact of their proposed mine states that water from the mine site will need at least 500 years of treatment. 500 years ago - the year 1514 - Henry the Eighth was King of England. What sane person would believe that a modern company could provide 500 years of protection for Minnesota's waters. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Julie Lochowski-Haney 1384 Sargent Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2327 (651) 291-0482

48568

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. PolyMet's study of the impact of their proposed mine states that water from the mine site will need at least 500 years of treatment. 500 years ago - the year 1514 - Henry the Eighth was King of England. What sane person would believe that a modern company could provide 500 years of protection for Minnesota's waters. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Julie Lochowski-Haney 1384 Sargent Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2327 (651) 291-0482

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie MacRae

16976

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Julie MacRae 18900 Rutledge Rd Deephaven, MN 55391

50262

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Julie MacRae 18900 Rutledge Rd Deephaven, MN 55391

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Nelson

39781

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Julie Nelson 240 5th St E Apt 308 Saint Paul, MN 55101-1873 (612) 824-2121

39782

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Julie Nelson 240 5th St E Apt 308 Saint Paul, MN 55101-1873 (612) 824-2121

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Nester

21381

TO: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us FROM: Julie Nester, 4800 Lyndale Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55419 HYPERLINK "mailto:jnester4800@msn-com"jnester4800@msn-com DATE: 2/23/14 RE: Comment on PolyMet sulfide mine SDEIS The PolyMet SDEIS has been shown to rely on an inaccurate water model and provides incomplete information about the health and environmental consequences of its proposed sulfide mine in Minnesota. I feel strongly that Minnesota DNR must require PolyMet to provide a plan that addresses the following: 1- Does the proposed mine plan keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. · The USEPA gave the proposed mine its lowest ranking: Environmentally Unsatisfactory and Inadequate. Polymet's SDEIS clearly shows that after 20 years, there will be three enormous pits up to 696 feet deep full of water polluted with sulfuric acid and toxic heavy metals. Treatment at the mine site will be required for a minimum of 200 years and at the plant site for a minimum of 500 years. Mine tailings will be added to an existing tailings basin that is currently leaking polluted water. I don't think there is anyone arguing that the mine will keep our water safe and clean. In fact, we will be responsible for polluting water for countless future generations. 2- Does the proposed mine plan put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. · There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin failure. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public knows if the company has the ability to respond to a crisis. Glencore, PolyMet's largest investor has a long history of environmental pollution. Tony Hayward, the former CEO of BP is the interim chairman of Glencore's board We must require PolyMet to disclose plans for dealing with environmental disasters on the scale of Glencore's and BP's past accidents. · The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates in the Lake Superior watershed. In the event of a likely accident, how would PolyMet prevent polluted water from reaching Lake Superior and the rest of the Great Lakes, which contain 20% of the Earth's fresh water. 3- Does the mine leave the site clean and maintenance free. · A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. How will PolyMet ensure and pay for pumping after the mine is closed. · A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. The SDEIS does not address in sufficient detail the amount of mercury and methylmercury released into the Embarrass River. 4- Does the mine plan protect Minnesota Taxpayers. · We cannot wait until the permitting process to answer this question. It is unfair to Minnesotans that this SDEIS does not address whether the financial assurance is adequate. Given the uncertainty of the amount of anticipated and unanticipated water pollution and the required treatment period, how will Polymet and the DNR protect taxpayers centuries into the future. The financial consequences of this project will outlive everyone, every mining company, and even every governmental institution we know today. The PolyMet SDEIS gives no details of the amount and type of damage deposit adequate to cover the cost of treating water for countless generations into the future. The consequences of our decisions on sulfide mining are guarant

Julie O'Leary

42934

Attached please find a comment on the NorthMet SDEIS Julie O'Leary 5128 Arnold Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Pavelich

40061

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Julie Pierce

18373

My name is Julie Pierce. I would yield my time to Pat Mullen.

Julie Sheehy

14812

As a resident of Ely, I certainly understand the need for good paying jobs. I feel that allowing this mine could potentially do such harm to our environment that it's not worth the risk. Especially given the fact that our water supply is already dwindling. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Stoltman-Kubes

16156

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Julie Tinberg

41902

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Julie Tinberg 6801 W 83rd Street Ter Bloomington, MN 55438-1240

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Julie Varichak

21406

To whom it may concern: I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I am a mine engineer with Cliffs Natural Resources and have experienced first-hand the environmental and safety regulations the State and Federal agencies have in place. It is my opinion that PolyMet will be held to the same high standard where the people and the environment will be protected. I find it irresponsible that people hold a double standard when it comes to mining and the minerals required to maintain the lifestyle we have ALL come to rely on. Developing these mineral resources in Minnesota, where we hold a high standard for safety and environmental behavior, ensures that the minerals are extracted responsibly. I support the thorough evaluation completed by numerous agencies, I attended many informational sessions throughout the process, and I support the decision to move forward with PolyMet. Thank you for your efforts in presenting a complete and thorough evaluation- Sincerely, Julie M. Varichak 13149 Watson Bay Rd Side Lake, MN 55781

Julie Viken

47654

I am writing to you with many concerns over the Polymet proposal. First is that the earth only has about .3% freshwater, and Lake Superior would be ruined by this mining. Second is that this proposal does not pose any money for after they mine, and that is very important. Look at WI and see why they restricted mining until they can prove they haven't ruined the environment for 20 years. Finally if this proposal is approved then other similar mining proposal would most likely be fast tracked and the next one would ruin the BWCA, one of the most visited natural areas in the world. Please turn back this idea that jobs are more important than the environment. Thanks, Julie Viken 1964 Prior Ave N Roseville MN 55113

Julie Weisbecker

39749

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Julie Weisbecker 1862 Walsh Ln Saint Paul, MN 55118-4242

Juliette Wilson

57887

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project. As long as PolyMet (or anyone) says "it's handled"--it isn't. When will we learn to stop making things worse, things that can never be mitigated even though in our hubris we think nothing will go wrong or if it does, it's fixable? Please don't let short-term views override long-term costs.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

June Peterson 41906

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs June Peterson 4300 W River Pkwy Apt 437 Minneapolis, MN 55406-3681

June Stewart 54806

See attachment

Juola (Joe) Haga 40858

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Justin Atkinson

16318

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Justin Dzelzkalns

23218

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I'm all for the development of our natural resources in safe, ethical ways. I have been enjoying the BWCA for years with my family and friends; it has incorporated itself into a large part of my self identity. Let's use our natural resources in a way that doesn't jeopardize an irreplaceable part of our national heritage. I understand that opening a new mine means new jobs and money, but the BWCA is already a large tourist draw and supports the local and state economy. There seems to be limited upside with significant potential downside; fiscally and ethically it doesn't seem like it's worth the risk. If mining must be done, then couldn't a pilot program be run in a less environmentally sensitive part of the state. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Justin Dzelzkalns 4866 N Rockwell St Apt 1w Chicago, IL 60625-2851

Justin Hager

42530

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Justin Halverson

39607

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Justin Halverson 701 Fulton St SE Minneapolis, MN 55455-0358 (952) 769-7860

Justin Hockensmith

6039

DNR, I am absolutely against the mining proposal. However, I understand the environmentalists against the project do not offer any alternative to job creations in the north woods. Fully expecting the short-term gratification of job creation, tax revenue, and company profits to silence the obvious negative impact sulfur mining has on the environment, I ask the DNR, state legislators, and the governor to impose extremely harsh financial penalties on PolyMet if, for whatever reason, environmental destruction occurs. Too many times companies involved in this industry get away with "slaps on the wrist" penalties or go to court with their slew of lawyers and gain unjust victories. I want PolyMet to put their money where their mouth is and allow massive financial penalties to occur if the mine does eventually leak sulfur into our state's waters. Justin Hockensmith Sent from my iPhone

Justin M Anderson

57253

As a union delegate organizing in Duluth, MN, I cannot support the proposed PolyMet project. Regardless of what the project may be, anything backed and primarily invested in by Glencore or any group involved in anti-union, anti-worker, anti-human rights should and must be opposed. No workforce, including here in the MN northland, should be subject to the exploitations of Polymet and this industry. Justin M. Anderson PO Box 3232 Duluth, MN 55803

Justine King

40339

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Justine King 444 East 75th Street #7C New York, FL 33433 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Justine Pliska

58136

I wish you comment that I think the mining of heavy metals in the state is bad for Minnesota. Despite good intentions, this action will pillage our fragile environment beyond repair. The negative impacts on human health through water and heavy metal toxins will cost much more than the short-term benefits the jobs will provide. The community throughout the state and adjuacent states will be negatively impacted if this project is allowed to continue.

K Helms

40442

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

K Smith

53557

Protect our water! Hooded Mergansers swim in northeastern Minnesota's pristine marshes, ponds, and rivers, feeding on fish, crayfish, frogs, and insects. PolyMet Corporation is proposing to destroy thousands of acres of pristine habitat to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St. Louis River - a major waterway that flows over 180 miles to Lake Superior. PolyMet's, a company with 0 years experience, proposal calls for 20 years of mining, and they acknowledge that 500 years of toxic runoff will need to be collected and treated. Please do the math. Just like the Hooded Merganser, our children and grandchildren all deserve clean water. Let clean water be our legacy - not toxic pollution from mining! Companies w/many more years of experience mining still walk away from mines they can't afford or don't know how to clean up!

Alphabetical by sender's first name

K Theiss

39871

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. *** As a teen, I first experienced the purity of the Boundary Waters and found out what a gorgeous heritage we share with Canada. My 6 children have also experienced this beauty We are native Minnesotans and do NOT want such mining and its negativity to ruin what we have helped preserve. Too many states give in to the temptation to ruin what nature strives to give us freely. My 4 grandchildren will soon be part of this big picture. There are other ways to create energy that do not destroy nature Clean, available water is obviously becoming a premium item let us PRESERVE it *** I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms K Theiss 2095 Mesabi Ave Saint Paul, MN 55109-1700

K Weller

29792

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Multinational corporation PolyMet is seeking permission for an open pit sulfide mine on National Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. If approved the mine will pollute Lake Superior, threaten our clean water and wildlands, and endanger public health for generations to come. A decision in favor of PolyMet's proposal would open a floodgate for more sulfide mining in a large area near Lake Superior and surrounding the Boundary Waters Wilderness - considered by some as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, K Weller 533 S 28th St Lafayette, IN 47904-3217

K. Cash Luck

39631

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. It is about time to ignore the dollar and protect our land. Cash Luck Sincerely, K. Cash Luck 6091 Fort Thunder Dr NE Remer, MN 56672-3056 (218) 566-2902

Alphabetical by sender's first name

K.M. Greenwood

15723

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kaare Melby

44984

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing you to ask you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. I am concerned that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine would damage the wild rice that naturally grows in the Partridge River watershed. My family has harvested and eaten wild rice as a large part of our diet for my entire life. This is a tradition and a way of life that I wish to pass on to my children, and a tradition that would be threatened by the water pollution caused by the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine. For this reason I ask you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. I am also concerned that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine would increase Methylmercury contamination of fish all the way to the St Louis River estuary resulting from mercury and sulfate pollution and impacts to wetlands. Fish is another important staple that I harvest as sustenance for my family. But if the fish become too contaminated with Methylmercury they will no longer be safe for my family to eat, and we would be forced to discontinue this tradition as well. This saddens me because the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine would threaten my ability to teach my children how to support themselves by fishing and harvesting wild rice. For this reason I ask you to reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. I am also concerned about the long-term cost of water treatment that will be left to the public at the rate of \$3,600,000 - \$6,000,000 per year for the next 200 – 500 years. This is a huge expense that should not be left to the public and future generations. Last month 59 groups in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan asked the United States Environmental Protection Agency to do a cumulative analysis of the effects of mining on the Lake Superior Basin. These 59 groups included Duluth businesses, non-profits, and faith groups, like Whole Foods Community Co-op Duluth, Institute for a Sustainable Future, Idle No More Duluth and Peace United Church of Christ Food, Energy and Environment Team. On January 6, Congress woman Betty McCollum sent a letter urging the EPA to use the funds provided by Congress to conduct an assessment and inform the citizens of the “generational consequences of sulfide mining to impacted ecosystems, human health and the basin’s tremendous water resource.” The PolyMet PSDEIS doesn’t study impacts that could affect mercury contamination of fish in the St Louis River estuary, let alone impacts to habitats and tribal resources in the region. A collative effects analysis of mining should be done before the PolyMet SDEIS gets finalized. That would permit us to know the consequences before opening up Minnesota’s Northeast to a sulfide mining district. The PolyMet SDEIS artificially limited cumulative effects discussion of water quality to just the Partridge and Embarrass Rivers. The St Louis River was left out completely. This cuts out anyone who fishes or eats fish caught downstream in the St Louis River or Lake Superior and ignores impacts on Fond du Lac tribal waters. It is not good science. The PolyMet project would increase mercury in the Embarrass River and could increase mercury methylation near the mine site as well. Increases in mercury or sulfates at PolyMet could increase mercury in fish in the St Louis River. Both existing LTV tailings seeps and other mine discharges flowing into the St Louis River also carry high levels of specific conductance, which the EPA has found can be toxic to fish. Tribal research shows that specific conductance is a water chemistry “signature” for mining discharge that can take more than 100 miles to dissipate. (SDEIS, Tribal CEA, pp. 16-17). Cumulative analysis of water quality impacts in the SDEIS must include the St Louis River and

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kacie Carlson

44179

Dear Fellow Leaders of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - I write to you not with scientific reasoning as to the numerous reasons why PolyMet's SDEIS is inadequate, but with demands for the DNR to uphold its mission, goals and responsibilities as it has been established to do so and as the leaders of this agency have been entrusted by the State of Minnesota. The DNR mission states, "The mission of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is to work with the citizens to conserve and manage the state's natural resources, to provide recreation opportunities and provide for commercial uses of natural resources in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life." I hope that the leaders of this PolyMet project recognize that that mission statement is more than a sentence. It is a mission that they are expected to uphold. A definition of "sustainable quality of life" is defined by "a life that can be continued given the natural and social resources available and not at the expense of an acceptable quality of life for current generations, future generations and other nations." To uphold this sustainability, Minnesota law requires that sulfide mines be maintenance free at closure. Leaders of the DNR, uphold your responsibility to create a sustainable quality of life and deny PolyMet's proposal to mine until they can ensure that the entire site be maintenance free at closure. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resource's Strategic Conservation Agenda stated that "Minnesota is predicted to grow by more than 1 million people in the next 20 years. With population growth and associated development come increasing demands on natural systems – our lakes and rivers, forests and grasslands, wetlands and shorelands." It continues to say, "Conservation-based approaches are imperative for creating sustainable developments that protect, restore, and enhance the natural environment – the foundation for long-term economic benefits and quality of life." Conservation-based approaches are imperative. I demand, again, that the current leaders of the DNR uphold their responsibility to carry out these agendas which have been established in the absence of a singular biased event such as this PolyMet proposal, go through numerous government and public layers of review and approval, and are created with purpose - purpose to be utilized and defended in situations like this. Defend the DNR, your, Strategic Conservation Agenda by not allowing vagueness and future uncertainties in PolyMet's promises to be conservation-focused. Leaders before you have done this and we future generations have been burdened with maintaining numerous Superfund sites. Have the leaders who will ultimately allow or deny this proposal intently studied those past projects, their permits and the reality of the aftermath. We have established cleanup initiatives, directed more tax-payer funding and put forth energy not assumed when those Superfund sites were permitted mining actions. Current leaders of the DNR, stop this cycle of history repeating itself for our future generations by denying PolyMet's proposal to mine until there is absolutely no vagueness or uncertainty, and that all possible situations and unexpected events have established procedure that maintain the responsibilities set forth under the original permitted actions. The Strategic Conservation Agenda also states, "Two-thirds of Minnesota's public water supply comes from groundwater. Demand for water is increasing faster than population growth is increasing. As demand grows, some communities are struggling to find adequate supplies of clean water. As testing proceeds, the number of impaired waters will increase and the challenge of restoring them while protecting our healthiest waters will become even greater." One of the three long-term desired outcomes is that, "Groundwater and surface water are used in a way that does not degrade them for future generations." Again

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36406

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby communities, and describe contingency plans to address the risk to public health and worker safety if asbestos-like fibers are detected during construction, operation, closure and post-closure 3) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate inaccurate characterizations of the University of Minnesota mesothelioma study. Specifically, eliminate statements that imply that commercial asbestos is the primary risk factor for mesothelioma risk Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks po

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36407

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being poten

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36408

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36410

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being potentially polluted, I too will support the mine. Until then, I live in fear that someday I will not be able to feed my family or spend my life in the area I have chosen. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are not the same as the proposed polymet mine. Taconite or iron ore mining are in a completely different category than copper sulfate mining. Although neither benefit or promote the surrounding ecosystems the effects of copper sulfate mining are potentially, significantly, vastly more detrimental than those of pit mining. The proposed mines are not responsible for or directly effected by potential problems that may arise. The minerals are not going anywhere - I urge you to move towards further - non bias- research. The development of new, less destructive mining techniques could be just around the corner. Someday the minerals will be safely accessible, then we will be able to h

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36412

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being potentially polluted, I too will support the mine. Until then, I live in fear that someday I will not be able to feed my family or spend my life in the area I have chosen. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are not the same as

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36413

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this test PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untreated every year. In fact, the SDEIS predicts that many years after closure this could violate the sulfate standard to protect wild rice, requiring additional measures (5-142). The SDEIS is contradictory, on the one hand relying on mechanical water treatment for hundreds of years in order to seemingly meet the sulfate standard, but also describing possible passive treatments that may be developed that would seasonally violate the protective sulfate standards. The EIS should eliminate that contradiction. Lastly, the SDEIS inadequately characterizes wild rice waters downstream of the PolyMet sites. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Council has provided additional wild rice sites other than those included in the SDEIS. The EIS should be revised to include these additional wild rice waters. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36414

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are not the same as the proposed polymet mine. Taconite or iron ore mining are in a completely different category than copper sulfate mining. Although neither benefit or promote the surrounding ecosystems the effects of copper sulfate mining are potentially, significantly, vastly more detrimental than those of pit mining. The proposed mines are not responsible for or directly effected by potential problems that may arise. The minerals are not going anywhere - I urge you to move towards further - non bias- research. The development of new, less destructive mining techniques could be just around the corner. Someday the minerals will be safely accessible, then we will be able to have clean water, protected environments and mining. Until then, put the safety of our land, water, and natural systems above that of consumerism and capitalism. Humans, particularly the DNR must act as advocates for the environment and the species that cannot speak for themselves. If you have looked at newspapers in the arrowhead region in the last few years, you will have noticed that the moose population is facing huge depletion. These animals are dying, and although they are being studied to find out why, further stress on their natural habitat could potentially push them over toward endangered. Another species, facing endangered status because of human development is a shame to say the least, but to put our own goals, which will not be affected negatively by waiting 5 to 30 years (other than different people get rich), ahead of a unique species is unforgivable. I thank you for your time and respect. Sincerely, Ms Ka

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36415

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. If you have looked at newspapers in the arrowhead region in the last few years, you will have noticed that the moose population is facing huge depletion. These animals are dying, and although they are being studied to find out why, further stress on their natural habitat could potentially push them over toward endangered. Another species, facing endangered status because of human development is a shame to say the least, but to put our own goals, which will not be affected negatively by waiting 5 to 30 years (other than different people get rich), ahead of a unique species is unforgivable. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pa

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36416

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being potentially polluted, I too will support the mine. Until then, I live in fear that someday I will not be able to feed my family or spend my life in the area I have chosen. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are not the same as the proposed polymet mine. Taconite or iron ore mining are in a completely different category than copper sulfate mining. Although neither benefit or promote the surrounding e

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36417

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36418

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Metals and Teck American projects are listed as "speculative" in Section 6-2-2-1-21 and are not analyzed for their cumulative effects. No evidence or rationale for excluding these projects from the cumulative effects analysis is offered. In Section 6-2-3-6-4, the Gray Wolf is the only "Special Status Species" for which even limited analysis of cumulative effects is conducted, despite the Canada Lynx's status as a federally threatened species. Please take the following actions: 1) Include the Twin Metals and Teck American projects as reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative effects analysis in section 6-2-2, since the disposition of the NorthMet SDEIS and subsequent permitting decisions could make these projects more likely to be built. 2) Include the Canada Lynx as a "Special Status Species" in Section 6-2-3-6-4 and conduct a cumulative effects analysis of the impact on Canada Lynx. 3) Analyze and include mitigations such as tunnels and fencing to limit the possibility of incidental take of Canada Lynx by increased road traffic associated with the NorthMet proposed action. 4) Remove contradictory language in SDEIS about Canada Lynx utilization of roads as travel corridors. For example, on p. 5-628 the SDEIS states "Lynx utilize snow packed trails and roads as travel corridors," while on p. 5-366 it says "this species does not rely on roads for travel." 5) Analyze and include mitigation such as accelerated re-vegetation of the mine site after closure to decrease the amount of time the mine site would be inhospitable to Canada Lynx. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36419

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being potentially polluted, I too will support the mine. Until then, I live in fear that someday I will not be able to feed my family or spend my life in the area I have chosen. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

36420

Mar 3, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or harvested out of the woods around our home. Our vegetable garden needs water, and during the dry weeks, when we are not able to collect rain water, we haul water from the lake. The average family eats pasta or store bought rice 4 meals a week. Both pasta and store bought brown rice are significantly less nutritious than wild grown wild rice. My family doesn't buy pasta or rice, we harvest wild rice. Animals, which we hunt and eat, depend upon the water too. This and the surrounding lakes will not be protected and will be polluted past the point of sustaining life when and if the polymet mine leaks pollution into the water system. My food source will be extinguished if this happens, an event I cannot sit by and let happen. Once I can be assured that the water systems are 100% free of being potentially polluted, I too will support the mine. Until then, I live in fear that someday I will not be able to feed my family or spend my life in the area I have chosen. Ely is a part of the Iron Range and was founded as a mining town, there are large mines in the near by area, these mines are not the same as the proposed polymet mine. Taconite or iron ore mining are in a completely different category than copper sulfate mining. Although neither benefit or promote the surrounding ecosystems the effects of copper sulfate

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kahsha Hyde

49528

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. I want to urge you to put support behind a deeper investigation on the consequences of the mine. I am not against mining. I am an Ely Minnesota native, a 21 year old who hopes to be able to return to the North Woods with my fiance, to raise my children and make my life. I grew up in the woods, surrounded by healthy trees, lakes and diverse ecosystems I am a biologist because of the experiences I had growing up there. I want the future generations to be assured access to these experiences as well. My home is built miles from the nearest highway, we have no power (other than a generator we use to power a battery) or running water/ septic. We drink directly from the lake that borders our property. My family lives well below the poverty line, but we always have plenty to eat. We spend our money on gas to get to work, propane for our lights and other man made necessities. We afford all we need to because our food is mostly grown on our own land or h

Kai` Hoffman

4288

Dear DNR I am a 10 year old boy who lives on Lake Superior in Duluth. I know that there have been no known sulfide mines that haven't polluted water systems Every year I take a trip to the Boundary Waters where I love to swim in the water and drink the clean water. If sulfide mining starts, all those lakes I love to visit and swim in will eventually be polluted. After many years Lake Superior will be polluted as well. This is where I live and I want to be able to enjoy it for the rest of my life. Others will be harmed as well, and no tourists will want to come to northern Minnesota to see polluted lakes. The lakes will no longer be safe to drink or swim in. Please stop sulfide mining. Kai Hoffman

Kaia Anderson

44603

I am an 18 year old from Prior Lake, Minnesota. As I came to the turning of the age where I can voice my opinion, I will make it clear here. This mine will destroy an area, leave harmful pollutants, and create an unfit environment for the animals living around the area. Even if it brings slight economic benefit do you really think Polynet will remain relevant and support the clean up for 200-500 years. Really. The choice is clear. The Boundary Waters are too valuable. I do not support this mine. Kaia Anderson.

Kaia Knutson

42754

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kaia Lindquist 54534

It took a while for me to collect all the information I thought I needed on this issue. Although I was aware of PolyMet's mining plans, I didn't not completely understand the severity of this issue. After reading, what I believe to be sufficient information, I believe that the costs to sulfide mining proposed by PolyMet dramatically outweigh the benefits reaped from the mining. The mining will inevitably negatively effect the MN environment far into the future. Forever effecting the pH and polluting the waters. In addition, the plans for protecting this pollution are not complete enough to be a safeguard. If the mining were to continue and pollute there are not concrete plans of who would be responsible nor sufficient safeguards to fix what would go wrong. The benefits of the mining would not be worth the potential benefits reaped from the sites.

Kaia Svien 54650

See attachment

58156

The PolyMet mine sounds too destructive of our natural resources to be allowed to go through. Let's put attention to brining in jobs for the Iron Range that are not detrimental to the environment.

Kaija Ornes 44587

I have lived in Minnesota for all my life . 16 years. I can tell you that I have been to this area of Minnesota at least once a year every year starting when I was four. I can say that it is to dense with resources and beauty to ruin it for an economics gain for about 20 years. The consequences far out live the economic gain. With the time to clean it up being around 500 years. I hope to be able to bring my children up to north east mn. I even have had the idea of getting married up there from the time that I was 10- Economics can change in an area over time but ruining an area for 500 years is a long time. Did any companies from Columbus's time still exist today if so I would love to know. Do we really think that this company will be around to make sure the clean up is up to par, in 500 years. I don't think it will be and this is my point. I am currently in ap environmental science. I have learned a lot about pollution and why it is so deadly. I hope that this will never happen because I want to be able to go north and see the beauty I fell in love with as a kid. Kaija Prior lake

Kaitlyn Culver 54336

Lisa Fay, EIS Project ManagerMNDNR Division of Ecological and Water ResourcesEnvironmental Review Unit500 Lafayette Road, Box 25St.Paul, MN 55155-4025Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager,To start off, there are a lot of advantages to the proposal of the land site, but there are a lot of disadvantages. One thing that caught my eye, was the fact that it would affect the Ojibwe people. They are native to the land andI don't think it's fair for them to take their land away. It would also affect the Beaver Bay which could possibly ruin their habitat. Like they said in the fact sheet of cultural resources, is they are not sure whether or not it would affect animals.This land exchange would gain a lot of things such as: 2 plant species, vegetation, 9 additional plant species, etc. I think it's cool how they would gain so many things, but there are also a lot of things that they would lose. Something big that we would lose is 11 plant species. They would also lose about 1,000 acres of floodplains which they aren't super worried about. Something that I noticed was that there is very small deposits of mercury in ore and rock.My opinion would be to not take so much land because there are a lot of plant and animal life you would take away. Also, the Ojibwe people had the land for a long time and that's their land to have. I would decrease about 1,000 acres in different spots and let the Ojibwe people stay on their land. I don't have a problem with mining the land, but the animals are my biggest concern.Sincerely,Kaitlyn Culver, 8th grade

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kaitlyn Pommrehn

42066

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kaitlyn Pommrehn St Louis Park, Minnesota

Kaleb Vold

36519

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Kaleb Vold 4085 Pleasant St SE Prior Lake, MN 55372

Kane Jeffery And Melissa Rust

18241

The name is Kane, K-A-N-E, Jeffery, J-E-F-F-E-R-Y and Melissa R-U-S-T. We are property owners in Finland and Isabella, over 90 acres. This is 20 miles, approximately, east of the location of the mining operation to be proposed. We are against this because we purchased this property in the effort to wipe off our carbon footprint for what we use, and we feel that the actions taken by the mine undermine our personal beliefs in that area, and they outweigh -- our beliefs outweigh the proposed economic input to that area compared to the saving of the natural environment. Period.

Karen & Kalen Johnson

42627

See attachment

Karen B Holden

42721

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Baker

39569

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Karen Baker 2 Bindowan crescent Maryland, None 228)

Karen Bell-Brugger

30427

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest There is a lot of talk about PolyMet having to have a fund for future clean-up of our water. What I imagine is the reality of the situation - after PolyMet has retrieved all it can from our land, it will go bankrupt to avoid having to pay for 500 years of polluted water clean-up. Then, Minnesotans in the future will have the opportunity of paying endlessly to do the clean-up work themselves, or they learn to live with a devastated landscape. Sincerely, Karen Bell-Brugger 5207 Humboldt Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-1121 (612) 822-4013

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Bell-Brugger

41961

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Bell-Brugger

41995

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

42072

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Karen Bell-Brugger Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Blaha

17173

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Karen Blaha Bryant Mpls., MN 55409

50439

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Karen Blaha Bryant Mpls., MN 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

karen callahan

12079

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Karen Cedarmoon

47300

Hello, I live in northern Minnesota. I have to tell you that the feeling up here is overwhelmingly against the copper mine. We see the proposed 500 year damage to the environment as absurd Our Nation is less than 500 years old. There is not a company that has lasted that length of time yet you are considering allowing this mining company to do that kind of damage with their assurance they will clean it up. Ridiculous. even were they to obtain significant outside insurance it would still be absurd as no company, no amount of money can really reasonably guarantee the clean up and safety of the earth and its people. There is no compensation that provides for the destruction of the earth. The small number of jobs dangled before our eyes does not come anywhere close to the jobs that will be lost due to the loss of environment that no doubt will occur. If this kind of mining can be done safely, then why isn't it being done safely anywhere else. Because it can't be and won't be, because this is all about companies like this one making huge profits and then getting out, leaving disaster in their wake. The bigger picture, for me, is this: when does it stop. When does the greed and voracious gobbling up of the earth stop. Where is the line. When does the earth and its citizens come before corporate greed and market driven need. We do not need the products that have driven this destruction so badly that it compensates for what is lost, lost forever. I'm not going to be around in 500 years and neither are any of you reading this. We can't even conceive of that length of time, yet we feel we can risk it for the money. Minnesota is one of the few places left with some even remotely unspoiled places. I know, I've lived all over the country and I've seen what these kind of choices look like. Lake Superior is the largest body of fresh water on this continent. No one has the right, for money or any other motivation, to destroy that Lake, that Water. We all know that this company, this mine, is just the beginning. We have no right, and no need, to make decisions to serve greed that will take and take and take from the earth, from its inhabitants, from the way of life of indigenous peoples. I urge you to say Minnesota is not for sale. It stops here. Thank you for your time, Karen Cedarmoon Hovland, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

karen chartier

40395

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, karen chartier 45 Rivocean Dr Ormond Beach, FL 32176 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Cleveland

41600

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Karen Gardner

57981

Toxic sulfates will destroy Minnesota's streams, river, and watersheds. I enjoy spending time in Northern Minnesota and own a house near Lake Superior. I don't want to see the watersheds and the lake become polluted. I want my grandchildren to be able to enjoy an unspoiled environment. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Karen Graham

6342

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The 2014 plan by PolyMet is still inadequate. After an additional 3 years to provide more in-depth details and planning. The company failed to meet the basic requirements to achieve their ultimate goal. If they won't accept responsibility for producing a quality report, what makes you think they "plan" to do anything different when operating the mine. To put the at least 500 years of toxicity from tons of mine wastes into perspective, consider that our country is 238 years old. At 238 years, the USA hasn't even reached the half-life of the waste produced by this mine. Think of this again, it will take maintaining environmental processing of tons of waste spread out over acres, twice the age of country and then some -- if we're lucky. Go back to the book - stop this plan. Sincerely
Karen Graham 11600 37th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55441 763-551-9572

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Graham

6345

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The 2013 report from PolyMet is inadequate. In spite of the fact that you gave them 3 more years to study and provide more in-depth information. How compliant is the company, if they can't meet the needed standards of a report. Let me put the at least 500 year toxicity producing waste into perspective. Our country is 238 years old. This means that the USA hasn't reached the half life of the toxicity predicted by this plan. Consider this again, the plan will produce tons of waste needing constant environmental control for more than twice the age of our country. Go back to the books - don't allow the PolyMet open pit mining. Sincerely Karen Graham 11600 37th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55441 763-551-9572

38865

From: Karen Graham [mailto:gramkl@comcast.net] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 3:30 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Re: Reevaluate the PolyMet Mining Proposal
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The plan is flawed, vague handling of data and specifications, and oblique assurances of PolyMet being a good partner in a 500+ year environmental disaster. I respectfully request that the MNDNR and PolyMet answer the questions raised by the Fond du Lac tribe of Chippewa, Water Legacy organization, and the Audubon society to their satisfaction. I request the proposal be rejected until the specifications and requirements are written in a full proposal that meet the above mentioned tribe and organizations, and the requirements of health, water quality, biological survey, and environmental protection agencies and departments of Minnesota and the United States of America. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity 5) Write a concentration range of sulfide contamination in water treated through the reverse osmosis plant to provide clean water: - specification on the reverse osmosis system for handling the waste water - purity of treated water in holding water. a) Recalculate the number of reverse osmosis systems needed to handle water purification treatment. b) Rewrite to require water treatment facilities be built before mining commences. Proposal stipulates that facilities won't be built for 40 years after the mining process begins. As the mine is expected to operate for about 30 years. It is also only designated to handle the mine's intentional surface water discharge. c) Rewrite proposal defining how the centuries of operations, maintenance, monitoring, and reconstruction of water treatment facilities will be handled and financed. No details are provided in proposal addressing these issues. 6) Develop program to treat seepage from mine pits, waste rock, and tailings piles to be treated to produce clean water.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Graham

38965

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The plan is flawed, vague handling of data and specifications, and oblique assurances of PolyMet being a good partner in a 500+ year environmental disaster. I respectfully request that the MNDNR and PolyMet answer the questions raised by the Fond du Lac tribe of Chippewa, Water Legacy organization, and the Audubon society to their satisfaction. I request the proposal be rejected until the specifications and requirements are written in a full proposal that meet the above mentioned tribe and organizations, and the requirements of health, water quality, biological survey, and environmental protection agencies and departments of Minnesota and the United States of America. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity 5) Write a concentration range of sulfide contamination in water treated through the reverse osmosis plant to provide clean water: - specification on the reverse osmosis system for handling the waste water - purity of treated water in holding water. a) Recalculate the number of reverse osmosis systems needed to handle water purification treatment. b) Rewrite to require water treatment facilities be built before mining commences. Proposal stipulates that facilities won't be built for 40 years after the mining process begins. As the mine is expected to operate for about 30 years - this action is too little too late. It is also only designed to handle the mine's intentional surface water discharge. To put this in perspective, would you want to swim or drink the water in the holding pond after treatment. I wouldn't. c) Rewrite proposal defining how the centuries of operations, maintenance, monitoring, and reconstruction of water treatment facilities will be handled and financed. No details are provided in proposal addressing these issues. 6) Develop program to treat seepage from mine pits, waste rock, and tailings piles to be treated to produce clean water.

42905

From: Karen Graham [mailto:gramkl@comcaStnet] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 10:34 AM To: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR); Fay, Lisa (DNR); rperiman@fs.fed.us; douglas.w.bruner@usace.army.mil Subject: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Thank you for accepting comments. I trust that you will act responsibly for the state of Minnesota and the health of the citizens of Minnesota. PolyMet's proposal to mine low grade ore by open pit as the only option for the company's economic advantage. Rejecting the SDEIS proposal doesn't necessarily stop bring jobs to the state only bringing jobs by the option favored by PolyMet. The company's mission is not partnering with the state of Minnesota for the benefit of Minnesota. Please include the attached letter in your review process. Thank you, Karen Graham 11600 37th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55441 763-551-9572

47788

From: Karen Graham [mailto:gramkl@comcaStnet] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 10:34 AM To: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us; lisa.fay@state.mn.us; Periman, Richard -FS; douglas.w.bruner@usace.army.mil Subject: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Thank you for accepting comments. I trust that you will act responsibly for the state of Minnesota and the health of the citizens of Minnesota. PolyMet's proposal to mine low grade ore by open pit as the only option for the company's economic advantage. Rejecting the SDEIS proposal doesn't necessarily stop bring jobs to the state only bringing jobs by the option favored by PolyMet. The company's mission is not partnering with the state of Minnesota for the benefit of Minnesota. Please include the attached letter in your review process. Thank you, Karen Graham 11600 37th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55441 763-551-9572

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Graham

48640

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I respectfully request that the MNDNR and PolyMet answer the questions raised by the Fond du Lac tribe of Chippewa, Water Legacy organization, and the Audubon society to their satisfaction. I request the proposal be rejected until the specifications and requirements are written in a full proposal that meet the above mentioned tribe and organizations, and the requirements of health, water quality, biological survey, and environmental protection agencies and departments of Minnesota and the United States of America. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity 5) Write a concentration range of sulfide contamination in water treated through the reverse osmosis plant to provide clean water: - specification on the reverse osmosis system for handling the waste water - purity of treated water in holding water. a) Recalculate the number of reverse osmosis systems needed to handle water purification treatment. b) Rewrite to require water treatment facilities be built before mining commences. Proposal stipulates that facilities won't be built for 40 years after the mining process begins. As the mine is expected to operate for about 30 years - this action is too little too late. It is also only designated to handle the mine's intentional surface water discharge. To put this in perspective, would you want to swim or drink

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Graham

48641

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. I respectfully request that the MNDNR and PolyMet answer the questions raised by the Fond du Lac tribe of Chippewa, Water Legacy organization, and the Audubon society to their satisfaction. I request the proposal be rejected until the specifications and requirements are written in a full proposal that meet the above mentioned tribe and organizations, and the requirements of health, water quality, biological survey, and environmental protection agencies and departments of Minnesota and the United States of America. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge Ri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

karen heegaard

21214

Feb 24, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I am writing to comment on the SDEIS. I have never commented on an EIS before but I am very concerned about the impact of sulfide mining on our Minnesota. I am shocked that we would even consider something that will require careful monitoring and oversight for 500 years. I will write about 3 concerns: clean water, sustainable jobs and long-term oversight and accountability. 1- Clean Water. What is the plan for catching and monitoring all water exposed to sulfide tailings for 500 years given fractured bedrock and fluctuating water tables. How does a mine that needs hundreds of years of monitoring comply with Minnesota law that requires mines to be maintenance free at closure. Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Extend the water pollution model and account for changing water tables and fractured bedrock. 2- Sustainable Work. Jobs are so important in our state and especially in Northern Minnesota. I am concerned that the jobs generated will be short lived, largely utilize imported workers and be divisive in the communities we hope to support. Demand that Polymet and Glencore produce documentation about the numbers of local jobs they expect to produce; to describe how they will train and protect Minnesota laborers, how they will protect existing economies (wild rice, winter and summer tourism, fishing) that depend on clean water, silence, low light pollution; to describe methods for enhancing sense of community rather than creating tension and hostility that we see over and over in communities (most recently in our neighbor North Dakota) where new mining industry disrupts and does extensive damage even while providing jobs to a relatively small number of local workers. Demand that Polymet describe and include local jobs prod

Karen Johnson

33358

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I'm 75 years old and have loved the BWCA and its surrounding areas since I was 20 and was a canoe guide taking delinquent kids on canoe trips for a camp. The change in those kids was remarkable and it is in all who experience the wonder of the wilderness. Please don't ruin the water and woods in order for some company to make money. There are things in this world that aren't replaceable and once water, air, and land have been poisoned there is no way back. Surely our next generations deserve to have their inheritance protected. Sincerely, Karen Johnson 28311 County 93 Laporte, MN 56461-4313

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Johnson

39701

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I am 75 and when I was young I guided canoe trips at a camp located at the end of the Gunflint Trail. The young people who came for those trips were church kids and also kids from correctional services. All were amazed at the beauty and wildness of the BWCA. As a social worker later I met some of these kids again who were now young adults and learned from them what life changing trips those had been for them. I grieve that we are so enamored of business and money that we will risk ruining these waterways and woods that cannot be redeemed after businesses ruin them. Surely it is important to take the time to study what is ahead instead of rushing these decisions. Karen Gulsvig Johnson The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Karen Johnson 28311 County 93 Laporte, MN 56461-4313

48866

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I am 75 and when I was young I guided canoe trips at a camp located at the end of the Gunflint Trail. The young people who came for those trips were church kids and also kids from correctional services. All were amazed at the beauty and wildness of the BWCA. As a social worker later I met some of these kids again who were now young adults and learned from them what life changing trips those had been for them. I grieve that we are so enamored of business and money that we will risk ruining these waterways and woods that cannot be redeemed after businesses ruin them. Surely it is important to take the time to study what is ahead instead of rushing these decisions. Karen Gulsvig Johnson The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Karen Johnson 28311 County 93 Laporte, MN 56461-4313

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Kimbrough

41052

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Karen Korslund

42115

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Karen Korslund 515 Huron Blvd SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-3323

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen L Dingle

48645

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. People have been asking if Minnesota and the DNR can trust PolyMet to stand behind their mining operations. That is the wrong question. The DNR and other involved officials need to be asking: Can we trust Glencore XStrata, PolyMet's primary owner. A quick review of the XStrata labor and environmental history in the more than 100 copper mines they own world-wide shows that we cannot. They routinely violate laws and standards with impunity and seem to be large enough that they are not held responsible for their actions. There's no reason to believe they would be any more responsible here than they are everywhere else. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Karen L Dingle 3938 Cannon Ball Lake Rd Duluth, MN 55803-8209

Karen Lackner

10854

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According to the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I have recently been asked by State Representative Jason Metsa to sit down and write up bullet points . things that need to be addressed in the SDEIS and this was one of the very things I was going to bring to the forefront. The exact area where the proposed mine is to be is major moose habitat. Bog Berry Lake. The moose is already on a dangerous path. This mine, if it happens, will destroy what few we have left in the area. Plus I found a statement about eagles in and around the proposed mine site that was a complete fallacy. They obviously were 'not' looking up. My husband and I have seen with our own eyes eagles maturing. That is changing from their brown head to white heads. Hence, there are obviously nests. The same goes for osprey. And I would like to add eagles [do] live, hunt, fish, etc. around small lakes. The report stated "that they are found around large bodies of water so eagles will not be affected." This simply is not true. Sincerely, Karen L. Lackner 302 5th Street South Virginia, MN 55792 Sincerely, Mrs Karen Lackner 302 5th St S Virginia, MN 55792-2731

Karen Ladner

9328

I have been listening to the debates and trying to be objective about whether the PolyMet mining in Northern MN is a good idea. I vacation in the Ely area 2-3 times a year, both winter and summer. I have met many local residents who wish there were more jobs in that area, but allowing this mining to take place does not seem like the best answer. The number of promised jobs is not really that many. And the unknown impact to the land, wildlife and BWCA as a whole is to risky given the facts as they state them to be. Please do not let this mining go through. We can do better by MN and by the people of that area by fostering the tourism and offering incentives to non-mining companies to locate there. These are my humble opinions. Karen Ladner 4024 93rd Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Main 57170

Please do not permit PolyMet as the pioneer in sulfide mining. The company's lack of experience is a red flag for its ability to cleanup, to insure proper pollution controls in the process. Surely the abysmal rating on its initial EPA proposal gives sufficient cause to turn down the application. If sulfide mining is ever approved, please assure it will be on control of an experience, proven company. Karen Main 3314 Riley Road Duluth, MN 55803

Karen Pearson 42757

See attachment

Karen Peterson 54129

I DO NOT support Polymet mining--no way, no shape, no form. Bad for our planet. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54130

I do NOT support PolyMet mining and shame on you/Allete for doing so. You whitewash the truth for the Almighty Buck. I would rather have less dividends--then getting money from such a bad immoral project! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54131

I think there is a grave conflict of interests here that you, Mr. Hodnik, are on PolyMets Board of Directors. I am NOT confident that PolyMet can and will hold dear what Minnesotans hold dear. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

54132

I do NOT support PolyMet mining. Even the name sounds hokey. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Karen Ringsrud 39277

I am concerned and oppose the Polymet mining proposal currently being considered by the DNR. I feel there are too many problems with this proposal, including the fact that sulfide mining of this sort has never been done safely, without environmental damage, anywhere in the world. I urge the DNR to deny the permit to Polymet. Karen Ringsrud 1948 Drew Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55416 rings001@umn-edu

Karen Stady 57179

I strongly believe that the BWCA needs to be preserved and protected for the enjoyment of all people, now and for future generations. Mining near this area isn't worth the risk of contaminating it. If there is mining in the watershed, contaminants will be washed into the bodies of water. Please put the environment ahead of profits. Karen Stady 1950 Palace Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Karen Stickney 42428

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Karen Stickney 27 Baril St Lewiston, ME 04240-5213 (207) 689-3186

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karen Thompson 35164

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Public lands are just that public. The land doesn't exist for the purpose of commercial ventures that benefit a few. And, the possibility of a few jobs being prevented doesn't equal hundreds of thousands of people losing their natural resources which were purposely saved for their enjoyment and healthy living. Voting 'NO' is a no-brainer for those who serve the public rather than catering to the few who would destroy anything that gets in their way of amassing wealth. Do the right thing. Sincerely, Karen Thompson 1104 Chestnut Ln NE Ham Lake, MN 55304-4828

Karen Voigt 14659

To whom it may concern, I would like to chime in with my concern and disapproval of allowing the mine in northeast MN. Any possibility of pollution (even with strict control) is not something I would approve of for that area of our state. We need to leave some things untouched and protected. Chalk me into the disapproval column please. Thank you so much, Karen Voigt Brooklyn Park

Karen Williams 45874

Nonferrous sulfide mining with its consistent historical record of pollution and SDEIS projected 500 years of water cleanup should never be seriously considered. Disastrous consequences would result. This kind of mining has never been successfully nonpolluting in similar environments. A brief Internet search reveals numerous lawsuits against mining companies for environmental damage, water pollution, and human health issues. Because sulfuric acid pollution is toxic to aquatic ecosystems, this area in northeastern Minnesota is a high risk location. Dangerous contamination of water is inevitable which would destroy wetlands, pollute underground water, rivers, and lakes, and endanger fish and animal habitat. The current decline of the moose population may be related to water issues. Of course, human health would be in jeopardy. Economic and financial concerns need to be addressed. Loss of tourism dollars would negatively impact the economy when the recreational opportunities and beauty are lost due to sulfide mining. According to revised information from the mining company, only 25% of the proposed 360 permanent jobs would be local hires. Much is in jeopardy for only 90 jobs. Little financial security has been provided by NorthMet for the inevitable clean up - expected to be more than 500 years worth. It appears that taxpayers, the very people who would be subjected to health problems and ruined environment, would be responsible for the burden of cleanup at astronomical expense. Other states now require hundreds of billions of dollars to be held for reclamation and clean up. Obviously there is too much at stake. Why allow this disaster to happen. No nonferrous sulfide mines should be allowed to exist until mining technology has been proven safe for all - forever. That is the only responsible, ethical, conscientious decision for all of us, including future generations. Karen Williams 6316 N Temple, Indianapolis, IN 46220 9260 Birch Lake Rd, Ely, MN 55731

Kari Block 44300

Greetings, I am not in favor of the proposed PolyMet Mining, Inc. project. I do not want this in our water supply. Nothing is 100% safe. This could cause severe ecological consequences. Thank you, Kari Block Minnesota Resident 612-281-0106 [HYPERLINK "mailto:karilynnblock@yahoo-com"](mailto:karilynnblock@yahoo-com)karilynnblock@yahoo-com

Kari G Wenger 54516

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kari Hovorka

17057

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kari Hovorka Kari Hovorka 4930 Arrowood Ln N Plymouth, MN 55442

50328

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kari Hovorka Kari Hovorka 4930 Arrowood Ln N Plymouth, MN 55442

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kari Jacobson

38849

Hello, I am submitting my comments for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement . My comments are attached to this message, and also pasted below. Kari Jacobson Hedin 1323 N 7th Ave E Duluth, MN 55805 3/11/2014 To whom it may concern, Water quality in the St Louis River Area of Concern has improved in recent decades, due to the cooperative efforts, funding and endless rounds of planning by a multidisciplinary group that includes scientists, resource managers, agencies, and citizens. In his 2014 State of the City Address, Mayor Don Ness portrayed the City of Duluth as having a vibrant future in part because of the improvements to water quality in the St Louis River. All of that work, and the quality of life that comes with improved water quality on the St Louis River, will be lost if PolyMet is allowed to mine in the upper reaches of this watershed. I am deeply concerned by the modeling results in the SDEIS that show water must be treated in perpetuity to prevent the St Louis, Partridge, and Embarrass Rivers from becoming heavily polluted by copper, lead, sulfate, aluminum, and other pollutants. Water treatment for centuries has never been done, and the probability of such long-term water treatment being successful is highly unlikely. To propose such a thing as a matter of course is deeply immoral and saddles future generations with a terrible burden. The precautionary principle puts the onus of responsibility on the project proponents to accurately assess risk to human health and the environment and consider all costs. However, NEPA documents such as the SDEIS for PolyMet have repeatedly shown that they are not reliable in predicting water quality problems (Maest and Kuipers, 2005 Predicting Water Quality at Hardrock Mines). This is glaringly clear in PolyMet's SDEIS, as it was recently discovered that the models predicting flow rates and hydrology in the Partridge River are deeply flawed. The claim in the SDEIS that no water quality exceedances will occur during or after mining is based on this flawed model, and so any predictions about water quality and quantity based on these models must now be ruled out as false. The groundwater models in the SDEIS are also flawed and seem to claim that no impacts will occur outside the area of permitted action. PolyMet seems to be proposing in general that there will be no environmental impacts outside of its area of potential effect, as if the mine operates in a vacuum. Mining proponents claim that sulfide mining is right for Minnesota because of this state's robust set of environmental regulations. However, regulations are only effective if they are enforced. For example, Minntac continues to discharge sulfate from its tailings basin that exceeds the 10 mg/L legal limit for waters that contain wild rice. While this discharge continues, the state of Minnesota is granting them and other mines permits to expand their mining operations. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's track record in regulating taconite mines on the Iron Range is not good, and it is likely that there will be little political will to enforce regulations when PolyMet begins to have its own water quality exceedances. PolyMet and mines like it are allowed to dump toxic tailings and overburden into streams and wetlands because of two mining loopholes in the Clean Water Act. I support the National Wildlife Federation's call to the EPA and the US Army Corps of Engineers to close these two loopholes through a rule change. Without a change, PolyMet will be allowed use nearby waters as disposal sites for untreated industrial waste. The Clean Water Act's "waste treatment system exclusion" should apply only to manmade waters and the definition of "fill" should be amended to exclude waste disposal. PolyMet downplays the direct and cumulative impacts the mine will have on the landscape. Losses will include 1,741 acres of Minnesota Biological Survey

Kari Sealund

34650

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I would like to offer some comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the GTAC Penokee Range Project in Northern Wisconsin which will both heavily impact the whole Lake Superior watershed in a very negative way. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and the Penokee Mountain area in Northern Wisconsin. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Also in the Penokee Range Mining done by GTAC, rocks containing asbestos form minerals have been found causing much alarm about mining in that area. I have grave concerns about these project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's and GTAC's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Kari Sealund 302 S. Wilshire Lane Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Karin Rea

43085

The SDEIS for the Poly Met Mining Project is flawed and does not guarantee that sulfide mining can be done in Minnesota without seriously harming water and habitat. Please do not let this project should go forwaRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karin Winegar

10751

January 29, 2014 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney, I went to the PolyMet event last night, and it was packed-not just with people who oppose the mine, but with people who think jobs should come first at any price. I asked a few questions of the experts at the many displays and learned that Polymet is new, has no mines yet and is owned by Swiss and other international investors. I learned that the numbers used for stream flow were hugely underestimated by the company and the first Environmental Impact Statement therefore got a failure grade by the EPA. The mine would be in our Superior National Forest lands-how can the state consider allowing public lands to be exploited (and certainly polluted, possibly permanently) for private investor profit. It seems to me that it would be saner, safer, cleaner and cheaper to use state funds to employ all these willing workers in green or at least neutral jobs than to allow the destruction of our north country water. Jobs, certainly, are a priority, but not short term and not at this coSt Water is more precious than any other resource on earth and getting moreso as climate change dries up supplies in many states, and fracking destroys water in still more states. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. The mine will have tragic environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Sincerely yours, Karin Winegar 1832 Carroll Ave St Paul, MN 55104 -- Original Message-- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) To: Karin Winegar Sent: Mon, Feb 3, 2014 5:49 pm Subject: RE: Reject PolyMet's NorthMet Mining Proposal Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

15929

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan will have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS' rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Karin Winegar 1832 Carroll Ave St Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karin Winegar

15983

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

58169

In the 21st century water is and will be the most precious substance on earth. Our northern water and Superior National Forrest should stay protected and intact. It is a public resource, not a site for corporate exploitation and profit of international investors. It would be wise and more economical both the short and long term to provide good jobs (using state funds of necessary) than to expect or trust a mining company to provide well paying, long term significant numbers of jobs in northern Minnesota. Mining has a long and disastrous history in both environmental damage and job loss.

Karl Koenig

1942

To whom it may concern, I oppose any and all mining activities proposed by PolyMet Mining Inc. The risk of damaging fragile ecosystems is far too great to justify any type of mining activity on National Forest lands. Furthermore, I feel that mining activities are not consistent with the management objectives of any National Forest land areas. Thank You Sincerely, Mr Karl Koenig 108 E. Maple Ave Frazee, MN 56544

Karl W Hodil

57143

DO NOT ALLOW POLYMET MINING IN MN.Karl W. Hodil15 N Chester PkwyDuluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karla 44815

To: DNR, I oppose Polymet's Mining proposal. I do not believe this can be done without serious harm to water quality, wetlands and wildlife habitat. Karla Anderson plymouth, MN

Karla Faith 40168

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Mapping done by the PolyMet miss represent the boundary of the 100 mile swamp implying that the drainage of the swamp is in one the direction only and away from the boundary waters. In the maps drawn in the US government atlas www.nationalatlas.gov/streamer the 100 mile swamp flows into two watershed areas. One of which drains to the boundary waters. This contradiction in mapping presents evidence that danger to the boundary waters is being under reported in the environmental impact statement . At a minimum plans for hydrologic testing before operations and continual monitoring of water during mining operations flowing from the swamp in both directions is nessasary. This plan needs to be in place for full understanding and protection of the water quality in the area. Lacking this basic protection PolyMets proposal is deficient for clear assessment of the danger to the water flowing to the boundary waters. Sincerely, Ms Karla Faith 1090 County Road E New Richmond, WI 54017-8409 (651) 247-9100

Karlene Mostek 23803

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Native Americans have a saying: "Not until the last fish has died, and the last river has been polluted will we understand that we cannot eat money." Sincerely, Karlene Mostek 5555 N Sheridan Rd Apt 1008 Chicago, IL 60640-1623

karlene plante Jim Etzel 44897

Minnesota has already seen plenty of destruction with iron ore mining in the Northern tier of the state. The destruction from that will be seen for many years to come. This new proposal should not be considered as it will cause a significant amount of damage to many acres of wild habitat for many creatures, both terrestrial and aquatic. Tell the mining company to start mining the many dumps throughout the United states for the metals they seek. There should be plenty of it there. No more mining in Minnesota .. James Etzel 5652 Bachelor rd NW Hackensack, MN 56452 218-547-4083 earthsteward1@gmail-com

Karol Gresser 54642

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Karolyn Redoutey

57590

Jan 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Kat Glessing

39788

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Kat Glessing 1064 Cedar View Dr Minneapolis, MN 55405-2129 (612) 374-3873

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kate Crowley

6112

January 16, 2014 To: The officials and state and federal agencies reviewing the PolyMet permit I am writing today to express my absolute opposition to the PolyMet Mine. I have many ways that I think of myself: naturalist, author, adventurer, wife, and mother, but the most important title I bear is Grandmother. I am not an American Indian, but I strongly believe in the philosophy of Seven Generations, which means that we do not make any decisions or take any actions which do not take into consideration the impact on those people who will come after us. The owners of this proposed mine can offer us all the assurances in the world that they will be good stewards and guarantee us that the pollution created by the dangerous chemicals created by and used in this mining process will not impact or impair our waters. But all the studies done and experiences with mines such as this in the past prove incontrovertibly that such assurances mean nothing. There WILL be pollution and it WILL make its way into our waters, whether surface or underground. The studies have shown that these polluted waters would have to be treated for hundreds of years. Who of us alive today can guarantee that people in the future will have the funds or ability to sustain this sort of mitigation. Minnesota prides itself, in fact, brags about our freshwater resources. We are the Land of 10,000 Lakes. This is how we advertise ourselves to others – to settle here or at least visit. If those waters become seriously polluted we will have to amend our title and I can't think of a good addendum. Can you. This proposed mining project will give short term financial gain to an international company and some residents of the region, but the overall benefit will be far, far less than the overall negative impact. All we have to do is look to West Virginia to see how a community is affected when its freshwater is ruined by a chemical spill. The ultimate results of that disaster will not be known for a long, long time. So, as I said at the beginning, my values about our environment and the future are absolutely bound to my grandchildren and to all of their friends and classmates and all of the children they will one day have. We have a moral obligation to protect the water we cannot live without, into perpetuity. This mining project must not go forward. Sincerely Kate Crowley 82119 Bennett Rd Willow River, MN 55795 [HYPERLINK "http://www.lakesuperiormagazine-com/cat/gfc.html"](http://www.lakesuperiormagazine-com/cat/gfc.html)<http://-www.lakesuperiormagazine-com/-cat/gfc.html><http://www.lakesuperiormagazine-com/cat/gfc.jpg> Available in May Going Full Circle A 1,555-mile Walk Around the World's Largest Lake by Mike Link and Kate Crowley "Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need, but not every man's greed." Gandhi "I hope you love birds too. It is economical. It saves going to heaven." Emily Dickinson

41759

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Kate Crowley 82119 Bennett Rd Willow River, MN 55795-3079

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kate Fitzgerald

44597

Dear Ms Fay, As a mother of two young children and long-time resident of Grand Marais, MN, on the edge of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in NE Minnesota, I am acutely concerned about the proposed PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal. I believe the project's risks to human health would be unacceptable, and it is with great earnestness that I ask you to reject PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS and the mine and wastes proposal. One of my top concerns is mercury. At a time when one out of ten babies in MN's Lake Superior region are being born with dangerous blood levels of mercury, it would be unconscionable to accept a mine and wastes proposal that would only cause that percentage to grow. To support this concern, we only need to look at what has happened downstream of the PolyMet project, where the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes have become legally impaired due to the toxic mercury level in fish. Having attended a very detailed and well-supported presentation by NE Minnesotans for Wilderness advocate Jane Reyer and former State Representative Frank Moe in Grand Marais on Feb. 19, everything I learned leads me to the conclusion that the PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is misleading and inadequate. Through Ms Reyer's careful explanation, I learned that the SDEIS' claims that sulfates and mercury and sulfates will be captured are unreliable. I learned that their information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks is extremely poor and full of gaps. I learned that impact of lead, aluminum, and manganese in water causes damage to the human brain. That air emissions of nickel and other particulates, diesel, and asbestos-like fibers can lead to cancer, as can arsenic. I am alarmed that there is no reference in the SDEIS to potential human harm-notably our most vulnerable community members: infants, children and elderly people. Additionally, the SDEIS does not assess worker at-site risks or residential well risks. Its lifetime risk assessment of 30 to 40 years is half what it should be. The SDEIS does not take into account the effect of toxic pollutants when accumulated in fish, game, and wild rice-notably the effects these toxins have on high-level consumers of these products, including regional tribal members, low-income families, hunters, fishermen, and countless children and elderly people. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to adequately assess human health impacts. The proposed PolyMet mine and mine wastes would be an unacceptable risk to our health. That is why I am asking you to please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Kate Fitzgerald Grand Marais, MN

Kate Flynn-Kitzmann

22678

Due to the unavoidable pollution effects of sulfide mining and high environmental and monetary costs I strongly urge Minnesota to say NO to this mine. There is no way this company will be in existence to cover cleanup costs and the money they set aside will not be enough. Do NOT sell our pristine wilderness, no amount of money would be worth it; allowing this business to ruin our state is short sighted and Minnesota has always planned for long term. Many businesses in that area depend on tourism; pollution of the area would cause them to fail. I can't believe this is even up for discussion. If it passes the DNR and those responsible should hang their heads in shame. Kathleen and Gary Kitzmann [HYPERLINK "mailto:kfkitz@gmail-com"](mailto:kfkitz@gmail-com) 5230 60th Ave SW Rochester MN 55902

Kate Mader

43070

To begin with, please consider the people and companies involved with this sulfide mine copper nickel and other minerals mine plan. PolyMet is a new foreign company with no experience. It is backed by, controlled by, and has given exclusive rights of sale to a thoroughly disreputable foreign company which is chaired by a thoroughly disreputable man. PolyMet is a Canadian company, funded and controlled by Glencore, a Swiss company which has been involved in environmental disasters, labor violations, and human rights abuses all around the world. Glencore's chairman, Tony Hayward was the BP CEO in charge when the Deepwater Horizon oil rig caused the largest oil spill in history in the Gulf of Mexico, while he showed no compassion for the environmental destruction or the people who were so devastated by the disaster. Is this what we want in Minnesota or anywhere in the United States. We have a responsibility to do as little harm as possible to the environment. We have this responsibility to the Creator, to ourselves, to our children, and grandchildren. We have a responsibility to our government. First of all we are responsible to NOT poison our land, our air, our people and our fauna and flora. And that is exactly what sulfide mining does. Secondly we have a responsibility to our government at every level to not give away resources which if used at all should be used for our own benefit. I personally believe they belong left in the earth, that we can live without them as has been done for most of history and obviously will be done in the future. The challenge is to learn to live in peace with nature, not to plunder the earth and poison ourselves and everything on it while scrambling for power, war, and devastation. But I do know that many people separate themselves from moral responsibility when making financial decisions-government personell often feel that personal payoffs are more important than the people they represent. We all know the devastation caused by this mining. We all know that there would be no benefit to the people, and much disaster in the way of poisoning the land, the people the water, the wildlife, the fauna and flora. This is my plea to NOT give any permits to any foreign company to mine our precious earth and destroy our people and land in doing so. Catharine Mader 3152 29th Ave S. Mpls, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kate Mahonen

54348

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I disagree with the PolyMet Mining going to happen in Minnesota. The Copper-Sulfate Mining is a big project and I don't think it will benefit Minnesota enough to make it worth the tune, land, and money that it would take to go through with the mining. Yes, it would create jobs in Northern Minnesota, but is that really the only positive thing that will come out of all this? We use all of this land to create jobs in Northern Minnesota and it's not like the jobs will be there forever. They will be filled for the 20 year span when the mining will take place but after that it will be back to square one with 13,000 acres of land destroyed from mining. The Polymet Mining will have a large effect on the cultural resources being that there are four or five locations that would be affected from this mining process. The Land Exchange is another big problem I see coming from the mining. The company PolyMet, would like to use a bunch of public land as well as gain private land. I don't think it makes one bit of sense to lose a bunch of public land so that a company can mine it, and then leave it as a piece of crap that will never be the same again. This mining would affect me in major ways. We use this land and its what makes Minnesota, Minnesota. I was told to write this paper as a school project, and if this wasn't assigned I would most likely never have looked into this. Thank goodness it was though, because now I realize how many dumb things could happen to our state without the voices of our local citizens being heard. Sincerely, Kate Mahonen

Kate S

16780

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kate S n/a Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kate S

50129

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Kate S n/a Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

Kate Smith

58152

Without a doubt, a great deal of effort has been expended to generate this extensive plan. Involvement has included several local, state and federal departments as well as PolyMet's mining experts and consultants. Mining copper, nickel and precious metals is a means to an end, money. What seems to be missing in the EIS is an accounting for the flow of money both as future costs and benefits. Without that information, it is impossible to know if the project is viable and environmentally sound. Poly Met

- Having already spent \$65 million, it is clear that PolyMet expects to make mega-bucks selling metals.
- Controlling costs is paramount to making a profit. How can the public know if corners are cut during design, construction or operation?
- In the event of a mishap during construction or operation, what penalties can be enforced? Is the amount of money set aside by Poly Met sufficient for monitoring and maintenance for 500 years?
- If Poly Met goes bankrupt, is dissolved or is purchased by another mining company while still in operation, what fiscal and environmental protections are in place?
- Is PolyMet responsible for anything in the 500 years following closure?

Local People

- The SDEIS states that 500 people are expected to be employed during construction of the mine about one year, 360 employed during operation for 20 years and 322 indirect jobs are expected to be created in the local community.
- How many of the jobs will be technical experts brought in from distant places?
- The higher the number of locally hired miners, the fewer indirect jobs will be needed since local people already have local services.
- The more people that are hired and then move into the area, the more indirect jobs will be created. However, these newcomers will take the mining jobs from the local people.
- The number of jobs for local people will be less than the sum of the number of mining jobs added to the indirect jobs, 682.
- How many jobs will be lost the tourism industry?

Government Entities/ All tax payers

- How many tax dollars have already been spent on this project?
- What is the anticipated tax revenue generated from 20 years of mining?
- How is that divided between Federal, state and local entities?
- What is the expected cost of post-mining site management for 500 years?
- Who picks up the cost for post-mining site management for 500 years?
- What tax funds will be withheld for anticipated post-mining site management?
- Who picks up the bill if waste containment is not confined for 500 years?
- What is the net gain or loss for combined government entities?
- What provisions for future expansion of mining and processing have been inadvertently

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kate Winsor

44051

The following are my comments on the PolyMet Sulfide Mine DEIS: 1- The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's waters safe and clean. 2- The proposed mine plan does not provide contingency plans should an accident occur. 3- The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. 4- The proposed mine plan does not account for how treating polluted waters will be paid. I am especially concerned about the impact such a mine will have on resident, nesting, and migratory birds. I am also concerned about the impact to the Superior National Forest. Please reject this plan, as it imposes unacceptable risks to Minnesota's environment. Thank you. Kate Winsor

Kate Zimmerman

54360

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing you to express my opinion on the PolyMet mining project. I do not support the project for the following reasons. The first reason is that the proposed project could affect the endangered or threatened species that live in this area. They could be affected by the noise, traffic or vibrations caused to their habitats by the projects. Their habitats could also be destroyed or removed by the construction of the mine. They could also be affected by water pollution or changes in the quality of the water or the air caused by the waste products of the proposed mine. Another reason that I do not support the project is the effect it could have on the Ojibwa that live in this area. The waste products from the project could affect the animals and plants in that area. Some resources that they use could be affected as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project could also affect other cultural resources that are located in or near the area of the project. Another reason is that the project will affect the quality of the water in that area. The project is located on a site that is near the Partridge and Embarrass rivers. These rivers then flow into the St. Louis River and from there will flow into Lake Superior. The project could add to the water Mercury that might be present in waste materials. Metals could also be released that will affect organism in the water even if it is a low concentration of the metals. It could also add sulfate to the water from the chemical reactions of the waste products. This sulfate could affect the growth and viability of wild rice that is grown on the rivers. The proposed project could also affect the wild rice that is grown downstream of the site for the project. Wild rice is an important environmental resource of Minnesota and also has a cultural significance to the Ojibwa people of Minnesota. To conclude there are many reasons why I feel that the proposed project is not a good idea. The project will affect different cultural and environmental resources of northeastern Minnesota. Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Sincerely, Kate Zimmerman

Katelyn Soukkala

15080

Katie Soukkala Ms Olson Chemistry, Hour 4 1/30/14 Copper Mining Aka Contamination. Copper mining is the excavating of a natural resource called copper. Recently, a large copper vein was discovered near Babbitt and Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. This state has been considering excavating the extremely useful metal. Right now, experts are weighing the effects on the environment versus the profit for our economy. Sulfide mining has a few benefits, however I believe the detrimental impact it will have on our environment outweighs all of the potential gains. I am against copper mining in Minnesota for many reasons. The first reason being that when mining copper, sulfate is released, and when mixed with air and water this creates sulfuric acid. Sulfuric acid will lead to the production of toxic heavy metals in water. This will lead to the methylation of mercury. Methylmercury is the kind that accumulates in fish which can put humans in danger of having mercury toxicity. Another reason that I disagree with letting PolyMet mine in Minnesota is because the mine would be in the Superior National Forest which is rich in peatlands. Cutting down the forest would not only kill many plants and animals, it also would destroy peatlands. Peat is the first stage in the process of creating fossil fuels. In our fossil fuel driven world, we cannot afford to destroy valuable hydrocarbon. The final reason that I oppose mining near Babbitt and Hoyt lakes, Minnesota, is because the mine would only be open for twenty years and there would be over five hundred years of environmental damage. It seems like a huge habitat loss for such little gain. PolyMet should find a cleaner, more eco-friendly way to mine the copper. If they can do this, then maybe it would be more reasonable to possibly consider mining the ore. Harming our delicate ecosystem is not something to be taken lightly. As one can see, I do not agree with PolyMet's way of mining in Minnesota as of right now. If they were to figure out a way to protect the environment, I would reconsider my opinion. Too much of our ecosystem is at risk with the current mining plan. It is important for you to consider my input as a fellow Minnesotan. This issue will directly affect people that live anywhere near the mine and the watersheds it is located near. Thank you for your time.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kateri Trembley

40179

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

katharine odell

40389

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, katharine odell 1415 Vilas ave Madison, WI 53711 US

Katharine Rauk

52349

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Katharine Rauk 1924 Drew Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katherine D. Doerr 19984

I am shocked that the state of Minnesota is considering this proposal in light of evidence that this project threatens the quality of a major water shed and would create serious air pollution in a highly valued tourist area. Please consider the value of our state's public health, especially the air and water resources, which would be prohibitively costly to rectify, if damaged. A private company whose aim is to profit cannot override considerations of public health and safety. The long term costs to our northern communities with the loss of safe drinking, bathing water and breathable air cannot be overlooked. The idea that providing jobs is worth such a trade off is ludicrous and very short sighted. We have an obligation to be good stewards of our natural resources and prevent waste and destruction for private, short term profit at the expense of general welfare. The Department of Natural Resources has a moral duty to protect Minnesota's treasured land and her people. Economic gain from our natural resources needs to be sustainable and safe for everyone. Katherine D. Doerr 112 Edgewood Court Wayzata, MN 55391 612-396-8000 Katherine D. Doerr kadedoe2@gmail-com

Katherine Doyle 41813

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Although mining jobs are important to Northern Minnesota, a healthy habitat for humans, animals, and plants is certainly more important. At some point, the mining industry may be able to protect Minnesota by treating dangerous pollutants before they are expelled into the environment. This is not currently the case. If this does become mechanically and financially feasible, please make sure the mining companies are able to pay for the substantial costs of dealing with the pollution. The unmeasurable and unpredictable long term costs should not be shifted to the tax payers. As with physicians who must take the Hippocratic Oath, the Minnesota DNR's first job should be to do no harm and protect the environment. Columbus arrived in America a little over 500 years ago. It is impossible for us humans to predict what the world will be like in 100, let alone 500 years. Yes, Minnesota has one of the largest copper nickel deposits in the world, and hopefully someday we will be able to extract these precious metals without the risk of serious environmental harm. At this moment in time, however, the risk is very real and should not be tolerated by an agency with the responsibility of protecting our precious environmental resources. Pollution is not progress, and jobs which pollute the environment are not blessings. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine, and to make sure all future mines do not endanger our wilderness, watersheds, wildlife, and the personal health of the people you have the responsibility to protect-whether they are currently living or our great, great, great, great, great, great, great, great, great grandchildren. Respectfully Submitted, Katherine Doyle 2232 Vermilion Road Duluth, MN 55803 Sincerely, Ms Katherine Doyle 2232 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803-2216 (218) 724-0589

Katherine G Lewis 54807

See attachment

Katherine G. Lewis 39022

From: katherine lewis [mailto:kglewis1@gmail-com] Sent: Saturday, March 08, 2014 3:14 PM To: Stine, John (MPCA) Subject: No to PolyMet mine Please do not let centuries of environmental damage occur in exchange for brief commercial gain. We should be recycling our copper rather than selling it abroad and doing unnecessary mining here. Please OPPOSE the POLYMET MINE.. Sincerely, Katherine G. Lewis

Katherine G. Pohlman 43022

Here is my mailing address: Katie Pohlman 908 Curtis Avenue Columbia, MO 65201 email: HYPERLINK "mailto:kgp2q3@mail.missouri-edu"kgp2q3@mail.missouri-edu phone: (301) 529-9911 Katie Pohlman University of Missouri-Columbia Journalism and Environmental Science Major University News Editor, The Maneater HYPERLINK "mailto:kgp2q3@mail.missouri-edu"kgp2q3@mail.missouri-edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katherine Huska 42070

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Katherine Huska 211 N 24th Ave E Duluth, MN 55812-1860

Katherine Krumwiede 38958

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. Lake Superior is one of our most beautiful and valuable resources in Minnesota, and needs our protection from the industrial world. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Katherine Krumwiede 2415 Hennepin Ave Minneapolis, MN 55405-2605

katherine lewis 41821

Please do not let centuries of environmental damage occur in exchange for brief commercial gain. We should be recycling our copper rather than selling it abroad and doing some unnecessary mining here. And on public land, for private profit. OPPOSE the POLYMET MINE. Thank you Katherine G. Lewis

41827

To whom it may concern- Please do not allow centuries of environmental damage to occur in exchange for short-term personal gain. We need to recycle copper, not sell it overseas, and not mine it unnecessarily here. This mine will create some temporary jobs but cause enormous damage on public lands. NO TO POLYMET MINE..
Katherine G. Lewis

Katherine Loban 39626

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Katherine Loban 4772 Oak Dr Moose Lake, MN 55767-9208 (218) 485-8777

Katherine M Lewis 54808

See attachment

Katherine McClure 58125

NO MINING NOW! WAIT UNTIL THE TECHNOLOGY IMPROVES1. New untested mining procedures should not be tested on our state2. 500+ years of pollution is too long for so few jobs and so little money3. We would save money by funding 350 jobs instead of paying for clean up later. Let's find 350 green jobs or environmental jobs up north4. You can't expect to live in pristine wilderness and also necessarily have a good paying job (I moved to the T.C.)5. Why Polymet! Why not a state run mine?

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kathleen

44390

To Department of Natural Resources regarding Polymet Environmental Review The following are comments from: Kathleen Anderson 3388 Petrell Rd Brimson, MN 55602 David Olafson 1235 Pequawayan Lake Rd Duluth, MN 55803 Alicia Hachfeld 619 North St Apt 3 St Paul, MN 55106 Brian Hubbard 619 North St Apt 3 St Paul MN 55106 Department of Natural Resources, It is our understanding that there is a mission of the DNR and laws that direct you to protect our natural resources. We also feel that we have a moral obligation to care for the Earth and insure that it is treated in a way that does not harm people and animals. We have great concerns with much of the information in the Environmental Impact Statement and are opposed to granting any permits to Polymet. Regarding Economic Impact, Minnesota law states that sulfide mines be maintenance free at closure. Waste rock and water will need to be contained for hundreds of years. This company has not indicated that it will guarantee that it will be in business this long or that it will pay for the maintenance/clean up for any pollution. How can we be assured that there will be a company or adequate money if there are any problems. This is a concern because in the history of sulfide mining , mining companies are unable to point to a sulfide mine that has ever been developed, operated or closed with out producing polluted drainage. The US EPA identified hardrock mining as our nation's top toxic producing industry. In 2010 the metal mining industry was responsible for 41% of all toxins in the environment. The history of sulfide mining is filled with companies going bankrupt or lacking financial resources to respond to pollution. The Summitville Mine, Colorado, the Zortman Landusky Mine, Montana, the Gilt Edge Mine, South Dakota all bankrupt and the taxpayers are paying millions for clean up. The Flambeau Mine in Wisconsin has surface water runoff and does not meet Wisconsin water quality standards. It is closed and Wisconsin has a moratorium on this mining because it can not be proven to be safe. Polymet has not proven it will not pollute, just because it says it won't and they have a computer analysis that says it won't. There will be water runoff. This is northern Minnesota, there are heavy rains, floods, snowstorms, . the rock and water cannot be contained permanently and safely. There are many statements about computer models. Who has done these models. Are they really done by impartial and totally scientific methods. Has the company had any input, are they reliable. The standards and quality we want have never been met in a real sulfide mine and that is important to consider. The DNR itself has a report confirming what tribal scientists have said for years that the actual rate of ground water base flow is 200-300% higher than in the SDEIS. This puts in question many statements that Polymet has made. It has been shown that this mining has by products of arsenic and thallium which have been linked to increased risk of cancer. We live and work downstream of this proposed mine and do not want our water contaminated and Polymet has not proven that it will not be. Also on the economic impact, we work at a tourism business very close to the proposed Polymet. They may create jobs but they will also negatively impact existing businesses. Our business depends on clean water, clean air, quiet, wildlife and a reputation for these things. Have you really checked out how much tourism exists by sulfide mines. Our guests come from all over the world because of our pristine natural resources. We are being sold out and once we are polluted, it will never be the same. Tourism is a sustainable industry and has not been considered adequately for the negative impact it will have on us. Also have property values been considered. I already know of people who will not buy in this area because of the mine. Another grave concern mentioned

Kathleen A Portogue

54898

See attachment

Kathleen Brown

34910

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest When these toxins reach the air, they will leach into the ground water and into the local rivers, streams and water sources. Minnesota is the home of the Mississippi and of the largest fresh water lake in the world, Lake Superior. Both of these bodies would become contaminated forever. Once we allow permits, Glencor Xstrata is ready to buy out Polymet company and take over. They are known worldwide for their poor quality in care of the environment. They have poured acid directly into the rivers of Africa and Peru is filing lawsuits against them for their destructive policies. We cannot let this happen here. We must stop them before it is too late. Sincerely, Kathleen Brown 7244 York Ave S Apt 130 Edina, MN 55435-4415 (952) 393-6418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Bryant

57217

We have a family home in the mining area. We are concerned that the water for our home will be polluted and the streams and ponds will be negatively impacted. How can homeowners in the area be assured of water quality and what recourse will we have if the water is polluted? Kathleen W. Bryant 3320 Hill Lane Wayzata, MN 55391

Kathleen Donnelly

16877

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Felt

41513

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Felt

41514

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Kathleen Groh

41878

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I had lived in the Arrowhead for 17 years and watched and witnessed the struggle to reclaim the scarred land from pit and taconite mining. The tailings polluted Lake Superior and no amount of clean up will ever recover all that was lost. Copper mining is even MORE devastating and the years of pollution doesn't begin to justify short-term job gains. It just isn't worth it once the mines are depleted and the waste is left behind for generations. My grandchildren will be left with this and wonder why I ever let it happen. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Kathleen Groh 114 Bichner Ln Mahtomedi, MN 55115-6810 (651) 777-0991

Kathleen Hamill

35862

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, It is unconscionable to risk irreparable damage to the Boundary Waters region and Lake Superior. Any short-term economic benefit is eclipsed by the possibility of the devastating long-term consequences that may be suffered by our children and our children's children. We should act as the custodians of Earth, not her robber and rapist, not only out of kindness and goodness, but also enlightened self-interest. Sincerely, Kathleen Hamill 9n639 Koshare Trl Elgin, IL 60124-4305

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Hills 47084

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved, because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. If this permit is issued and the project continues, it will be nothing less than a disaster. In addition to the irreparable harm it will do to the water and the wildlife and people who depend on it, the destruction to the landscape will be heartbreaking. Northern Minnesota is already under great risk from climate change. The last thing we need is to add to that. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. This decision should not be based on popular opinion, but on the facts of the situation, which show undoubtedly that the trade-off of twenty years of a few mining jobs for hundreds of years of pollution of sensitive habitats and a permanent ugly blot on the landscape is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kathleen Hills 2015 Greysolon Rd Duluth, MN 55812-2108 (218) 349-5955

Kathleen J Eggers 54785

See attachment

Kathleen Jones 14833

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Jones 38959

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. DO WE NEED COPPER. WHAT ABOUT FIBER OPTICS. Sincerely, Ms Kathleen Jones 469 Ferndale Woods Rd Wayzata, MN 55391-1542

kathleen klinkenberg 52241

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, kathleen klinkenberg 712 4th st se apt 2 Minneapolis, MN 55414

Kathleen M. Sullivan 42282

I wish to state unequivocally I am totally AGAINST permitting PolyMet to mine in NE Minnesota. The poses too much of a danger of contaminating the precious waters and watershed of the area that is our one last hope of unspoiled wilderness. The sulfide residue will leach into our waters for way too long a time to risk it for 20 yrs of jobs. NO. No permit. Kathleen Sullivan 28 Mort Meadow Rd Grand Marais, MN 55604

Kathleen McGee 58126

Polymet Sulfide Mine is a bad idea and should be rejected- it is not a sustainable profit model. I am not native to Minnesota and in the past 17 years that I have lived here have slowly discovered the beauty of the north woods. I am used to the heights of the Sierra Nevada but the Boundary Waters is like no place on earth. I tell everyone I can to make sure that the boundary waters are on their list of trips they must take. Why then would anyone agree to risk polluting this amazing wilderness area in order to realize short-term profits that benefit a multi-national company- Glencoe? Would the state really prefer to have jobs in the short term but a polluted landscape in the long run? The negatives are just too great: • There has never been a sulfide mine that did not pollute • The state will have to pay for cleanup after the company is gone so ROI on a sulfide mine are greatly diminished • Future water quality standards cannot be guaranteed by the company • The state would be a fool to move ahead with this project and see the waterways polluted and the beauty of the boundary waters destroyed. If history is a lesson, this pillaging of the land leads to harm to humans, the land and wildlife. The cost is too great. Please do not proceed with this misguided plan.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Mcquillan

15979

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Miller

19456

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Kathleen Miller I am a property owner on White Iron Lake and will be affected by these important decisions that are being reviewed. I expect that these meetings will be very well attended and not likely to accurately reflect the interest by residents unless more opportunities are offered. Three meetings is ridiculously few for this important issue. I do health research at the University of Minnesota and am expected to get far more community input for decisions that affect far fewer individuals. Kathleen Miller 153 Sunset Road Ely MN 55731, MN 55731 612-203-2459

43035

Kathleen Miller, BSN, CCRC

Kathleen Moraski

42459

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Kathleen Moraski 7611 Teal Bay Woodbury, MN 55125-1557 (651) 271-2590

43100

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Kathleen Moraski 7611 Teal Bay Saint Paul, MN 55125

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Peippo 54701

See attachment

Kathleen Petersen 16136

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Smith

52560

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Soehl

15951

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kathleen Soehl 65055 340th Ave Lake City, MN 55041

Kathleen Sullivan

42855

See attachment

Kathleen Walker

41859

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. While I myself do not reside in Minnesota, my children, grandchildren and other relatives do. My husband and I are frequent visitors and plan to reside there in the near future. I am always proud to disclose my Minnesota ties to others, not only boasting about the pristine beauty of the many untouched areas in the State, but the fact that The great state of Minnesota cares about preserving and protecting its natural resources for generations to come. I hope I am not wrong. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Kathleen Walker 622 Captains Way Reedville, VA 22539-3236

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathleen Zurcher

41972

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kathleen Zurcher Prior Lake, Minnesota

Kathleen Zweber

45003

As a Minnesota citizen, I oppose the mining project proposed by PolyMet because I believe that the risks to the Northern Minnesota ecosystem and to our State's economy are not worth taking. Although some have pointed out benefits like job creation from this project, such benefits are short-term and there is too much potential for mining profit to come at the expense of existing livelihoods and cost more in the long run especially if Minnesota's taxpayers end up with a bill for cleaning up after the mine closes. Minnesota's unique environmental and natural resources are priceless and should be preserved for generations to come. Kathleen J. Zweber 1418 Torgeson Road Duluth, MN 55804 (218) 522-0007

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Faley

38961

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Kathryn Hanson

40941

I am submitting comments as a concerned citizen of northern Minnesota. My name and husbands name and address are as follows: Kathryn and Dirk Hanson 1491 Pyhola Ctwy Ely, MN 55731- I have noted specific comments in the attached files. Overall, we are concerned that: 1- The public was not given sufficient time to digest the very long document. 2- Input parameters going into the various numerical models may not reflect the true range of uncertainty and hence the results of the modeling may not accurately represent the hazard. It would seem that additional analyses or sensitivity studies are warranted to show that the model results are sound. 3- The economic downsides of sulfide mining-impact on recreational property value, tourism, short-term negative impacts on communities of transient workers-are not adequately accounted for. The cache of the lake country around Ely, MN, the reason why I relocated here in 1984 along with a number of key innovators and business owners, is being irreparably damaged by the threat of long-term pollution for short-term mining profits. 4- There is no reason to assume that the State of Minnesota will not be left paying for the pollution that will ultimately ensue. I am not willing to bank on yet unproven mitigation measures and non-mechanical post-closure promises.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Iverson

4614

Jan 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

43034

Please see the attached comments. Thank you, Kathryn J. Iverson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Keiner

40619

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Kathryn Keiner 2688 61st St Fulda, MN 56131-9599 (507) 425-2788

Kathryn L Glessing

42040

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kathryn L Glessing Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kathryn Larson

43256

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the PolyMet. I have reviewed the SDEIS and believe that while it is not perfect, it is a detailed, thoughtful consideration of environmental, social and economic impacts of the project. I believe the SDEIS shows a need for the project and shows that it can be done successfully, minimizing impact to the environment. I trust the process and I trust the State and Federal Agencies that will be granting permits for the project. I am impressed that PolyMet will use and existing Brownfields site and reuse existing infrastructure. Based on my review of the SDEIS, I am convinced that PolyMet will provide a needed service (producing metals that are in demand) in an environmentally responsible manner that will also generate a positive economic effect on Minnesota and the entire United States. Respectfully Submitted, Kathryn Larson 120 Greenwood Lane Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Lee

57880

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project. Lake Baikal is at risk already. The world needs MN freshwater protected. Tx facilities require maintaining. We can NOT predict the future. The risks are too great.

Kathryn M Stingl

43097

To whom it may concern: I have grave concerns about preserving the St Louis watershed from any contamination from the results of copper mining. The habitats are pristine. The water all leads to our "Big Lake" Superior. I also have concerns about the effects of closure of the mine on our water sources . Thanks for "listening". Kathryn Stingl Duluth MN 55803 Confidentiality Notice: This E-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply E-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Kathryn Marschalk

40748

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Lets get moving . The people are desperate for decent paying jobs. This has been drug out long enough. NAME Kathryn Marschalk ADDRESS 6382Birch StApt 21 North Branch,Minnesota 55056

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn McMurray

44181

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Our family owns property and resides seasonally near Ely, Minnesota. We believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and that this destructive project must not proceed as currently proposed because of the 1) widespread and severe environmental damage inherent in the PolyMet project and 2) the failure of the SDEIS to include a cost/benefit analysis and specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. We believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. 3) Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures -The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. -The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The Mine Plan Requires an Absurd and Unachievable Level of Monitoring and Maintenance for Many Centuries -Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 requires that the site must be maintenance-free at closure, but the PolyMet mining plan calls for at least 500 years of active water treatment. -526 acres of land, covered by more than 167 million tons of waste rock, would be covered by a plast

Kathryn Mensing

57266

I would like to see specific research on the impact on women's health, specifically on breast cancer and toxin deposit in mammal glands. I also would like also a report that takes into consideration the rights, needs, and health effects on Native American Reservations and communities. Kathryn Mensing 930 North 13th Ave East Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Rod

39185

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Kathryn Rod Kathryn Rod 4048 Fairview Rd Duluth, MN 55803

Kathryn Rudd

16253

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Schmitz

41723

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Kathryn Schmitz 202 Allen Ave Green Bay, WI 54302-4404 (920) 468-8972

Kathryn Sergent

40979

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Kathryn Sergent 300 Charles Ave Amherst, OH 44001-2080 (440) 772-7007

Kathryn Stoneman

41036

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Not only are Minnesotans, but I also am very concerned,with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. The cost of potential damage to the wetlands, wildlife and habitat to wildlife is a real possibility. In addition, there are far reaching problems with impact on human life and quality of water and soil damage for miles and miles, should there be leakages or inability to handle waste products. This is an extremely real possibility. Are you willing to risk so much on this project. Future generations will have you to thank for this poisonous fiasco should leaks and human mistakes come to pass. I understand that the products gained are important to all of our lives but the risks are too great. Our Federal lands should be protected from this type of exploitation. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Kathryn Stoneman 1501 Claremont Ave Richmond, VA 23227-4031 (804) 264-8709

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathryn Yetter

54218

I'm writing to you today to express my views on the proposed copper mine in Northern Minnesota. I attend a Y camp in the boundary waters on Burnside lake. For years I've enjoyed the pristine wilderness. The clean water and the fresh air that I can find in that area away from the city. The opportunity to fish and see wilderness is a novel one for a child raised in the city with parents who are fundamentally opposed to camping. Due to my fantastic experience in that area I oppose the use of sulfide mining. The proposed copper mine would produce 99% waste, far too high a price to pay for the pine trees. It could pollute one of the purest watersheds in the area, far too high a price to pay for the fish. The degradation of the environment would diminish future revenues from ecotourism. Far too high a price to pay for short term, dirty, unsustainable jobs. Please do not approve the copper mine so that future generations can enjoy the wilderness like I have. Any amount of degradation or habitat loss is too high a price to pay.

Kathy Alvig

19999

Dear Sir, I grew up just outside of Duluth. I heard horror stories about iron mining mishaps for miners and companies all the time. When my friends' loved ones started dying from the impact of iron mining, there was nothing any one could do but go to the funerals. The mining companies were always in control. Also, we know there is significant damage to the earth, ground water, and also wildlife habitat that comes from the greed mining operations bring. There is no such thing as real recovery from this. Once the soil earth is damaged, once ancient trees are Knocked down (called overburden by miners), and wildlife habitat is impacted, there is no true reclamation. We lived through the rape of the land during iron mining (still suffer from it) in northern Mn. Take a look around Chisholm and Hibbing and see what the land looks like. Do we want that area looking like a huge open sore. When will the whole state of Mn understand that there is a huge price when there is profit from such mining . When will today's decision makers understand that a decision to support mining does not support current land owners who do not hold mineral rights. There is a huge price to pay. Mining copper in Mn will bring much profit to the mining companies who I understand are based in South America.. Not even from the USA. All of the mining companies profits will go to South America on the backs of the people who live up near Hoyt Lakes. South American companies and share holders will profit on the backs of our childrens safety and good health. This area that makes northern Mn a tourist destination will suffer from air and water pollution, congestion from transportation of the ore, and company controls and bullying. I hope the lobbyists who have been hired by the mining companies do not win. I hope the legislature is smart and strong and does not succumb to pressure regarding this issue. Kathy Alvig Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Baker

16224

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Burkett

52195

Dear EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay, My understanding is the proposed open pit sulfide mine is to extract copper, nickel and other metals. In other states sulfide mining is associated with long lasting water pollution and has never operated without polluting its nearby waters. Looking at a map, besides the nearby lakes, the Embarrass River runs right by the plant site, flows into the St Louis River and then into Lake Superior. The Partridge River winds around the mine site and does the same. As you must certainly know this type of hard rock mining of sulfide ores react with oxygen in the air and water (precipitation and other water sources) and forms sulfuric acid. We know this acid is harmful to fish and other water organisms and causes toxic heavy metals in the rocks to leach out. We know these toxic heavy metals are harmful to people and wildlife alike. Acid mine drainage can stick around for more than a millennium. Many sulfide mining companies have failed to provide financially for dealing with this long lasting pollution and then go belly up. As a taxpayer I am not willing to be responsible for the liability of clean up. In early 2010 the EPA gave the rating of Environmentally Unsatisfactory and Inadequate for this project plan PolyMet set forth and I am leery that the standards even come close to protecting our waters and environment for the long term. It is disturbing that there were no contingency plans included with their proposal for accidents from failures of collection and treatment systems, tailings basin failure, accidental releases, etc Where is the plan regarding treatment of the water should a plant break down and what is the plan for where the toxic polluted water will go when this inevitably happens. One is left to wonder why was this not included. This lack of information is a red flag. Yearly, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin plus over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will go untreated into the ground water. I foresee an additional 6-2 + million gallons of contaminated toxic water per day being released directly into the environment when treatment plants breakdown. With something so obviously needed to safeguard environmental safety, yet not included in their proposal, I see no indication that PolyMet is committed to clean mining. I find this of grave concern especially when the waste water treatment plant located off site would need to run for the next 200 years and a long 500 years for the water treatment plant on site. Allowing this mine to go into production for the short anticipated life span of 20 years is clearly for short term gains. 200 years, 500 years and 1000's of years of treating the toxic pollution created by this mine is a long term commitment with long term consequences consequences that we would be forcing upon our future generations. I don't know anyone who would consider this acceptable or ethical. I find this mining process dangerously irresponsible, on a multitude of levels, thus strongly disagree with allowing this to happen anywhere and that includes here in our own back yaRd Sincerely, Kathy Burkett 14820 13th Pl N Plymouth, Mn 55447 763 208 9171

Kathy Glover

39405

Dear Madame or Sir, Please count me among those who oppose mining in this sensitive wilderness. Thank you for making a comment period available to the public. Hoping that long term values (healthy waters, wilderness, respect for the land) will weigh greater than short term goals (money, money, money). Thank you Kathy Glover St Paul MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Holander

18243

Kathy Hollander, K-A-T-H-Y, H-O-L-L-A-N-D-E-R. My name is Kathy Hollander. I'm a Minneapolis resident who also owns lands in St. Louis County in Pequaywan Township. I love the swaying birch and spruce trees of Northern Minnesota and how clean the air smells. My family goes there to escape the smog of the Twin Cities. I have drunk the water from the lake near our land, used it to wash dishes and my child, as well as swim in it. When it came time to put in a well, we did that. I have seen the lake swell to an all-time-high level during unprecedented rains and dwindle down to very low levels during periods of drought. I am concerned about water and land use. At the legislature last year, I heard about some of the wells in Northern Minnesota drying up. I would like to know how much fresh water, both ground and underground this project is scheduled to use. I am not aware of anywhere in the SDEIS where the amount is specified. With climate change coming, there will be areas of drought and areas of heavier-than-normal rainfall that quickly run off. In a drought year, will there be enough water for people and animals to use for drinking water? Will the streams still flow? Will the stream-fed lakes dry up? Will the mining company be able to take all they want even in a drought year? I want this specifics in the SDEIS. And I'm also concerned about the land exchange. By law, an appraisal must be done on the land being lost in the Superior National Forest, and on the new land that will be exchanged to make sure that the new land is worth at least 75 percent of the value of the land being given up. We the people the of Minnesota own the land now, although it belonged to the Anishinaabe people before the European settlers. The Anishinaabe people retained their rights to hunting, fishing and gathering on this land and now even that will be taken from them. What kind of people are we that we do this to the native people of our land. The forest service should disclose to us, the public, all land appraisal information now and extend the comment period so we the taxpayers can comment on this land-exchange issue. On the current land, the state owns the mineral rights. The new lands have split mineral rights. There are no covenants to prevent mining. The land exchange proposed by PolyMet should be rejected since it's not in the public interest. PolyMet must find land where the public owns the mineral rights. No split mineral leases to sell off. And the swap is not equal. We will have a net loss of over 6,000 acres of lands with high biodiversity. We will have a net loss of over 2,000 acres of mature forests and be given less mature forests in exchange. We will lose over 1,400 acres of flood plains. The exchange should be denied as we, the taxpayers, end up with a lot less. It is horrifying that we have to fight you our own government to save the environment as Ansel Adams. Reject the exchange of the Superior National Forest land for the PolyMet project. Thank you.

Kathy Hollander

18228

That's rough being the last speaker. I think I would have rather been the first. My name is Kathy Hollander, and I vacation in St. Louis County. I love the white birch and the white pine trees of Northern Minnesota and how clean the air smells. Many people have spoken about our love for the environment tonight. I have drunk the water from the lake that I have a cabin on, I've used it to wash dishes, I've washed my child with it as well as went swimming in it. I've seen the lake swell to an all-time high level during the last, what was it, 100-year flood in Duluth, and also dwindle down to very low levels during the drought that we had last summer. I am concerned about water and land use. At the legislature last year, I heard about some of the wells north of Duluth are drying up. Who would have guessed? This is drinking water. I would like to know how much fresh water, both ground and underground, this project is scheduled to use. I am not aware of anywhere in the SDEIS where the amount is specified. With climate change coming, there will be areas of drought and areas of heavier than normal rainfall that quickly runs off. In this drought year, will there be enough water for people and animals to use for drinking water? Will the streams still flow? Will the stream-fed lakes dry up? Will the mining company be able to take all the water they want, even in a drought year. I'm reminded of the Aspac River in Northern Canada where the river runs dry when the mining company takes as much water as they need. Also, I'm concerned about the land exchange. By law, an appraisal must be done on the land being given up in the Superior National Forest, and on the new land that will be exchanged to make sure that the new land is worth at least 75 percent of the value of the lands being given up. We the people of Minnesota own that land now, although it belonged to the native people before the European settlers. The native people retained their rights to hunting, fishing and gathering on this land and now even that will be taken from them. What kind of people are we that we do this to the native people of our land? The forest service should disclose to the public all land appraisal information now and extend the comment period so we taxpayers can comment on this land exchange issue. On the current land, the state owns the surface minerals rights. The new lands have split mineral rights. There are no covenants to prevent mining. The PolyMet must find land where the public owns the mineral rights. No mineral leases to sell off. It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environments that Ansel Adams (inaudible.) We trust exchange of the Superior National Forest of the PolyMet project. It's not in the public interest. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Iverson

10057

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kathy Iverson 2641 Jersey Avenue South St Louis Park, MN 55426

18274

My name is Kathy Iverson. I am here to submit my perspectives on this big decision. We have had a cabin up by -- well, it is at the end of the Arrowhead Trail in northern Minnesota. So, as a girl I had had an opportunity to play and recreate in that wilderness area and came to appreciate the fishing with my father, with my brothers, and came to appreciate the beautiful woods, with canoeing. And, really, I mean it was so different from urban living, because I lived in Minneapolis my whole life. And so the thought that there are countless lakes and rivers that could be contaminated just, you know, to me is No. 1. That is something so precious that we cannot put a dollar figure on that. It is about heritage. It is about passing on to our children and our grandchildren our legacy that we have experienced in our lives. We have every bit of responsibility in protecting that environment and in ensuring that they are going to have the same experience that we had. That's all I got to say. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Iverson

18804

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kathy Iverson 2641 Jersey Avenue South St Louis Park, MN 55426

50878

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kathy Iverson 2641 Jersey Avenue South St Louis Park, MN 55426

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Kahn 47661

All the plans for cleaning up the pollution caused by mining can never make nature as it was before. You can't buy that. Just don't mess it up in the first place. Please, no destructive acid pit mining in that beautiful area.

Kathy Klotz 39353

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Kathy Klotz 33619 County Road 32 Utica, MN 55979-4503

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Kormanik

40444

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Kathy Magnuson

42969

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Murn

47798

From: Kathy Murn [mailto:kmurn09@gmail-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 1:17 PM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: PolyMet Dear Sir, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health.

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health:
 - Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources.
 - Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured.
 - Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution.
 - Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including:
 - 1- Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public.
 - 2- Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from taili

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Ogle

46728

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("PolyMet SDEIS") fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential sites. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction

Kathy Palmquist

39704

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Kathy Palmquist 803 Glen Ln Winona, MN 55987-4138 (507) 454-5532

Kathy Sidles

9678

I'm against allowing the mining because the acid concentration of the waste water is too high and persists too long. Wildlife is sensitive to acid level, and the potential for destroying the water-dependant wildlife is too great. There is no way the company can guarantee they will pay for what the public - including other private companies - can loose. The risk of pollution and extent of pollution and the time frame for risk is too great. We have to think of other ways to create jobs, and not risk losing existing and potential jobs because of this particular type of pollution. Kathy Sidles 1380 Winchell St Saint Paul, MN 55106 651-771-7528

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kathy Thonvold

41494

Dear Sirs; I am a resident of Minnesota and our family has long enjoyed trips to Northern Minnesota and particularly the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. I am writing to express my concern in regard to the proposed PolyMet copper mine in the Hoyt Lakes/Ely area. I am opposed to such an operation in that area and am gravely concerned in regard to the effect on not only the pristine Boundary Waters Canoe Area, a national treasure to be sure, but all water in the area and the safeguarding of that area for the generations who follow us. From what I have read, PolyMet does not seem to be able to give 100% guarantees that money will be there for the cleanup after the mining has ended, or that they themselves will even be there to see that the cleanup is done. I am strongly opposed to the proposed mining and would ask that you consider carefully and protect faithfully this beautiful area for ALL of us to enjoy long into the future. Sincerely, Kathleen Thonvold 1316 Co. Rd 9 SE Willmar, MN 56201

Kathy Witherow

39068

---Original Message--- From: Kwithero@umn-edu [mailto:Kwithero@umn-edu] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 9:32 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Kathy Witherow 12675 Tussock Ct Eden Prairie, MN 55344-3942

Katie Feterl

41039

I am a third-year undergrad who attended a very well put together interactive presentation at Gustavus Adolphus College on the meaning and issues surrounding the proposed PolyMet Mining project near Ely, MN. I am not a resident of Ely, and have only visited the area once (it was beautiful). Even though I have no direct stake in the project, I have been moved to comment. What I learned reaffirmed something I've wanted for a long time—a shift in focus from the immediate short term benefits to the long-term consequences. 20 years of jobs is not worth lifetimes of a destroyed environment that presently largely contributes to the tourism industry of Northern Minnesota. The construction of this mine will only expedite the implementation of future mines in the area, accelerating environmental degradation. Tourism will most likely tank if the area is unhealthy and unsafe. The mine is not the only option for providing jobs. It does not mean the end of Ely if it is not constructed. If people believe that, they have little faith in their own ingenuity and abilities. However, it could put Ely in a much worse position in a few decades should there be large health consequences and/or reduced tourism due to acidic water supply that destroys the life system around it. Weighing the short and long term benefits and consequences, it simply doesn't make sense to take the risk of passing the PolyMet project. Sincerely, Katie Feterl St Peter, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katie Fournier 58097

Thanks for this opportunity to comment! The limited number of jobs provided by this project for a limited number of years is not a valid trade for the prospect of another economic bust in NE Minn when the mining is finished. We have seen the boom/bust cycle too often from extractive industries in this part of the state. When you add the prospect of remediating, pollution for centuries (when our Republic itself is only ca 230 years old), it seems clear that we in Minn and elsewhere in the world should focus on reuse and recycling of needed materials, rather than putting our waters and landscape at risk. Please see Barton Sutter's comments in the Star Tribune 1/26/14. He said this much better than I can.

Katie Haws 42882

I submit the attached comments for your consideration in the Polymet Mine EIS as part of the public comment record. Please respond to my comments and concerns. Thank you, Katherine V. Haws (address on the attached document)

Katie Heitzig 42866

See attachment

42867

See attachment

42875

See attachment

Katie Karbo 54679

See attachment

Katie Krikorian 42641

See attachment

42861

See attachment

47020

thank you. I think you have my address, but just in case its: Katie Krikorian 1313 Missouri Ave Duluth, MN 55811 I really don't believe this kind of mining should be allowed in this region at this time. It's not safe or economical in the long term. Thank you for working so hard on this. On Wed, Mar 5, 2014 at 2:53 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katie Perkins

39903

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Katie Perkins 11311 133rd Ave N Dayton, MN 55327-9421

Katie Prock

39880

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Katie Prock 3120 3rd Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3221

Katie Smet

41611

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Katie Smet Rochester, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katie Weddle Langer 39529

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The fact that this type of mining has not been proven safe is extremely concerning, and the State of Minnesota should not allow it. We can't afford to damage the natural resources that we need in order to live healthy lives. The decision you make will have long term consequences on Minnesotans' quality of life. Please do not allow PolyMet's NorthMet mining project to happen. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Katie Weddle Langer 608 Wilkins St W Stillwater, MN 55082-4459 (612) 730-7849

Katie Williams 42732

See attachment

Katja M Coppetto 54546

I grew up on the South Kiwishink and because of my childhood experiences, I hold the natural Northern Minnesota in a dear place. I know that the natural resources may be available in a finite amount but I'm concerned for the infinite resource of human social, creative capital. The level of pollution over multiple generations will put human life in great danger. Please stop the mines.

Katrine Antolak 43805

I believe the mine is a fabulous idea. It will create a lot of jobs and help our economy a great deal. We need to be less dependent on others for natural resources. Sincerely, Steve Antolak

Katy Kennedy 9737

Hello, Please do not allow the Polymet Mine to happen. Doing so will pollute nearby waters for years to come. It will also destroy the natural beauty of the area with large pits, and piles of excavated waste material. It's just not worth it. Thank you, Katy Kennedy

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katy Tharaldson

11738

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katy Tharaldson

40027

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Katy Wortel

39063

---Original Message--- From: enviros@hickorytech-net [mailto:enviros@hickorytech-net] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:58 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Katy Wortel 1411 Pohl Rd Mankato, MN 56001-5751

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kay Acton

15762

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Kay Beams

22892

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Their proposal contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. It is time for these analysis to look at the implications to humans-not to their wallets. Greed reigns again. The health of all Minnesotans is at stake here-so a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project needs to be done and the results included in the EIS. The time for leaving out essential studies and information is over. We are tired of incomplete impact studies being done on human and environmental health effects. It is time to start worrying about the health of the citizens of the state of MN. The HIA needs to include an analysis of the social determinants of health. Sincerely, Ms Kay Beams 9539 Hartford Cir Eden Prairie, MN 55347-3149

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kay Erickson

41880

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources To whom it may concern: I am writing regarding the SDEIS for the PolyMet mining project. The SDEIS is inadequate and doesn't provide any assurance that it won't be harmful to northern Minnesota. Any project that would require treating water for 200-500 years should be rejected out of hand because there is absolutely no guarantee that this will be done. This kind of mining has resulted in contamination of surface and or ground water with heavy metals and sulfates all over the world. PolyMet tailings will be added to an existing tailings basin that is already leaking polluted water. It will destroy bogs, tamarack swamps and degrade 7,300 acres of wetlands. It will leak polluted water into the St Louis River and eventually into Lake Superior. It will pollute our water resources at a time when, due to climate change, those resources are more precious than ever. Lake Superior is a huge source of freshwater, a resource that will absolutely need in the future. It isn't worth 500 years of cleanup for 20 years of mining. I would be somewhat more confident about the project if the companies that pollute our air, water and land would actually pay for the clean up they promise when these projects are approved. From the Gulf of Mexico to West Virginia just recently in the news, companies spend years in costly court battles to avoid efforts to make them pay for cleaning up their pollution and even declare bankruptcy to avoid taking responsibility for cleaning up the messes they make. The track record is abysmal. And it isn't just this mine we need to be concerned about. I have a map that shows at least ten sites in northern Minnesota where mining is being proposed or explored. These projects should be considered as a whole when looking at whether to approve any of them. The cumulative effect of all these projects needs to be considered, especially because it is inevitable that, like pipeline projects, once they get their "foot in the door," they will want to expand and destroy more our forests, waterways and lakes. Until companies can come up with a way to extract copper, nickel and other metals in a way that doesn't pollute our water for 500 years, let those metals stay where they are. Sincerely, Kay Erickson 27930 Smithtown Road Shorewood, MN 55331 _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Kay Kieval

58005

MN regularly ships copper to China in the form of old alternators & motors which China recycles for use in tech mfg. Instead of mining we could do this here. The small amount of natural land that is left once lost is forever. We always use jobs as an excuse for something bad for us. Remember West Virginia. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Kay Kurt-Jankofsky

42755

See attachment

Kay Moore

25320

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I'm Kay Moore, from Idaho, and I have learned the value of clean drinking water, and water cool enough to support fish. The PolyMet Mining Corp. will be similar to Buck Mountain, in Washington. Mining Companies, play up the per't's. The realities are quite different, the mining company did NOT COMPLY, with the water quality, and the land restorations. Each year, the town, has meeting, and the mining company says "YES" , But does NOTHING,,,only talks, and show up with lawyers, but in essence, STEALS, livelihoods, and life, with polluted streams, and polluted land. IT is A RAPE. of the community, and a theft of the land. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Kay Moore 1029 Colt Rd Moscow, ID 83843-2456 (208) 882-8612

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kay Nelson

605

Dear Lisa Fay, I am asking that this project does not gain approval. Keeping the water supply clean is too big of a risk for the State of MN to take. Thank you. Kay Nelson
6844 Sheridan Avenue South Richfield, MN 55423-2054

Kaydell Gaasvig

20273

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kaydell Gaasvig P.O. Box 1420 Bemidji, MN 56619

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kaydell Gaasvig

40390

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kayellen Taylor

47142

Please, please do NOT let this happen. Do not allow the PolyMet's proposed open-pit mine and ore processing facility near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: The environmental impact will be significant and detrimental, and the supposed "clean up" many years down the road is a fantasy, as history shows. How can you actually "clean up" this kind of environmental destruction. The record shows that mining companies rip up and pollute the earth, make their profits, and then walk away or declare bankruptcy, after being permitted to do so by state officials. Please do not do it this time. Global warming has shown us that we must look into the future with a greater scope than we have up to now and this is a case of huge importance and impact. If allowed to go forward, this project and its pollution will be yet another contributor to the Extinction of the Species of Humans on Earth. FINANCIAL ASSURANCE: As Rep Phyllis Kahn has recently pointed out, the issue of financial assurance is also a major concern: She says: I. "In chapter 3, pages 136 to 138, you list information that includes the preliminary cost estimate of closure. The source cited is "Foth 2013-" I've looked at the Foth memo cited in the SDEIS. The Minnesota DNR has simply copied information from PolyMet's hired consultant without confirming or fact-checking their work. If the Minnesota DNR and its co-lead agencies are unable to fact-check the work they presented on financial assurance, how are we to expect that they are capable of the adequately protecting the citizens of Minnesota. II. This project should not go forward unless a third-party insurer, such as Lloyd's of London, can be found. The simple fact is, if a third-party private entity will not take on PolyMet, the state shouldn't. Private insurers have expertise in managing risk that the State of Minnesota can't match. Additionally, policymakers could tap the assurance funds for other purposes. Private insurance is clearly superior to a state managed approach in this case. III. In the SDEIS you say that financial assurance will be done in the Permit to Mine stage. Looking at the most recent MinnTac Permit to Mine document, there is one short paragraph on financial assurance. This project shouldn't go forward without robust public debate, and the opportunity for legislative hearings, if what we can expect is a paragraph from the DNR in the Permit to Mine phase. You must ensure that the public, including financial experts and those elected to represent the citizens of Minnesota, have a chance to weigh in on financial assurance. It has not been your practice to do so in the past; will it be in this case." CONCLUSION: As elected representatives of the taxpayers of the State of Minnesota, do NOT offer POLYMET an opportunity to do this kind of damage, make money from it, and then walk away. Do your research thoroughly and carefully and I think you will find out that it is best to say NO before the irreparable damage is done. Kay Taylor

Kayla Hiller

41824

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kayla Hiller Minneapolis, Minnesota

KC Strang

20109

To whom it may concern; I reside in Omaha, NE and regularly canoe the BWCAW - based on what I've read, Nickle mining often creates serious long-term environmental problem. Please be very sure this is wrong before any approval by MN DNR. I am against any new mining permits there. K C Strang kcstrang@hotmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keegan Ramey

52345

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Keegan Ramey 1240 Plummer Road Martinsville, IN 46151

Keelin Kane

58114

This mine should not and must not be allowed. The long term pollution is unacceptable. The "assurances" are more than inadequate – they're ludicrous. To imagine that twenty years of jobs is enough to offset permanent destruction of an irreplaceable landscape! The international conglomerate will reap the money and the benefits and leave a mess behind. Boom, then bust. Northern Minnesota has a thriving tourist industry. People come from all over the world to enjoy it. Don't sell it out. It's a world treasure.

Keely Gelineau

39371

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Keely Gelineau 709 N Boundary Ave Proctor, MN 55810-2664

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keely Gelineau

39374

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Keely Gelineau 709 N Boundary Ave Proctor, MN 55810-2664

Keely King

16282

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keely King

17146

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Keely King 875 27th ave se Minneapolis, MN 55414

50412

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Keely King 875 27th ave se Minneapolis, MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith A Haglin 57145

I don't think we should permit this mine as clean-up will cost more than the value of the ore. The trickle down or the pollution will be devastating to watershed to Lake Superior. Taxpayers should not get stuck at the end of the mining. Keith A Haglin 701 W. Ideal St Duluth, MN 55811

Keith Erickson 42608

See attachment

Keith Goetzman 43201

I urge the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to deny permission for the operation of the Polymet Northmet copper-nickel mine in northern Minnesota. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed mine is insufficient in several regards. To begin with, the SDEIS is overly long and inaccessible as a document to encourage public comment. At 1,800 pages and full of technical language, it at once presents an abundance of data and a dearth of basic, understandable information. The SDEIS does not address exactly how long water treatment will be needed at the mine site, instead presenting a theoretical 500-year model that has done little except to sow public confusion about the actual duration of treatment. The SDEIS uses a flawed model for the amount of contaminated water flowing from the mine site, meaning the project's planned treatment plants may have to process larger volumes of water than expected. The document describes long-term reverse osmosis water treatment that is yet unproven at the scale, use, and time frame proposed. The SDEIS does not describe adequate safeguards against worst-case scenarios that could compromise the integrity the waste and water retention and treatment systems. Liners can and do fail. Extreme weather can and does occur, lately with increasing frequency. The SDEIS also describes an unacceptable amount of wetlands loss. Mining at the site would destroy approximately 1,500 acres of wetlands, one of the largest wetlands destructions ever permitted by the Army Corps of Engineers. Wetlands are an important resource for sequestering carbon and slowing climate change, and destroying them would release significant carbon into the atmosphere. "New" wetlands created elsewhere in the state to mitigate these losses are not a true replacement. Another reason I urge the DNR to deny permission for the Polymet Northmet proposal: We simply do not have enough information yet, and this comment period is closing before key pieces of information are even in hand. Financial assurances of Polymet's long-term commitment to cleanup and mitigation are key to the proposed project's environmental impact, and yet the public has been asked to let the DNR and Polymet work out financial assurance details after the comment period is closed. The current financial "assurances" outlined in the SDEIS are wholly insubstantial and not assuring to this citizen. Also, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency has twice delayed its ruling on a state sulfate standard for wild-rice waters, so this vital information is also unavailable as the comment period closes. Finally, I urge the DNR to more closely scrutinize the players in this business proposal. Polymet, which Minnesotans are being asked to entrust with the stewardship of our lands and water, is a newly formed junior mining company that has acknowledged in financial documents that it has no history of mining, has little cash on hand, and can offer no assurance that it will make money. Its largest shareholder is Swiss-based commodities and mining giant Glencore, which has a disturbing history of environmental and ethical behavior. However, the SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, which will own the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. I urge the DNR to require that the PolyMet EIS include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate, and to require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore. Sincerely, Keith Goetzman 1171 Century Ave S. Maplewood, MN 55119

Keith Haas 58103

I believe the study was done complete and with the best [ILLEGEIBLE] available.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith Jentoft

40992

From: Keith Jentoft 38 Varner Road Gunflint Trail Grand Marais, MN 55604 I am writing to STRONGLY oppose the efforts to mine the Minnesota Arrowhead for copper/nickel using sulfide to extract the metals from the ore. I believe that the study is flawed and unfairly promotes the interests of the mining industry. Specifically, the company proposes to excavate three enormous pits up to 696 feet deep. Waste rock would be stored next to the pits in 20-story high piles covering 526 acres. The waste would be added to piles of tailings that are currently leaking polluted water. The mine will destroy 900 acres of high quality wetlands, eg, coniferous bogs and tamarack swamps, and impact an additional 7,000 acres. The mine has a projected lifespan of 20 years; polluted water must be treated for 500 years. Leaking polluted water will flow into tributaries of the St Louis River and finally into Lake Superior. I strongly object to the impact the Sulfate releases will have on the wild rice in the drainage area. Please oppose this project. Regards, Keith Jentoft

KEITH KEMNITZ

11432

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr KEITH KEMNITZ 1310 S White Iron Rd Ely, MN 55731-8253 (612) 819-0886

Keith Kuckler

10707

I am a 65 year old resident of Cook County. I have lived here for over thirty years. I have served many years on the Cook

Keith Laken

18231

My name is Keith Laken. K-E-I-T-H, family name L-A-K-E-N, as in November, and I'm from Winona, Minnesota, and I'm here, today -- my public comment that I would like to make is very simple and straightforward. What I would like to see, if any mining permits are approved, that the mining company provide a surety bond for 10 times the estimated reclamation -- cost of the reclamation project, so 10 times. So if the project's going to produce, let's say, \$1 million of estimated reclamation for the next 40 years, it's 40 million times, times 10, or \$400 million post -- bond would have to be posted just for that specific piece of reclamation for that specific piece of river or land. So the idea is that the companies that are granted these permits cannot just create a shell corporation, issue their dividends to their investors and then walk away from the public. So my interest is basically that the public is served in the long run, not just the short-term interest of the profits for the mining or the resources that are being taken out of the ground, but that the other consequences of the mining that the -- that there's actually a bonding process by which the -- the resources are there to reclaim any damage that's done to the environment. The second thing is that those people that are responsible for approving the -- the project and for running the project, that violation of any federal or state law is a capital offense, not just a minor offense. That individuals and corporations are held accountable from a capital standpoint; in other words, these are severe crimes against humanity. That's my comment. Thank you very much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith Lusk 39901

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Keith Lusk 701 Horseshoe Ln Braham, MN 55006-3223

Keith Monsaas 39226

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Keith Monsaas 1525 E Superior St Apt B Duluth, MN 55812-1640 (218) 260-3399

Keith Morris 54817

See attachment

Keith Nelson 42733

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith Thompson

47853

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. As caretakers of the fresh water in this region, our duty lies to protecting the water, not filling the pockets of big corporations who add nothing to our quality of life. Please don't be short sighted on this issue. Your children and grandchildren depend on you to do the right thing. Sincerely yours, Keith Thompson 7223 98th Street S Cottage Grove, MN 55016

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith Thompson

48322

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. As caretakers of the fresh water in this region, our duty lies to protecting the water, not filling the pockets of big corporations who add nothing to our quality of life. Please don't be short sighted on this issue. Your children and grandchildren depend on you to do the right thing. Sincerely yours, Keith Thompson 7223 98th Street S Cottage Grove, MN 55016

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Keith Thompson

52350

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. As caretakers of the fresh water in this region, our duty lies to protecting the water, not filling the pockets of big corporations who add nothing to our quality of life. Please don't be short sighted on this issue. Your children and grandchildren depend on you to do the right thing. Sincerely yours, Keith Thompson 7223 98th Street S Cottage Grove, MN 55016

Kel

43696

I am very concerned about the environmental impact of letting the current PolyMet mining proposal move forward I don't believe there are enough safety measures in place to adequately protect our wetlands and groundwater sources. Too many companies continue to dump their waste into nearby lakes and wetlands because of loopholes in current regulations. I fear this will end up just the same and cause catastrophic damage to our northern wilderness. Please stop the PolyMet Project Kelly Huxmann 2105 St Anthony Pkwy Minneapolis, MN 55418 Sent from my iPhone

Kellen Giblette

44378

Hi my name is Kellen Giblette. I'm 18 years old and wish to express my opinion on the proposed mine. I feel that the mine will have extremely detrimental effects on the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area. I have been to the Boundary Waters myself and members of my family have been going for years. The BWCA is the most beautiful area in Minnesota, and one of the most beautiful and untouched areas in the country. I would hate for that significant of an area to be ruined in any way for this small economic boost to the area. I concede that jobs are good. They stimulate the economy and change families and lives for the better. However, I do not feel that any amount of jobs for any amount of time is worth the possible (and in my opinion inevitable) destruction of such a special piece of land. The claim of your company is that you will financially support the overseeing of the mine for 200-500 years after. This to me is a laughable idea. Can you name many companies that have been around for 500 years. Me neither. I think that the mining industry has built a history of empty promises and deceit. I feel that, not to cast judgement upon your company or any individual persons, you have made such an empty promise. I personally do not feel that it is reasonable to say that you will be financially stable to oversee the mine for 500 years, or even that you as an entity will exist in 500 years. So I implore you to reconsider this proposal.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kellen Roberts 1774

To whom it may concern, My name is Kellen Roberts. My home address is 3124 Columbus Ave Minneapolis MN 55407- I am deeply concerned about the environmental impacts of this mining project. I see in the report that Minnesota will be committing itself to treating the water at the site for at least 500 years. I think it is irresponsible to take on such a commitment. We cannot know how much this will cost and who will manage such a long term project. It is reckless to assume that whomever is in charge of that land 500 years from will have the resources or the interest to maintain whatever treatment process is created when the mine is closed. I strongly oppose this project unless there is a way to clean it up within a reasonable amount of time after the closure of the mine. We as a state cannot agree to take on this commitment. thank you, -
Kellen Roberts

Kelley 47708

Hello, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed PolyMet Northmet copper-nickel mining plan. I am not at all convinced that the short term goal of mining is at all worth the inevitable pollution it will cause. Nor am I convinced that PolyMet will be able to reverse the damage to water and land to it's original healthy state. I vacation every year on Lake Superior, the largest body of water in the world. I cherish it and am proud to live in a state that boasts this gorgeous treasure of a lake. I am afraid the pollution will inevitably enter the near by Embarrass River and Partridge River which flows into the St Louis River that then flows into Lake Superior. Please think of what is good for the earth and its people and stop this dangerous plan. Thank you for reading this. Sincerely, Kelley Meister 2427 Chicago Ave,#2 Minneapolis, MN 55404

Kelley Eldien 1768

I support the Polymet project and believe it will bring economic stimulus to our northern MN region and ultimately benefit the entire state and our residents/businesses. I also believe Polymet will perform full due-diligence to ensure operations are done as carefully as possible to minimize all potential environmental impacts to our beautiful north woods/BWCA. Please strongly consider your full support of this project. Kelley Eldien Customer Communications Administrator ALLETE | Minnesota Power 218-355-3548

Kelli Danger 1775

Say NO to non ferrous sulfide mining on the North Shore. Protect the pristine lakes and streams that bring tourism to this beautiful area. Kelli Danger Will Earnie, MN Sent from my iPad

Kelly Amo 42030

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kelly Amo Sauk Rapids, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Andrlle

17344

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate because open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality, and impacts human and animal life. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kelly Andrlle Shoreview, MN BWCA Camper Kelly Andrlle 1624 Knight St Shoreview, MN 55126

50496

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate because open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality, and impacts human and animal life. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kelly Andrlle Shoreview, MN BWCA Camper Kelly Andrlle 1624 Knight St Shoreview, MN 55126

Kelly Dalager

41896

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kelly Dalager Monticello, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Fries

9374

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kelly Fries 4508 Laura Ave Edina, MN 55436

18550

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kelly Fries 4508 Laura Ave Edina, MN 55436

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Fries

50626

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Kelly Fries 4508 Laura Ave Edina, MN 55436

Kelly Hickey

3633

Good Afternoon DNR, I am writing to urge you to please put a stop to the proposed, permanent desecration of our treasured Minnesota Northwoods. I grew up in the Duluth area, left Minnesota for college, adventure, and career and recently returned with my husband to raise a family. I have spent weeks in the Boundary Waters and have always valued our homeland's greatest treasures, the lakes and waterways. The idea that a mining company could destroy the health of our most valuable resource (water, not copper/nickel/other metals) indefinitely (though they only admit to a 500 year issue) for the sake of temporary jobs and revenue is sickening. I have lived all over our nation and have seen the devastation left behind after mining companies closed their doors. Most notable to me is the Berkeley Pit in Butte, Montana, which is now a Superfund site with absolutely staggering environmental consequences. The jobs and money the mine once brought to Butte are but a distant memory, but the "pit of death" (in 1995, a flock of over 300 migrating snow geese landed in the Berkeley Pit and died from internal sores resulting from exposure to the lethal waters) remains, threatening to spill into the water table as its acid bath continues to rise. Polymet will almost certainly leave devastation in its wake, as every hard-rock mine in the United States has before it. History repeats itself. We cannot let it happen in our backyaRd Please protect and preserve the natural beauty and health of the Northland for our children and countless generations to come. Say NO to Polymet Mine. Thank you. Respectfully, Kelly A. Erbach, RN 4020 Clearwater Road, Apt. 213 St Cloud, MN 56301

Kelly Kraemer

42452

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Kelly Kraemer 100 Woodhill Rd Saint Cloud, MN 56301-5132

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Moran

41855

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kelly Moran Oronoco, Minnesota

Kelly Mormann

16592

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Nelson

38893

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Kelly Nelson 1535 Central Ave SW Cambridge, MN 55008-2620

Kelly Peteson

40464

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelly Rogers

39608

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The potential short term gain is absolutely not worth the long term pain of what this mining will do to our environment and the health of our communities, both physical and financial. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Kelly Rogers 8818 Logan Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55431-2065

Kelly Strebig

9314

January 31, 2014 To: NorthMet SDEIS and Lisa Fey, EIS Project Manager I attended the public informational PolyMet meeting on January 28, 2014, in St Paul, and had planned to speak; however, my name was not drawn during the allotted three hours. I am therefore sending my comments to you to add to the information you have received from others. I hold a B.S. and an M.S. in mining engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and have over 30 years experience in improving workers' health, and improving air quality. I also have experience in fugitive dust control and mine land reclamation obtained while working for the US Bureau of Mines and the University of Minnesota. I have followed the PolyMet copper/nickel project for the last seven years. I had visited the site both when it was the Erie taconite mine and after Polymet bought the plant site. As a mining engineer, I agree with the EIS that this is a low-sulfur deposit. I have read the executive summary of the EIS and I find it thorough and that it addresses all the environmental issues. The dangers posed by environmentalists can and do exist in countries with no laws concerning the environment, and problems may have existed 60 years ago when the United States had few regulations. However, I feel that this mine will not threaten the environment because of the very strict Minnesota regulations, which PolyMet has shown it will meet. Minnesota mines can operate successfully while still protecting our much-loved environment. Therefore, I strongly support the NorthMet project. Kelly Strebig 261 Wentworth Av E W. St Paul, MN 55118

58155

I have a Bachelor and Masters degree in Mining Engineering and 30 years experience in working health and air quality improvement. I strongly support the NorthMet Project because mining and the environment can co exist in Minnesota.

Kelly Weber

6787

I am very disappointed in the State of Minnesota and the continuous roadblocks and delays that they allow to prevent a company like PolyMet from bringing to this State many jobs and tax dollars for both now and future generations. What's with all the delays. PolyMet has been working on this for many years at a tremendous cost of millions of dollars. I have been a Minnesota resident my entire life and certainly believe in protecting the environment. I also believe that the recent SDEIS demonstrates that precious metals can be mined in an environmentally sound manner. We all use these critical metals in almost all day to day activities and it's about time we allow a company (PolyMet), that wants to mine these metals in a safe and proper manner, to get started. The NIMBY thought process that continues to force these metals to be mined in other parts of the world where there are no environmental regulations at all, does not make any sense in today's world. LET'S GIVE POLYMET THE APPROVALS THEY NEED TO GET STARTED. Thank you, Kelvin (Kelly) Weber Sent from my iPad Kelly Weber, OUTSIDE SALES Brock White Company, LLC 4231 West 1st Street, Duluth, MN 55807 P. 1-218-461-4003 F. 1-218-628-2917 M. 1-218-348-9201 www.brockwhite-com kweber@brockwhite-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kelsey L. Reisdorph

43960

Hello, My name is Kelsey Reisdorph and I'm a senior at the University of St Thomas in St Paul, Minnesota. I'm very passionate about protecting the environment because it is where we live, we only have one environment and we only have one life to live in it. Whatever damage we inflict on the environment, we inflict on ourselves. I am emailing to express my concerns about the PolyMet Mining Project here in Minnesota. Based on PolyMet's own report on the consequences of open pit sulfide mining, it will take centuries to fix the damage for only around 20 years of mining. My proposal is that if PolyMet wants to do this project, they should establish a trust fund of an amount established and decided on by a third party and governed by the state, the purpose for which would be to pay for the damage that they are inflicting. Thank you for your time, Kelsey Reisdorph

Ken Bachofer

16250

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

ken chastain

47040

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. 200 years of pollution to keep track of. It's absurd to think you would want to get involved in that kind of responsibility. For the sake of your children's children (Unless you plan to move away with them when this gets out of hand) please reconsider. Sincerely yours, Ken Chastain ken chastain 4728 10th ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ken chastain 47041

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. 200 years of pollution to keep track of. It's absurd to think you would want to get involved in that kind of responsibility. For the sake of your children's children (Unless you plan to move away with them when this gets out of hand) please reconsider. Sincerely yours, Ken Chastain ken chastain 4728 10th ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407

Ken Chervenak 46961

Thank you for this opportunity to again express my major concerns to this proposed debated mine near the BWCAW. It surprises me that the process ever got this far. How could any of the responsible elected officials in the state of Minnesota ever consider putting the Crown Jewel of your state at jeopardy. Anyone who has ever been near or on a wilderness trip in this amazing area knows what I mean. I say NO to this mine now and forever in the future. There are not many areas of wilderness beauty left in this country let alone in this state where people can go to escape the routines of their urban lives to refresh themselves physically and spiritually in this wonderful area known as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Thank you, Ken Chervenak Rowe Marketing 1200 N. Arlington Heights Rd Suite 430 Itasca IL 60143 p. 630-228-8846 f. 630-228-8852

Ken Engelhart 40936

Minnesota DNR, I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed copper-nickel (sulfide) mining in northeastern Minnesota for the following reasons: § Toxic pollution has happened at every sulfide mine site in the world to date, including the Flambeau mine site near Ladysmith, Wisconsin. Other sulfide mine sites have been declared Superfund sites. With this type of record, it is extremely doubtful that the outcome would be different for Minnesota, even though we are all "above average". § The proposed open pit mine is expected to operate for 20 years and create 300-400 jobs. By comparison, this mine would leave a legacy of millions of gallons of polluted water for hundreds of years in one of the more water-rich areas of the world. Sulfide mining would require measures to "treat" this polluted water for up to 500 years or more. It is unlikely that PolyMet and other current mining companies will exist in 100 years, and unimaginable that they will exist in 500 years. However, it is likely that Minnesota taxpayers will exist, and will ultimately will be the ones left to pay for the cleanup, if possible, of the toxic mess that is left behind after the mining companies are long gone. Other states with sulfide mines have been saddled with billions of dollars in clean-up costs. § Northeast Minnesota generates \$1-6 billion annually in tourism income. The BWCAW is the most-visited wilderness in the USA. The waters we have in northeastern Minnesota are unique and precious. The highly toxic process of sulfide mining has great potential to destroy these waters, as well as the tourism trade, native cultural heritage and wild rice that exist because of these precious waters. § In summary, sulfide mining is a highly toxic process that has caused pollution at every sulfide mine site in the world. It is a type of mining that has never been done in Minnesota and that would leave a toxic legacy of millions of gallons of polluted water in one of the most unique and precious water regions of the world. The short term "benefits" of mining do not outweigh the disastrous long-term consequences to our pristine northeastern Minnesota waters and land. I urge you to resist the allure of short-term "gain" for what ultimately will be long-term pain that Minnesotans will deeply regret. Kenneth Engelhart. M.D. 4160 Burton Lane Minneapolis. MN 55406

Ken Halfmann 35232

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. While I haven't yet been to the Boundary Waters Wilderness, I have visited a number of other beautiful sites on the Lake Superior shoreline from the Apostle Islands to Tahquomenon Falls, and can't imagine subjecting any of these places to the degradation that this mining project would bring. Sincerely, Ken Halfmann 1819 Laurel Crst Madison, WI 53705-1066 (608) 238-5284

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ken Hanson

37145

I'm very concerned about the environmental impact sulfide mining will have on the sensitive eco-system which is northern Minnesota. I understand the industrial need for copper and nickel and the significance of job creation but I find it difficult to accept that either of those issues should take precedence over the preservation of our natural environment-particularly water quality. I would like to believe mining technology has advanced to the point of at least a near guarantee of environmental protection but after following the issue closely for months I don't find in all the literature I've read (for and against the project) any suggestion Polymet or any other mining operation can even begin to assure the beautiful lakes region of northern Minnesota won't be significantly, negatively altered by their sulfide mining operations. The world will exert, I'm sure, heavy demand for the metals proposed to be mined but I find it unacceptable that mining should occur at the expense of our air and water quality. Are these metals really worth more than our clean water. I wish to register my opposition to this and other sulfide process projects planned for northern Minnesota until that time when environmental protections can be reasonably assured. Ken Hanson 2703 Kelly Ave Cloquet MN 55720

Ken Illegible

57279

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative. I am concerned that a decision around jobs will outweigh the potential impact on the environment. Concerns around the impact on the environment should be a priority. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks.

Ken Kaseforth

48088

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and also reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal. This project would present unacceptable risks to Minnesotans well into the future, in terms of health, environmental contamination and financial liability. All of these long-term risks for about 20 years of mining by a Canadian company funded primarily by a Swiss commodities trading firm, and whose chief customer will be China. It is hard to believe that, absent corruption, this proposal continues to be seriously considered. When you also factor in the inevitable and long-term off-setting losses to neighboring recreational business, this proposal becomes absurd on its face. It is not one that will benefit Minnesota or US citizens in the long-term. Rather, us tax-payers will be left holding an empty but foul bag if this mine is permitted. Very truly yours, Ken Kaseforth 10724 Beard Ave S. Bloomington, MN 55431 952-888-3123

48449

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and also reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal. This project would present unacceptable risks to Minnesotans well into the future, in terms of health, environmental contamination and financial liability. All of these long-term risks for about 20 years of mining by a Canadian company funded primarily by a Swiss commodities trading firm, and whose chief customer will be China. It is hard to believe that, absent corruption, this proposal continues to be seriously considered. When you also factor in the inevitable and long-term off-setting losses to neighboring recreational business, this proposal becomes absurd on its face. It is not one that will benefit Minnesota or US citizens in the long-term. Rather, us tax-payers will be left holding an empty but foul bag if this mine is permitted. Very truly yours, Ken Kaseforth 10724 Beard Ave S. Bloomington, MN 55431 952-888-3123

52476

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and also reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal. This project would present unacceptable risks to Minnesotans well into the future, in terms of health, environmental contamination and financial liability. All of these long-term risks for about 20 years of mining by a Canadian company funded primarily by a Swiss commodities trading firm, and whose chief customer will be China. It is hard to believe that, absent corruption, this proposal continues to be seriously considered. When you also factor in the inevitable and long-term off-setting losses to neighboring recreational business, this proposal becomes absurd on its face. It is not one that will benefit Minnesota or US citizens in the long-term. Rather, us tax-payers will be left holding an empty but foul bag if this mine is permitted. Very truly yours, Ken Kaseforth 10724 Beard Ave S. Bloomington, MN 55431 952-888-3123

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ken Klein

19925

Watch 2 minutes of this instructive video.. Industry reassurances mean little when "accidents" happen. Do more than due diligence to keep this type of tragedy from happening in our great state. Otherwise our license plates might read "The Land of 6,000 Lakes". Thank you. Ken Klein Phd, 12 Meadowlark Ln., St Paul, MN. 55127
<http://www.tytnetwork-com/2014/02/26/company-responsible-coal-ash-leak-unsure-can-ever-cleaned/>

20043

I believe from reading the SDEIS that assessment of plausible neurotoxic risks associated with the Polymet project(s) has been inadequate. More specifically, I believe that several independent analyses by respected experts needs to be incorporated into the SDEIS, and that the models presented have relied too much upon industry data and speculation. Methyl-mercury contaminants can migrate into water, soil, and air, and their cumulative effects need to be evaluated in the context of other likely discharges (eg other approved mines, industry discharges, ambient pollution, baseline levels of neurotoxins in Lake Superior watershed, etc) No bond or financial guarantee will begin to cover health related sequelae if neurotoxic damage ensues. No mitigation, monitoring, abatement, restoration, reclamation processes and funding can address permanent neurological damage that residues from sulfide mining are known to occasion. One only needs to review recent "accidents" (discharges) in North Dakota, West Virginia, and North Carolina to realize that substandard regulation, permitting, inspections, and enforcement actions have imperiled the public health. This cannot be allowed to happen in Minnesota based upon a less than comprehensive and independent analysis of the risks entailed. The economic benefits to the region and state are paltry when they are viewed in juxtaposition to public health risks lasting centuries into the future. Needless to add, tourism will decline significantly if any "accidents" do occur given the current pristine nature and allure of this unique wilderness area. Thank you for your attention and consideration of my comment. Dr Ken Klein 12 Meadowlark Ln. North Oaks, MN. 55127

21255

Ken Klein Phd 12 Meadowlark Ln. St Paul, Mn. 55127 I've submitted a comment and wish to be on your mailing list Thank you. Ken Klein On Mon, Feb 24, 2014 at 10:10 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

21257

Dear DNR staff, Please consider health risks associated with the proposed Polymet mining operation. I am requesting that you confer with our Mn. Dept of Health and the MPCA in your deliberations, and commission independent research to evaluate human habitat (eg. health) consequences from mining residues. This is just one very troubling report re: heavy mining in South America. http://www.worstpolluted-org/projects_reports/display/89 Sincerely, Kenneth Klein Phd (St Paul, Mn.)

21524

2/22/2014 Dear DNR, I am very concerned that sulfide mining poses unacceptable risks to "human habitat" in the form of long term health risks from cumulative residues and byproducts (Including methylmercury) which can infiltrate the water supply, food chain, air emissions. These have been documented in the scientific literature by credible researchers writing for juried publications. I implore you to commission independent studies to evaluate these risks, to incorporate already known research findings in your deliberations and permitting process, and to very carefully weigh the costs in human terms (as well as financial burden) if health damage ensues from these operations. Reliance upon industry's own studies and assurances has shown time and again to be myopic. Accidents occurring recently in North Dakota, West Virginia, North Carolina, and elsewhere amply demonstrate the perils of sub-optimal regulation and enforcement. Posting of bonds (no matter the amount) might guarantee some degree of comfort to those contemplating monitoring costs, clean up costs, etc, but will not begin to cover the actual medical, legal, economic, and emotional toll if the health of current and future generations (in Minnesota, and in the surrounding area, eg. Lake Superior region) is imperiled or damaged. Please confer with the Minnesota Dept. of Health (Environmental Division) as you move forward Due diligence now may forestall this matter from winding up in the court system with prolonged litigation. Thank you for your attention and service. Sincerely, Dr Ken Klein 12 Meadowlark Ln. St Paul, MN. 55127

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ken Klein 40850

Dear DNR Polymet reviewers.. Please consider the full track record of previous heavy mining pollution globally, not just cherry picked data or representations from mining company officials. Cited below is one study of an actual long term operation that led to disastrous results for the environment and public health of the surrounding community. Regulators in Minnesota need to base their decisions upon worst case scenarios, not upon political pressures, or upon incomplete (at best) projections from vested interests which minimize long term risks to our state and future generations. Human habitat (eg health risks) must be foremost in your analysis, relying upon independent comprehensive studies from multiple impartial and knowledgeable experts, comparable to this one in scope and depth.
<http://eprints.ucm.es/20188/1/Mazarron.pdf> We cannot be asleep at the wheel (or turn a blind eye) as recently occurred in North Carolina, with the Duke Energy coal ash "accident" poised to happen from lax regulation. The costs are too great to ignore these disasters. Sincerely, Ken Klein Phd 12 Meadowlark Ln. St Paul, MN. 55127 cc. EPA

46882

FYI <http://download.thelancet-com/pdfs/journals/laneur/PIIS1474442213702783-pdf.id=caao-DN-OwMLy49p9n3su> No increased risk of neurotoxic exposure to future generations of children in Minnesota and the surrounding sulfide mining watershed can be deemed acceptable. How can economic gain (jobs) trump our kids' health. Please involve the CDC and other reputable experts to provide you an independent analysis of these risks before approving any mining permits. This is the only responsible course, given the long term cumulative risks to human habitat associated with heavy metal mining. Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, Kenneth Klein Phd 12 Meadowlark Lane St Paul, MN. 55127

46916

Please peruse this recent article: <http://download.thelancet-com/pdfs/journals/laneur/PIIS1474442213702783-pdf.id=caao-DN-OwMLy49p9n3su> No increased risk of neurotoxic exposure to future generations of children in Minnesota and in the surrounding sulfide mining watershed can be deemed acceptable. How can economic gain (jobs) possibly trump our kids' health. Please involve the CDC and other health experts to provide you an independent analysis of these risks before approving any mining permits. This is the only responsible course, given long term cumulative risks to human habitat associated with heavy metal mining. Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely, Kenneth Klein Phd 12 Meadowlark Ln. St Paul, Minnesota 55127

54736

See attachment

Ken Lucas 38841

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Ken Lucas Platt st Niles, MO 48120 (505) 401-8411

Ken Skrien 54754

See attachment

54755

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ken Swanson

37456

My wife and I have gone to most of the meetings and still have lots of questions about water quality and how any body will clean up after the mining is done. From all the information I've seen to date poly-met does not have a firm plan for keeping run off with in limits and they for sure cannot explain what or how to do it in the future. I have studied what effects sulfide ore does when in contact with air and water,and so far no other mining place has fixed this problem either. I have property about 20 miles from Hoyt lakes .I know how much work means to the range but is it worth destroying the area for years. PLEASE send this eis back to the foreign companies involved and make them understand WE want GOOD JOBS BUT NOT TO RUIN OUR STATE AND OR OUR WATER SUPPLY FOR GENERATIONS. this mine site is on top of three water sheds {Hudson bay,Mississippi,and lake superior} PLEASE DON'T DISTROY THEM FOR OUR GRAND KIDS TO TRY TO FIX IN THE FUTURE. THANKS
Ken Swanson

Ken Wainionpaa

36814

Support for Palymet: As a retired USX foreman, I fully support the Poly Met mine undertaking. The project should be passed and given approval to start up. When I worked at Minntac, Mt. Iron, Mn. (USS, USX Pellet plant), we followed all the air, water, and noise rules. Improvements were ongoing. At PolyMet; New, more stringent rules will be followed and if any occurrences threaten the environment, they will be dealt with immediately. This project will bring millions of dollars to the state of Minnesota. Overly strict laws on mining and manufacturing have forced many American producers to out-source to another country. The MPCA is one of the causes of companies out-sourcing their manufacturing to other countries. The USA cannot survive if all of our products are out-sourced. The PolyMet project will follow the most stringent rules. It will not harm the environment. By using modern equipment and testing, the project will be safe. Ken Wainionpaa 6393 Heritage Trail Gilbert Mn., 55741

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kendall Clevenger

16233

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Kendell Corbett

39087

To who it may concern: I live 6 miles from the proposed mine - I have been actively collecting data and facts on the project since 2004- I have no concerns that the project would be done safely and adhere to the strict regulations and standards set forth by the State of Minnesota. I commend the agencies on the due diligence they have shown in the years of research and testing - it is time now to move forward based on the sound science and facts of the project. I look forward to the permitting of the PolyMet Project. Thank You Ken Corbett 516 Coventry Rd Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750

Kendra Roedl

57196

I'm Kendra, and I am a youth in Minneapolis. I have not yet visited the BWCA, but I would like to someday. Mining there or near there poses too great a risk to one of the most pristine fresh bodies of water in the world, and the people that live there. I am opposed to the sulfide mining. Kendra Roedl 4520 33rd Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenneth Eckstein 19823

Sirs- Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments. I have vacationed and traveled in northeastern Minnesota and enjoyed the BWCA several times. I am concerned about the long-term environmental impacts of mining sulfide-bearing rocks and the effects it will have on the whole area. I have read tmost of the DEIS and my concerns about the adequacy of the DEIS are included below. Please forward the land exchange comments to the Forest Service. · Land Exchange: The DEIS does not adequately address all the biological and land use issues with the land exchange. Additional information on the natural heritage and timber resources of the exchange lands need to be gathered. The public is best served if the public gains much more public land than it gives up. The exchange ratio should be at least 2 to 1 and of high quality parcels. · Storage of Tailings: To prevent the oxidation of sulfide tailings a tailings basin must be designed to secure those tailings forever. Forever is a very long time. No made-made structure can be designed to last forever at this time, so at some point in the future the tailings storage facility will be compromised. At some time in the future the people of Minnesota will have to pay for and clean up the failing tailings storage facility. Large amounts of money put aside today for future remediation will fall short of what is really needed. Millions of dollars today will equate to pennies in the distant future. The DEIS should make very clear that the tailings storage facility will not last forever and at some time in the future the people of Minnesota will either pay huge amounts for a major cleanup or endure sulfide pollution in a large area. Think about the trade off of these few jobs and tax money compared to the value of tourism in this area. Kenneth C. Eckstein 5623 W. Howard Ave Milwaukee, WI 53220

Kenneth Engelhart 54786

See attachment

Kenneth Harris 39546

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Kenneth Harris 5099 157th St N Hugo, MN 55038-8810 (651) 407-7238

Kenneth hegman 46980

I believe the DNR has done all they need to do and will do an excellent job of watching out for the environmental concerns of the people. If the people will let them do what they are supposed to do, and keep the politics out of it.

Kenneth Indrelie 39465

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Kenneth Indrelie 514 Salem Ct Saint Paul, MN 55115-1483

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kenneth jensen

7469

I am in support of the Polymet Project in northern MN. I believe it will bring many good paying jobs to an area that could use them. Many years ago i moved from northern MN, to the metro area, because of the lack of construction work. I also believe Polymet will follow the proper procedures for clean and environmental mining.

Sincerely, Kenneth A. Jensen Jr.

11201 112th Sq. NE

Blaine, MN 55434

Kenneth Lapointe

40375

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Kenneth Lapointe 2781 Mozart Ottawa, CA 90210 CA

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenneth Lee

39617

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Kenneth Middendorf

40634

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. When are we going to learn from the past and stop doing harmful things to the planet. After all it is the only one we have. Sincerely, Mr Kenneth Middendorf 340 238th St Osceola, WI 54020-5947

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenneth Neff

42151

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Kenneth Neff 115 - 9th Ave SE Waseca, MN 56093

Kenneth Nelson

37275

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My name is Kenneth William Nelson My address is 3716 Norton Road Duluth, MN 55803 Kenwnelson5@yahoo-com 218-464-7512 I am a retired Electrical Engineer with three years of related experience in the design and construction of taconite plants. Based on the PolyMet SDEIS, I request that you deny the PolyMet permit to mine. My wife and I own 21 acres of property on Cadotte Lake within 25 miles of the proposed PolyMet site. We hunt and fish in the area and want to see our grandchildren to do the same. Compromising the quality of the water in the Saint Louis River and Lake Superior water shed is not responsible management of our environment. We are already limited in the size and type of fish that we can safely consume. Our efforts should be to reduce the amount of pollutants and not add to the liSt Any suggestion that the water treatment from the current taconite plants is acceptable and is an example of responsible mining is simply a sad commentary to our intelligence. Although the example of the costly Silver Bay on land tailings pond was better than direct disposal into Lake Superior, it is far from an environmental friendly solution. Sulfide mining presents its own added water treatment problems with even greater costs and challenges which we must solve before we open the flood gates to not only PolyMet but all the other mining operations waiting on the sidelines. A single limited scope sulfide mining operation similar to some of the taconite pilot plants might be something to consider for the first ten years of operation before allowing for full scale operation. Then if careful monitoring of all problems shows that indeed this mining is feasible and environmentally responsible, full scale operation can be considered. Sincerely: Kenneth W. Nelson Marcia C. Nelson Kenneth Nelson 3716 Norton Road Duluth, MN 55803

49551

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My name is Kenneth William Nelson My address is 3716 Norton Road Duluth, MN 55803 Kenwnelson5@yahoo-com 218-464-7512 I am a retired Electrical Engineer with three years of related experience in the design and construction of taconite plants. Based on the PolyMet SDEIS, I request that you deny the PolyMet permit to mine. My wife and I own 21 acres of property on Cadotte Lake within 25 miles of the proposed PolyMet site. We hunt and fish in the area and want to see our grandchildren to do the same. Compromising the quality of the water in the Saint Louis River and Lake Superior water shed is not responsible management of our environment. We are already limited in the size and type of fish that we can safely consume. Our efforts should be to reduce the amount of pollutants and not add to the liSt Any suggestion that the water treatment from the current taconite plants is acceptable and is an example of responsible mining is simply a sad commentary to our intelligence. Although the example of the costly Silver Bay on land tailings pond was better than direct disposal into Lake Superior, it is far from an environmental friendly solution. Sulfide mining presents its own added water treatment problems with even greater costs and challenges which we must solve before we open the flood gates to not only PolyMet but all the other mining operations waiting on the sidelines. A single limited scope sulfide mining operation similar to some of the taconite pilot plants might be something to consider for the first ten years of operation before allowing for full scale operation. Then if careful monitoring of all problems shows that indeed this mining is feasible and environmentally responsible, full scale operation can be considered. Sincerely: Kenneth W. Nelson Marcia C. Nelson Kenneth Nelson 3716 Norton Road Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenneth Reid

45524

As a contribution to assessing public opinion on the Polymet EIS deliberations please consider the following examination of the Star Tribune Minnesota Poll published on Friday February 21 2014 with the headline "Nearly half favor PolyMet copper mine". The Star Tribune is not renowned for its support of mining and the headline infers that more than half did not vote in favor. However the poll recorded only 21% rejecting the application. Thus equally true headline would have been "Only 21% oppose PolyMet copper mine", or "One in five oppose PolyMet copper mine" The 33% "Not sure" is much higher than typical for this type of public opinion poll where numbers for undecided are generally around 10%. Although it is not possible to know how the 33% would have voted consider how it might have looked if only 11% were not sure and the other 22% had voted. If they voted equally pro and con the result would have been 57% pro, 32% con and 11% undecided. However, if they had been split in the same proportions as the 67% that did vote, either most pro or most con, the results would have been either a) 61%, pro, 28% con, 11% undecided or b) 53% pro, 36% con and 11% undecided Considering these realistic possibilities it would appear that the poll indicates that a majority of the public is in favor of enjoying the economic benefits of permitting mining and relying on government regulations, industry responsibility and good policing to minimize potential environmental risks. I urge DNR to approve the North Met SDEIS. Dr Kenneth J Reid Professor Emeritus, University of Minnesota 11068 Hyland Terrace, Eden Prairie, MN 55344, USA Tel: 952-943-8909 Email: HYPERLINK "mailto:reidx002@umn.edu"reidx002@umn.edu

Kenneth Rosemark

11254

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a national treasure, just like the Grand Canyon. The BWCAW is the most pristine wilderness area on the planet. The residue left behind by copper mining seeps into the water, kills plant life, fish and wildlife. In a very short period of time, copper mining will ruin 500 Years Of Echo System. There are several mining companies ready to start mining in this area. As soon as one gets permission to begin mining, the other mining companies will be right behind Poly Met Mining Inc. All of these mining companies are not even US COMPANIES. They are for profit organizations and once they are given the green light, they will destroy this Pristine Wilderness Area. I implore you to take a stand, against allowing the mining companies, anywhere near, any waterway, tributary, stream connected to or running into a Boundary Water Area Lake Or Waterway. Several decades ago, one man stood up against a rich and powerful man, who wanted to dam up this area, to create hydro electric power, for the sole purpose of selling it and making even more money. Something's are worth more than money. The peaceful, pristine, soulful wilderness area, called the BWCA is one of them.. On behalf of my children, their children and your great, great, great grandchildren; PLEASE, SAY NO TO THE MINING COMPANIES SAY NO TO BIG MONEY . Carry on the legacy of the man who originally saved the BWCA. You are in a position to make a decision regarding this matter. On behalf of all of us and future generations, make it a good one. Thank you. P.S. Please forward to Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager , too. Kenneth B. Rosemark, Rochester, MN. Sent from my iPad

11397

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a national treasure, just like the Grand Canyon. The BWCAW is the most pristine wilderness area on the planet. The residue left behind by copper mining seeps into the water, kills plant life, fish and wildlife. In a very short period of time, copper mining will ruin 500 Years Of Echo System. There are several mining companies ready to start mining in this area. As soon as one gets permission to begin mining, the other mining companies will be right behind Poly Met Mining Inc. All of these mining companies are not even US COMPANIES. They are for profit organizations and once they are given the green light, they will destroy this Pristine Wilderness Area. I implore you to take a stand, against allowing the mining companies, anywhere near, any waterway, tributary, stream connected to or running into a Boundary Water Area Lake Or Waterway. Several decades ago, one man stood up against a rich and powerful man, who wanted to dam up this area, to create hydro electric power, for the sole purpose of selling it and making even more money. Something's are worth more than money. The peaceful, pristine, soulful wilderness area, called the BWCA is one of them.. On behalf of my children, their children and your great, great, great grandchildren; PLEASE, SAY NO TO THE MINING COMPANIES SAY NO TO BIG MONEY . Carry on the legacy of the man who originally saved the BWCA. You are in a position to make a decision regarding this matter. On behalf of all of us and future generations, make it a good one. Thank you. P.S. Please forward to Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager , too. Kenneth B. Rosemark, Rochester, MN. Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenneth Thompson

39548

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenny Bollis

38926

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage and

Kent L Kaiser

10701

cid:image008-png@01CEA8A4-1F7E8010 Kent Kaiser, MAT, MLS, PhD Associate Professor of Communication 3003 Snelling Avenue North, MJ 168 Saint Paul MN 55113 651-286-7685 HYPERLINK "mailto:klkaiser@unwsp-edu"klkaiser@unwsp-edu | HYPERLINK "http://www.unwsp-edu/"www.unwsp-edu

Kent Merkey

3447

Dec 21, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The proposed PolyMet mine would likely bring temporary short-time financial gain to the area, but the area also benefits greatly from tourist dollars and supports many outfitting businesses; these smaller local businesses, which otherwise might last decades, could well be jeopardized, and when the mine pulls out when it's work is done, would leave both its employees and the local environment (including economic and natural) in an overall weakened condition. Thinking critically, this project does not make long-term sense either economically or environmentally. Oppose it. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Kent Merkey 3307 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-7200 (952) 454-3253

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Merkey 51643

Dec 21, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The proposed PolyMet mine would likely bring temporary short-time financial gain to the area, but the area also benefits greatly from tourist dollars and supports many outfitting businesses; these smaller local businesses, which otherwise might last decades, could well be jeopardized, and when the mine pulls out when it's work is done, would leave both its employees and the local environment (including economic and natural) in an overall weakened condition. Thinking critically, this project does not make long-term sense either economically or environmentally. Oppose it. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Kent Merkey 3307 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-7200 (952) 454-3253

Kent Newman 30965

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please consider these comments, about the PolyMet Mining Corporation., NorthMet mining project, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. In its present form, it is a threat to wetlands, rivers, and lakes, across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior, and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has taken place. I am very concerned about this project's potential impacts on this region's natural resources and public health. This includes: risks to water quality, and loss of wetlands, and harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations. Also there is the concern of the cumulative impacts, from sulfide ore mining. The Federal land exchange, of protected Superior National Forest land to ease the creation of PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine, is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Kent Newman 2950 Washtenaw Rd Apt 2b Ypsilanti, MI 48197-1514 (734) 434-8643

39914

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I have worked on efforts to stop, a sulfide mine in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient. It should not be approved because it lacks vital information about long-term water treatment and how the treatment will be paid for. All sulfide mines so far, have leaked some acid, into their waterways. Decision makers should keep that in mind. PolyMet would like to mine within the high quality wetland habitat that is owned by the federal government, as a part of the Superior National Forest. It is the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of bird habitat, sulfuric acid and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will have a negative effect, on the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that eat fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will probably lose habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Sulfide ore mining has not been made safe so far, anywhere it has been done. Twenty years of mining, will likely assure, hundreds of years of water pollution to both sensitive birds and habitat. Until sulfide mining is proven safe, it should not be done anywhere. With much better mining technique, this site, is still not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Kent Newman 2950 Washtenaw Rd Apt 2b Ypsilanti, MI 48197-1514 (734) 434-8643

Kent Scheer 7706

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: We have obviously entered a time in history when our population and its extraordinary materialism is visibly damaging the environment from which we draw our sustenance. You have all heard the full litany of environmental damage ranging from the dead zone to exhaustion of entire ocean fisheries. This is not the time for intelligent people to permit another massive extraction process risking lasting environmental degradation. Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482 218 631 3084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Scheer

9962

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482

18717

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Scheer

18860

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482 218 631 3084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Scheer

18861

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482 218 631 3084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Scheer

50792

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kent Scheer 850 Scheer Drive NE Wadena, MN 56482

Kent Simon

2807

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It's hard to believe that allowing copper sulfide mining is even being considered, given the following: the public hearing period 90 days; but the clean-up period may be up to 500 years only 300+ mining jobs will be created; but how many more jobs rely on tourism, based on the natural beauty of the place, will be lost it's never been done before without environmental damage; but this is different, a special case So what have you been smoking lately The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Kent Simon 4733 Isabel Ave Minneapolis, MN 55406-2946

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kent Simon

44067

MNDNR: As an architect in professional practice for 34 years, I can say one thing with certainty – stuff leaks and systems fail - I deal with it on a regular basis. So it's a given that any well-designed open pit mining system comprising liners, computer controlled pumps, and block-off walls, will experience failures and will eventually need replacement. Regardless of whether the design is done according to best accepted practices, it cannot accurately account for some factors and will overlook others. It is simply hubris to think otherwise; no army of the best designers and engineers is capable of doing better today. In the design of the Polymet system, one factor that absolutely cannot be accurately accounted for is climate change and how it will affect precipitation and water flow levels. Despite the application of the best modeling tools science has to offer, there is no consensus on the rate of climate change over the next fifty years, let alone five hundred. Simply stated, water flows cannot be predicted with reliable accuracy. The only thing that is certain is that we are not perfect and the best laid schemes do go astray. And every system has an expected useful life, so well-considered contingency plans and replacement plans are critical. The lack of such plans in your report is glaring in its omission, all the more so because a leaking liner and drainage system burdened by a 200 feet mound of mining rubble is, for all intents and purposes, inaccessible. This would of less great concern if not for the fact that there will be a serious detrimental environmental impact when failure occurs. And we're not just talking about one mine here; this decision will be precedent-setting and if the Polymet venture is approved, the gate will be open. How many more mines will we be saddled with maintaining for 500 years. In the near future, better methods of sulfide mining will be developed; and technologies will develop that do not require the extensive use of copper for the manufacture of wind turbines, computers, batteries - you name it. It is prudent to wait until such time rather than to proceed, especially with a new mining company with no track record for anything except marketing. The time will come when the right proposal is made and we will recognize it as such. It will be a proposal that offers considerable economic benefits for all Minnesotans and preserves the environment, Minnesota's most precious natural resource. This is not that this proposal and this is not the time. Kent Simon, RA Vice President MILLER HANSON PARTNERS | ARCHITECTS + PLANNERS 1201 Hawthorne Ave, Minneapolis, MN 55403 Direct: 612-877-7070 | Office: 612-332-5420 | Fax: 612-332-5425 Email: HYPERLINK "mailto:ksimon@millerhanson-com"ksimon@millerhanson-com | Web: HYPERLINK "http://www.millerhanson-com/"www.millerhanson-com This message, including attachments, if any, may contain confidential, proprietary information that is legally privileged. If you are not the addressee or authorized to receive this for the addressee, you must not use, copy, disclose, distribute, or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at 612-332-5420 or via email by clicking on Reply, indicating that you received the e-mail in error. Please immediately destroy the original message, any attachments and all copies. Thank you.

51986

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It's hard to believe that allowing copper sulfide mining is even being considered, given the following: the public hearing period 90 days; but the clean-up period may be up to 500 years only 300+ mining jobs will be created; but how many more jobs rely on tourism, based on the natural beauty of the place, will be lost it's never been done before without environmental damage; but this is different, a special case So what have you been smoking lately The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Kent Simon 4733 Isabel Ave Minneapolis, MN 55406-2946

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kenta Yamamoto

41816

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kenta Yamamoto Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kenzie

54346

Dear Ms.Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager,I think that the PolyMet Mining has a very good plan in place. I think that it is well thought out, I also think that they have planned every aspect of the project out very thoroughly. I think that this copper-sulfate mining process will definitely benefit Minnesota in some ways.The advantages to this would be that there would be less unemployment, and better lives for many Minnesotans. But there would also be some disadvantages; there is always a risk of population considering how close the mining project would be tho many rivers, lakes, and wildlife.This will affect cultural resources. A segment of the Mesabe Widjiu known as a sacred place to the Ojibwe people, occurs within the project area so it would be affected. A segment of the Beaver Bay to Lake Vermilion Trail, It also exists within the project area so it would be affected. The Project is also located on land that was awarded to the U.S by the Bands under the 1854 Treaty. The Bands reserved the right to hunt, fish, and gather on these lands. Resources like fish, plants, and animals might be affected by the project.The land exchange would involve the transfer of 6,650.2 acres of federal lands from public to private ownership, and up to 6,722.5 acres of land from private to public ownership, depending upon the results of the environmental analysis and federal real estate appraisals. The federal land proposed for exchange is one 6,650 acre tract. Nonfederal land considered for exchange includes five tracts throughout the SNF ranging in size from 32 acres to 4,651 acres. I think that this land exchange is ok. I think that the land that was public that would become private is unfair. I don't know what the public uses the land for , but for example: if I walked my dogs through this public land every day and then all of a sudden they built and mining project on it I wouldn't be happy. This project will not affect me. I think that this is for a good cause and if it needs to happen, it should. i just think that the land exchange should be more fair to the public.Thank you for taking the time to read all of our letters, we really appreciate it!-Kenzie

Keri Lynn Igo

54501

See attachment

Kerry Carter

54117

I do not support Polymet. A few dollars of profit to corporation isn't worth destroying our water resources. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kerry martineau

40040

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The science as I believe proves there is no safe or environmental safe and sound way to for this mine like mining in Minnesota has been boom and bust no lasting good impact very few jobs no long term good for our water both ground and lakes and streams our lands or the creatures we share them with I vote yes for the life the future of all creatures and No vote for this mine.. Sincerely, Mr kerry martineau 13 Cypress Dr Duluth, MN 55810-1901 (218) 349-6869

Kerry Sage

58049

Really feel this will have a devastating effect on our beautiful lakes & natural environment. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Kerry Waschke Collie

42759

See attachment

Kevin Baker

15742

See attachment

Kevin Brungraber

41605

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Kevin Brungraber 1046 Fountain Dr Sun Prairie, WI 53590-3038 (715) 207-9736

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin G Olsen

9307

I am sending this email in opposition of Polymets proposal for ore mining in the BWCA in northern Minnesota. Myself and a group of high school friends have been enjoying the camping and tranquility of this area for the last 30 years. There is no other place like it. This area is what Minnesota is all about. To have this area ruined by sulfuric waste polluting our waterways and land is unthinkable. Do we really want to have 500 years of cleanup and pollution destroying the last pristine place in Minnesota. I say NO I've read over and over that 100% of sulfur mining projects have polluted the surrounding environments. Granted it may create jobs in a struggling economy, but the ongoing aftermath of such a project doesn't add up. This proposal needs to stop right here and right now. This area needs to be preserved for generations to come. People from all over the country come to Minnesota to enjoy this serene area, so it's not just Minnesota that this mining proposal will effect. A wasteland is not a pretty site. Take the trucks, cranes and front end loaders and keep them in the sandbox where they belong Kevin Olsen This e-mail, including attachments, may include confidential and/or proprietary information, and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.

Kevin Heaslip

46316

From: kheas@charter-net [mailto:kheas@charter-net] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 2:07 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: FW: Polymet EIS ----- Begin forwarded message ----- Subject: Polymet EIS Date: 3/12/14 1:39:06 PM From: HYPERLINK "mailto:kheas@charter-net" kheas@charter-net To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us" NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Dear Sir or Madam, Regarding the comment period for the Polymet EIS, I believe that the upcoming deadline for comment will unsatisfactorily limit input. Such an important issue as sulfide mining in our area needs to be fully examined; setting an arbitrary comment deadline only serves to rush an agenda. The people of Minnesota, and particularly northern Minnesota, will only get one opportunity to get this right. Please let us take our time. Thank you, Kevin Heaslip

46463

Dear Sir or Madam, Regarding the comment period for the Polymet EIS, I believe that the upcoming deadline for comment will unsatisfactorily limit input. Such an important issue as sulfide mining in our area needs to be fully examined; setting an arbitrary comment deadline only serves to rush an agenda. The people of Minnesota, and particularly northern Minnesota, will only get one opportunity to get this right. Please let us take our time. Thank you, Kevin Heaslip

46571

Dear Sir or Madam, Regarding the comment period for the Polymet EIS, I believe that the upcoming deadline for comment will unsatisfactorily limit input. Such an important issue as sulfide mining in our area needs to be fully examined; setting an arbitrary comment deadline only serves to rush an agenda. The people of Minnesota, and particularly northern Minnesota, will only get one opportunity to get this right. Please let us take our time. Thank you, Kevin Heaslip

Kevin Johnson

16328

Polymet must be able to open the mine. This is a huge opportunity for Minnesota and studies have been completed by Polymet as to not to harm the water. Mines have been in northern Minnesota for a hundred years without this issue. Please give them the opportunity to help Minnesota. Thanks.

Kevin Jones

57345

So my statement about the PolyMet project. Obviously, I think it is good for the State of Minnesota. I think it is important for Minnesota, as well as the United States, to show environmental stewardship by bringing leading edge technologies to the mining process. In addition to the many good things that I see the mine creating for not just Minnesota, but the local areas as well, I think it is -- I think it is an important opportunity for the U.S. to be able to showcase that we are really taking a leading, important role in environmental stewardship worldwide. Keeping it positive. You know, in addition, obviously, PolyMet will provide jobs to the area. But kind of going back, I think more important than the jobs and the revenue, and the taxes, and the money side of things, I think it is a great opportunity to really show how things can be done right. And that's it. Okay? Thanks.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Jorgenson

38471

The definition of FRAUD: 1- Deceit, trickery, sharp practice, or breach of confidence, perpetrated for profit or to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage 2- A particular instance of such deceit or trickery: mail fraud, election fraud 3- Any deception, trickery or humbug Basically, that's what the PolyMet proposal has come down to fraud. By knowingly allowing an environmental impact statement to use information on water flow that is incorrect and inaccurate, and if the DNR allows that information to be used moving forward, FRAUD is being committed. They are deceiving us about the true potential impact of pollution in attempt to profit by being allowed to mine minerals in Northern Minnesota. Any officials that move forward KNOWING that the information in the impact statement should be tried in a court of law as well. We should not mortgage the next 5 generations futures for the potential of a few hundred people to have jobs for 20 years. What is PolyMet going to do. They are going to pull the minerals out, make a ton of money and then leAve The state really isn't going to benefit, and the long-term costs of trying to prevent our precious waters from being polluted cannot be quantified by experts. Our waters will become polluted, and then not only will the state be burdened with the costs of trying to clean up the water, but that area will lose its beauty and revenue generator - tourism. Time and again we have seen sites become polluted, companies pull out or file bankruptcy and leave the people holding the bag. This company has no history in our state, no ties to us. They only want what is in the ground to make money and then leave the mess for us to deal with. We need to say no to this proposal. Their impact statement is knowingly false and inaccurate regarding water flow information that was used to determine potentials for pollution. If they are incorrect in a basic measurement like water flow, what more complex items in their report are also inaccurate. FRAUD is illegal for a reason. The state should not perpetuate FRAUD nor allow it to happen. Kevin Jorgenson 1421 Wildflower Ln NE Owatonna MN 55060

Kevin Kathmann

40123

From: farmecologist@hotmail-com [farmecologist@hotmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:04 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Again, I strongly support the rejection of this proposal. Thank you. Sincerely, Kevin Kathmann 6339 Pebble Ln SW Rochester, MN 55902-2521

Kevin Koschak

43027

Attached you will find comments on the NorthMet project. Kevin Koschak 2384 151st Ave NW Andover, MN 55304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Lee

47244

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please don't let PolyMet get away with submitting an analysis that is inadequate. The PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years. Lake Superior and the north shore is a beautiful and unique asset to our state. Don't let the North Shore environment be destroyed by mining that is almost guaranteed to pollute the ground water. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kevin Lee 2149 Temple Court Saint Paul, MN 55104

Kevin Milliken

40350

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Kevin Milliken 6385 138th Place SE Bellevue, WA 98006 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Myers

18874

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: What will your great, great grandchildren say when they hear how nothing was done to stop the destruction of Northern Minnesota. I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Kevin Myers 33 Riverside Dr Duluth, MN 55808 715 520 3085

Kevin Novak

39728

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Kevin Novak 321 Grace St N Ortonville, MN 56278-1212

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Oak 15444

My input, for what it may be worth It is appalling that PolyMet would wantonly cause egregious harm to critical environmental systems and habitat for the sake of short-term profits. The toxins and poisons they are intending to spew into the environment with callous disregard for life will still be killing long after they are gone from there. Minnesota will be a better state if it takes action to defend these pristine habitats for us and our posterity to enjoy into the future. PolyMet must not be allowed to destroy for their profit what belongs to all Minnesotans. Please protect our legacy. Thank You Kevin Oak 15603 W. Munson Ln Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

Kevin OHalloran 6038

To Whom it May Concern: I am writing to strongly encourage cessation of this project. There is no need to risk any environmental degradation of this part of the state. Please consider halting this project and any others.

Kevin ORourke 43072

Regarding the environmental impact statement in connection to the proposed sulfide mine and tailing to be stored at the south east corner of 100 mile swamp. I saw the map that is currently being used by SDEIS, and when superimposed on an accurate map of the area, it is clear that a crime is taking place in that there is a coverup of the actual environmental degradation that will take place. The SDEIS map shows a part of the marsh area that is much smaller than the actual area, and also shows a flowage under the bridge to the swamp and a flowage out of the swamp. There is no real flowage out of the swamp, as the swamp is continuous into the BWCA. That is the cover up. It appears that PolyMet has a cartographer in their pocket. It is important to remember that PolyMet comes from "old European money", that is from a community that has long hired private mercenaries to go into third world nations, wage war, and take materials. Their ethical standards are a violation of the values of Minnesotans. We could resolve the issue, have the mines, the jobs, and protect the waters if Minnesotans and PolyMet would agree to share the cost of an advanced water purification system, so that no sulfide runoff would occur. It is important to note that once water is acidified by even a small amount, it will no longer sustain trout fisheries. With sulfide runoff going into hundred mile swamp, the chemicals will eventually reach the boundary waters, and the trout habitat destroyed all the way. Signed Kevin O'Rourke 2743-16th Ave South

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407 From: mister.ericm@yahoo-com To: openprogressivemichael@gmail-com; rock@augzburg-edu; cedarislandgirl@gmail-com; thomaskorourke@msn-com Subject: RE: Submit comments about PolyMet and the BWCA before Thursday, March 13 at 4:30 Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2014 20:42:16 -0500

Hi, I just wanted to remind you that comments about PolyMet will only be accepted until 4:30 pm tomorrow, March 13- If you have a few spare moments and are willing to comment, comments can be submitted by email to HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us . Relevant comments speak to the environmental impact statement and require a full name and street address. One important thing to comment on is the maps in the environmental impact statement (SDEIS) are incorrect in a way that makes it appear the mine and the BWCA are isolated geographically when they're not. Mine runoff that contains acids and metals can percolate will drain to a swamp that is itself drained by two streams, one of which leads to the BWCA. What the incorrect maps do is simply cut off the portion of the swamp that drains to the BWCA.

What I and other people are requesting is for the MN DNR correct the mapping discrepancy, do hydraulic testing to determine what the split of waste to the two watersheds are, determine to what extent the BWCA is potentially affected, and to provide some protection for the BWCA by testing water flowing there. I'm attaching some sample comments as an example. I hope you will make some comments if you haven't already, Thanks, Eric From: Eric Morrison [mailto:mister.ericm@yahoo-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 11:47 PM To: openprogressivemichael@gmail-com; rock@augzburg-edu; cedarislandgirl@gmail-com'; Kevin O'Rourke (thomaskorourke@msn-com) Subject: Submit comments about PolyMet and the BWCA before Thursday, March 13 at 4:30 Hi, Please make comments about the PolyMet mine before the deadline, and make sure you tell everyone you know. Facebook and Twitter. Use the Internet. Comments can be submitted at HYPERLINK

"mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us For more information, make sure you visit the website at HYPERLINK "http://www.bwcasulfideminig-org"www.bwcasulf

Comments can be submitted at HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us For more information, make sure you visit the website at HYPERLINK "http://www.bwcasulfideminig-org"www.bwcasulf

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Piron

690

Ms Fay: I have a brief comment regarding the Polymet project and others like it such as Twin Metals. This does not directly pertain to issues of water quality, et al, but rather to our behavior as a civilized, responsible society. I know that the EIS statement is not concerned with what I have to say, but I am trying to get my thoughts into the record where possible. I very much support our efforts to prevent pollution of all types and to maintain the purity of our water and other natural resources. However, when we say that we don't want a project like Polymet to happen in our back yard, we are, in effect, saying that we want it to happen elsewhere where it won't be our concern. To me, elsewhere means many places in the world where people and their environment have little or no protections from mining and industrial practices that would never be permitted in our country. I would propose to say that when we as Americans are ready to give up our I-Phones, all of our personal computing devices, our HD televisions, our GPS, our high-tech vehicles, and all of the myriad tools, medical devices and appliances that depend on a reliable supply of copper and other precious metals, only then ought we to consider not permitting ventures like Polymet to move forward and at least give them the chance to show what they can do to provide these resources while protecting the environment. I believe we have a moral responsibility to provide our own resources when we know that there will be unmitigated human suffering in other countries if we demand that they provide the resources we crave and depend on. It is no coincidence that companies like Apple are in China producing many of their personal electronic devices - a country that has horrifying levels of all types of industrial pollution and the enormously elevated levels of awful diseases that accompany that. With kind regards, Kevin Piron Hibbing, MN Kevin Kevin Piron Creative Director/Architect Architectural Resources, Inc. <mailto:kevin.piron@arimn-com> HYPERLINK "blocked::http://www.arimn-com/"www.arimn-com 704 East Howard Street Hibbing, MN 55746 tel: 218-263-6868 fax: 218-722-6803 *****Confidentiality Notice***** The information contained in this message (including any attachments) may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that it is strictly prohibited (a) to disseminate, distribute or copy this communication or any of the information contained in it, or (b) to take any action based on the information in it. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

Kevin Shannon

42004

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kevin Shannon Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kevin Swanberg

40822

As a citizen and a taxpayer of Minnesota, I strongly oppose the proposed Polymet mine. I feel it is dangerous for our environment. Here in Minnesota, land of sky blue waters, home to (more than) 10,000 lakes, we must treasure and preserve our wetlands, our forests and our waters. They are our greatest natural resource. Not only are they beautiful, they provide jobs in the tourism industry, give us food and keep our state clean. The temporary jobs that the mine will create will destroy many permanent jobs the tourism industry and farming industry give our state. What good is a few hundred jobs that will only last 20 years. Are they worth sacrificing our state's natural resources for. I don't believe so. Please consider this when making a decision on the mine. Don't put the fate of our state in the hands of people who don't even understand what Minnesota stands for. Thank you, Kevin Swanberg 632 E 3rd St Apt G Duluth, MN 55805 - Kevin Swanberg HYPERLINK "mailto:swanb034@d.umn-edu"swanb034@d.umn-edu (218) 260-5091

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kevin tsui

39580

Mar 11, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr kevin tsui western ave seattle, WA 98121-2153

Kevin Viken

41876

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Kevin Viken 1964 Prior Ave N Saint Paul, MN 55113-5405

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kevin Viken

43110

To Whom it may concern about the NorthMet SDEIS, I am writing in regard to the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am concerned with the draft as it stands for the following reasons but I also feel there are opportunities to be had with more changes: 1- The water in the tailings ponds will be highly toxic without regard to the eventual pH of the water. Because the tailings are created from pulverized rock which has had its surface area increased infinitely and exposed to air/water, even slow rates of leaching will result in toxic levels of heavy metals/sulfides that will harm native flora, fauna, microbiota that are all critical for the proper functioning of the local ecosystem. Most importantly, the magnitude of time the toxic water within the tailings ponds has to be determined. At some point it will escape because nothing can be contained in perpetuity. 2- Financial assurance needs to be addressed and well laid out with adequate resources and adequate protections. This cannot be done until item #1, above, has been determined. The reason this is so important is the water WILL leach out without question at some point. Geological changes are slow but unstoppable and severe weather events must be expected and planned for during the term of water sequestration. ie if water is to be sequestered for 500 years plans must expect a 500 year weather event to happen or a 50% chance of a 1,000 year weather event. Cost of such a catastrophic weather event needs to be adequately determined. To have adequate funds 2 things are necessary: a. Ensure adequate funds given different scenarios for the long term economic possibilities. b. Adequate protections of the money that is set aside is critical and requires that how it is handled must be enshrined in the constitution. If it is not enshrined in the constitution one only needs to look as far as the state tobacco money to see what will happen eventually 3- I do not see anywhere within the SDEIS where they have taken a survey of the microbiota currently present in the ecosystem and how those organisms will respond to the potential levels of leachate from the tailings ponds. This must be assessed because it has become known recently the important role microbiota play in an ecosystem. 4- I would like the setup of a recycling technology research and production facility to be set up on the iron range so we can learn to effectively mine our waste of these materials. This could stimulate the economy both short and long-term until a way to handle the waste from mining can be found to be safe for the very long term. In reality as it sits currently it would be safer to dispose of radioactive waste on the iron range because that eventually becomes inert ie waste from our nuclear power plants would be dangerous for 10's of thousands of years or less than a 100 years if it was reprocessed for the next level of nuclear power. Waste from the NorthMet project that is leached in the water will be forever toxic because it doesn't have the advantage of radioactive decay that nuclear waste has. 5- Lastly I would like it to be considered that the mine be required to be underground below the water table and the waste be used to backfill the mined tunnels. In my view we currently have the technology for this to be done safely for the very long-term. Sincerely, Kevin Viken 1964 Prior Ave Roseville, MN 55113 Phone: 612 419-6290

Khang Le

54225

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay I'm Khang Le, an junior at Humboldt High School on E Baker Street. So Mr. Morrison is one of my helping teacher in my chemistry class. One day, he presented with our class about a topic that make me felt ridiculous and kind of unfair about it. It's about the Polymet's mining and their mining construction at boundary water. I don't know is it illegal if you changing the map and information that provide for the contruction. The map that the polymet company providing is wrong, absolutely wrong, they had been rewriting the map of the swap where the mine, are going to be place on. And also the mining company dumping their rock into a swpp that having sulfite init and when sulfite meet with water they'll produce sulfuride acid that can make a huge damage the impact of the environmental that can change the ecosystem of living species inthere. Also the company is untruthworthy, the CEO of the company is one of the top ten wanted in FBI and that me have a bad feeling about this. So I recommend you to tell the company stop or rewrite the map and provide that there will not be anything happen to the boundary water. Khang Le 266 Fuller Ave, Apt #12 St. Paul, MN 55103

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kiersten Wilson

54359

Kiersten Wilson Earth Science 2/10/2014 Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I strongly disagree with this mining project. There are definitely a lot of pros, but the cons absolutely outweigh them. I'd like to start by stating that the amount of endangered wildlife is horrendous. If there is any chance, which there is, of destroying or affecting this wildlife, the project should come to an immediate halt. We cannot afford to risk losing any wildlife. I do realize the effort to plant the endangered plants on a different piece of land, but what about the endangered mammals, reptiles and birds? What will they do during this project? Even if it doesn't directly affect the animals, the sound, water pollution and deposition of dust will surely affect their lives. I also realize that you plan to plant more wildlife and trees at the site after the mining is over, but what about those twenty years when the animals may be deprived of their homes? What happens when they drink polluted water? As I have said before, we cannot risk the lives of these innocent animals over one mining site in Minnesota. As you can see, it would be a great loss not to have this wonderful mining site in Minnesota, but the lives of the wildlife should come first. The lives of these creatures are at great risk, and it would be silly not to disengage this mining project. Sincerely,

Kim Christensen

57953

If you wreck the water, the copper won't matter. I am concerned about what by-products will be left after this mining is done. I do not trust the plans to clean up the mess. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Kim Hall

41619

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kim Hall MPLS, Minnesota

Kim Keelor

42633

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kim Mickelson

16291

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Kim Schroeder

18285

My name is Kim Schroeder. And my concern is that this is a for-profit company. What if they go out of business? What is our, I guess, guaranty that this mess will be cleaned up if they don't make it to the 40-year mark or the 500-year mark? What is the plan to keep this out of the taxpayers' hands? I'm very concerned about that. Thanks.

Kim Wolff

41267

As a resident of the North Shore I strongly oppose the proposed copper nickel mine in northeastern Minnesota. The eventual loss of jobs from the environmental desecration of our lakes that tourists fish, loss of wildlife that bring people to our area to view, will outweigh the temporary increase in jobs to the area. The environmental impact statement is inaccurate as to poor test sites relating to the rivers that feed our lakes. Projected rises in Mercury levels are not specified. Please ask the questions and demand answers for the what ifs for worse case environmental disasters. Thank you for your efforts. Please Do Not Allow This Mining Project. Kim Kim Wolff, Broker TimberWolff Realty LLC www.timberwolffrealty-com (218) 663-8777 office (887) 664-8777 toll free (218) 663-8778 fax

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kim wood

44681

Hello, I am a citizen of NE Minnesota, a parent, a husband, and one who loves the outdoors. I have also travelled and worked overseas, and am aware of the global issues impacting the use and procurement of metals. I am also a physician. I am sure that you have been bombarded with comments on the proposed mine, both pro and con. My email today is a blessedly brief one. My initial reaction to the mine was fierce opposition. Several months ago, after stepping back a bit from the local impacts, and viewing the mine through a global lens, I supported it. I am now however firmly opposed to the mine for many reasons. The environmental impacts are long lasting. The economic plans to ensure ongoing water quality and mine maintenance after the mine has shut down, are, in my mind, flawed. The health impacts are unclear. This email will be forwarded along to Rick Nolan and Al Franken, our representatives in Washington DC. I will also contact Mark Dayton to let him know of my opposition to this mine. Thank you for your time and careful consideration in this matter. Sincerely, John Wood

Kimberle Ganzer-Wiley

17074

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kimberle Ganzer-Wiley 3839 Vincent Avenue North Minneapolis, MN 55412

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kimberle Ganzer-Wiley

50345

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Kimberle Ganzer-Wiley 3839 Vincent Avenue North Minneapolis, MN 55412

Kimberley Wagner

41952

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kimberley Wagner Finland, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kimberlie Calkins

40141

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Kimberlie Calkins 21505 Maple Ave Apt 303 Rogers, MN 55374-9673 (763) 428-9141

Kimberly E Olson

57178

I'm saying STOP! The poisoning of our land, and waters, it is yours too. Please don't take our Freedom of Nature away from us. We fish, swim, plant gardens, go hunting, hiking, and go camping. People come for vacations as well. The woodlands are great for getting away. Remember that old song called "In the Year 2525 – if man is still alive? This is what is happening to our world. Don't let the corporation's pressure you. Do what you know is right. Please leave our 10,000 lakes alone. I bet you would enjoy these lakes yourselves, to get away from it all also.Plus, think about ALL the soul's you would be hurting. Please don't poison our lakes and land.Kimberly E. Olson1006 East 3rd Street, #12ADuluth, MN 55805

Kimberly Miller

44875

My family values the environment of northern Minnesota. The plan PolyMet has put forward to deal with contaminated waste water is NOT adequate. I don't want to have to explain to my children that it was "good for the economy" when they see our most unique and valuable ecosystem harmed for generations. Please deny PolyMet a mining permit and ask them to develop a better plan for dealing with waste water. Kimberly Zachman Minneapolis, MN

Kimberly Nieman

39366

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Kimberly Nieman Orchid Circle Plymouth, MN 55446

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kimberly P

41946

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kimberly P Saint Paul, Minnesota

Kimberly Ped

39904

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Miss Kimberly Ped PO Box 4595 Saint Paul, MN 55101-4595 (651) 366-7451

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kimberly Swenson-Zakula

15759

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Kira Church

57185

The health of the BWCA and surrounding area is really important part of not only visitors who come to camp, but also Native American culture and all types of ecosystems. It is important that we protect these ecosystems and cultures. Thank you.Kira Church257 Macalester StSt. Paul, MN 55105

Kirby

44497

I believe a "No Action" process should take place at this time. Environmental consequences of air, water, and ground pollution will take place. Lead and mercury will be leached into the land, air and water. I believe this Polymet Mine can take place at a later time when environmental processes and abatement procedures are improved. I don't believe Polymet can make a case that there is a shortage of Copper or Nickel that necessitates any mining to be conducted now or near term. Another thing is there is not enough transparency on the part of the mines in Northern Minnesota including Polymet. I never see anything published in local newspapers or voiced on the radio as to what the mines do to meet NAAQS and Clean Water Act requirements. Therefore no new Polymet Mine should be allowed to go forth at this time. V/r Kirby Stross 2303 3rd Ave W. Hibbing, MN 55746

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kirk D. Haldorson

21976

TO: MN Dept. of Natural Resources FROM: Kirk D. Haldorson 202 W. Superior St Suite 510 Duluth MN 55802 Dear MN DNR, I would like to voice my support of the PolyMet Mining Project in Northern Minnesota. I grew up in Silver Bay Minnesota, my father worked for Reserve Mining/Northshore Mining for 43 years. He was able to raise and provide for six children all because of the benefits of having a good paying mining job with benefits. Not one of his six children have ever worked in the mining business or ever have ever worked in a mine. All six of us children though have went on to college, get married, all have children and every one of us, every grandchild, every spouse all live in Minnesota, pay taxes to the state of MN and now, my father has great grandchildren starting to work in the state of MN and pay taxes. Again, all from one mining job. I personally have owned my own company for 21 years and have employed many throughout the years. My oldest brother has created a company in MPLS MN with over 100 employees (mostly engineers) for over 30 years building grain elevators for Cargill throughout the world. When I hear that PolyMet will bring 300 jobs to our wonderful state I step back and think, it's just the tip of an iceberg. If my father would have had to move to another state for a mining job, I can guarantee you none of us six children would probably be living in this state, paying taxes in this state, raising children in this state or creating jobs in this state. All from one mining job. I grew up planting trees for the US Forestry to earn money as a child, fished often in the Boundary Waters, currently live on a lake within 60 miles of the proposed mine, and support the environment as much anyone. I would be the first to say shut the project down if the technology doesn't work, such as what happened to Reserve Mining years ago, but we must give PolyMet and the technology to prove themselves as this project is the utmost important to our state and to our beautiful country. It is time to move this project forwaRd Thank you for taking this into consideration. Sincerely, Kirk D. Haldorson <http://mail.aol-com/IM/.sn=kirkdhandlocale=en-usandpd=0> Kirk D. Haldorson

Kirk Haldorson

18369

Hi. My name is Kirk Haldorson. I'm from Duluth, Minnesota. I'm a local business owner. I truly, truly thank you folks for being here, for taking the time to do this. I grew up in a mining family. I grew up in the Boundary Waters, enjoying the Boundary Waters every week probably in the summer. I have planted more trees in the state of Minnesota than I think probably anybody in room in my lifetime. I totally, totally enjoy the environment. But saying that, I grew up in a mining family. My dad put 43 years in the mine. Raised six kids from that one mining job. All six kids of us stayed in this state. I own my own company. I created jobs. My brother created a company in Minneapolis with 100 engineers that builds grain elevators for cargo all over the world. If we wouldn't have had that one mining job, I guarantee you none of us six kids would still be in this state if we had to move. And they did shut down reserve mining when I was growing up, and my dad had to wait for the technology to catch up so they could continue to work in this state. I believe the state can do that. And I don't understand why -- I love the environment like everybody. If it doesn't work, shut it down. But give them a chance. We wouldn't be here today, I guarantee you, without that mining. All six of us work in this state. We're all married. All our spouses work in this state. Every one of our kids stayed in this state. That is lot of revenue from one mining job. I don't want to ruin our environment. I would be the first one to say "shut it down." Honestly. I would never -- and they will shut it down if they don't have the technology to do it. We went through it with reserve mining. So they will do that. But we have to give the time in the sea of the technology. I don't want to be dependent on China or another world. Everybody that took us down here today used copper. Everybody that has a phone has copper. Where are we going to get this from? Our country -- our state and our country needs to be independent. So give them a chance. I so much appreciate you guys doing what you do. And I understand the other side. I love the Boundary Waters as much as anybody. I planted probably 2 million trees in Northern Minnesota that some of you are harvesting today. I walk through the forest, I see it. I would never ever support a company or a project if I truly thought it was going to hurt our environment. I've met with the management of PolyMet many times. I've never worked in a mine. The only person that worked in a mine was my father. None of six kids did. We all stayed here. That's a lot of jobs. That's a lot of revenue. When I see grain elevators going up around the world and 100 engineers working in this state because of one mining job, that's really important. And we have to give them a chance. Truly thank you guys for doing this. I appreciate it.

Kirsten Anne

42571

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kirsti Gullickson 39598

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Kirsti Gullickson 4429 Fondell Dr Edina, MN 55435-4151 (952) 928-9730

Kirstin van den Berg 47081

Dear Department of Natural Resources, I live in Grand Marais, Minnesota on the north shore of Lake Superior. Having lived and worked here in Cook County for nearly 20 years I appreciate the opportunity to live where clean water is accessible for recreation purposes and for drinking. My biggest concern with a copper nickel mine is the potential for contamination of our natural water systems. I understand that a potential water contamination analysis was done, but that it did not reflect the appropriate depths of drilling/mining and its effects on the surrounding water tables. Water tables are infinitely connected. We see that especially here in Cook County, and I would expect similar situations exist in the Babbitt/Hoyt Lakes area. A well that is drilled in one location can have an effect on another neighbor's well several miles away. I am worried that if a contamination situation should occur, that it could be dangerous. I do not believe that Polymet could control the contamination even if they had the financial resources to do it. Our water systems are too interconnected. From reading the fact sheets, they have not demonstrated to my satisfaction that their mining processes are safe and that the risk of contamination is non-existent or even minimal. More and more of our population (especially young people) are getting sick with cancers and other body systems disorders. Everything that we put into our air, soil and water contributes to our well-being. A copper-nickel mine that has so many risk factors is not an industry that will contribute to a healthy living environment in our state. Copper-nickel mining may seem like a good short-term solution for local jobs, but is not a good long-term solution for a state where we pride ourselves on our clean air and clean water. We are the "Land of 10,000 Lakes" and to put any of them at the risk of contamination would be a travesty. Thank you for considering my comments. Kirstin van den Berg 921 West 1st Street Grand Marais, MN 55612

Kit Richardson 54827

See attachment

Kitura Main 44399

The water modeling needs to be reworked. This WILL compromise our health and State. No to polynet

Kiyrie Abernethy 44367

As a young person, I feel that it would be a hasty and poor decision to go forward with the PolyMet Mining project. Though mining is an important economic activity, the proposed mine's economic boons would be short-lived compared to the environmental degradation caused. The project is estimated to create 50-100 jobs, but these jobs would be cyclical, causing an initial boom and then a bust for the workers. The environmental impacts could last 500 years longer than the jobs. Toxic chemicals used to extract copper, nickel, and precious metals can pollute waterways. Mine tailings will have to be treated for generations. Ph sensitive plants such as wild rice will suffer. Finally, this project would threaten the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, the crown jewel of our beautiful state. We should consider the long term consequences of the PolyMet project before we do something we'll regret as a state. Kiyrie A. Sent from my iPhone

Kjen Fromberg 42526

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

kkelnberger

20883

I am a member of a board which has as its primary focus protecting the quality of lakes in Northeast MN. We have been studying the proposals and feel that the money that is being set aside for clean-up is not sufficient. The mine will fail. The taxpayers will get the bill. The only ones to make money on this project will be the venture capitalists and company owners.

kkenned2@d.umn.edu

40252

How can the DNR allow this copper mining in MN.. In 2008, Minnesota's voters passed the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment (Legacy Amendment) to the Minnesota Constitution to: protect drinking water sources; to protect, enhance, and restore wetlands, prairies, forests, and fish, game, and wildlife habitat; to preserve arts and cultural heritage; to support parks and trails; and to protect, enhance, and restore lakes, rivers, streams, and groundwater. The fact that you are even continuing with this copper mining permit issues flies in the face of the above amendment. This copper is a want more than a need. We need to find more ways to recycle, reuse and even get into landfills to retrieve copper.. We need to be the state that refused to allow the destruction of our wetlands, forests and lakes for the short term gain of a few jobs and large financial gains for foreign corporations. The DNR appears to have conflict within itself re: this issue. There is no guarantee, and no proof of even one of these copper mining sites has ever left the mining site able to regrow vegetation, much less enhance, restore or improve our environment. For cripes sake read this: Summary of Damage Sites from the Disposal of Mining Wastes, prepared for the US Environmental Protection Agency, January 1984- The DNR appears to have conflict within itself, you are supposed to protect and manager our resources, not sell them out to the highest bidder, and to heck with the devastation it leaves in its wake.

klarstrom

44825

To: Ms Lisa Fay SDEIS Manager MN DNR Dear Ms Fay: I see numerous problems with the NorthMet Polymet SDEIS, and request that it be rejected. The reasons include: 1) The SDEIS does not adequately take into account bedrock fault lines, which could channel unknown quantities of compromised water in unclear directions. Unforseen negative consequences may result. 2) The capture of polluted water is not necessarily as effective as the SDEIS portrays. The SDEIS should be re-done with a more realistic number. 3) With polluted water needing treatment far, far into the future, a proper financial assurance for funding for this activity must be part of the plan. This must include inflation calculations with a generous margin for error. The taxpayers of the year 2500 (yes, there will still be taxpayers.) do NOT want to carry the burden of miscalculations from 2014- 4) I believe that baseline water flowage data used as a basis for the SDEIS is grossly underestimated. The SDEIS must be re-done with flow rates closer to real-life and worse-case numbers. 5) The human cost to innocents is not adequately reflected in the SDEIS. Unforseen consequences can harm future Minnesotans for centuries into the future. An escrow account large enough to attempt to compensate harmed persons, individually or collectively, whether for medical consequences, loss of tourist trade, or other unforseen harms, needs to be included. It might be needed for 500 years, and should include monies to help defray legal costs so harmed individuals can obtain justice. I believe that the SDEIS is hugely flawed, and must be re-done. I request that you reject it. Thank you. Sincerely, Scott Lagaard MD 600 313th Ln NE Cambridge, MN 55008

44826

To: Ms Lisa Fay SDEIS Manager MN DNR Dear Ms Fay: I see numerous problems with the NorthMet Polymet SDEIS, and request that it be rejected. The reasons include: 1) The SDEIS does not adequately take into account bedrock fault lines, which could channel unknown quantities of compromised water in unclear directions. Unforseen negative consequences may result. 2) The capture of polluted water is not necessarily as effective as the SDEIS portrays. The SDEIS should be re-done with a more realistic number. 3) With polluted water needing treatment far, far into the future, a proper financial assurance for funding for this activity must be part of the plan. This must include inflation calculations with a generous margin for error. The taxpayers of the year 2500 (yes, there will still be taxpayers.) do NOT want to carry the burden of miscalculations from 2014- 4) I believe that baseline water flowage data used as a basis for the SDEIS is grossly underestimated. The SDEIS must be re-done with flow rates closer to real-life and worse-case numbers. 5) The human cost to innocents is not adequately reflected in the SDEIS. Unforseen consequences can harm future Minnesotans for centuries into the future. An escrow account large enough to attempt to compensate harmed persons, individually or collectively, whether for medical consequences, loss of tourist trade, or other unforseen harms, needs to be included. It might be needed for 500 years, and should include monies to help defray legal costs so harmed individuals can obtain justice. I believe that the SDEIS is hugely flawed, and must be re-done. I request that you reject it. Thank you. Sincerely, Scott Lagaard MD 600 313th Ln NE Cambridge, MN 55008

Alphabetical by sender's first name

knudaj7@yahoo.com

3165

Hi, I am a local Minnesotan living in the Twin Cities. I have heard about PolyMet through the local news and I'm writing this message to support it. PolyMet has shown that it can mine metals in a environmentally safe way while also creating jobs for local Minnesotans. This economical opportunity is what Minnesota needs. PolyMet can create hundreds of jobs that will support the families of northern Minnesota while protecting out beautiful nature in the north. Please allow PolyMet to dig. Thank you, A fellow Minnesotan Sendt fra min iPhone

Kolleen Kennedy

18345

My name is Kolleen Kennedy, Duluth, Minnesota. But I wanted to say, something that was never even addressed was 300 jobs, 300 jobs for 20 years. Cats live longer than 20 years. How many jobs are going to be displaced? Outdoor recreation jobs, which is a huge industry in Minnesota, in 2011 -- I have it written down here somewhere -- Minnesota alone spent 11 billion dollars in outdoor recreation, and that brought in over eight million just in state and local taxes. No one has addressed those jobs that are going away because we are going to have this horrible mine. I am not against mining. I am against this mining. I'm (inaudible). This is a state that voted on a legacy tax, for God's sake. I mean who does that? To keep our water clean. I just feel that this money is unconstitutional. I mean this legacy tax that we voted in was to protect our waters and not to allow them to be destroyed. I don't want to be a state that 50 years from now puts a fence around it, like I think our neighbors are going to have to. I want to say that we were smart, we were smarter than that, and we are not going to do this. Maybe come back in a hundred years. We are going to need jobs in 100 years, too. But right now, this is very unsafe mining and it is wrong. Thank you.

Kory Koch

16987

To whom it may concern: As a person who enjoys the BWCA, and want to see my children enjoy it also, I think it would be a good idea to mine the natural resources. I believe the job creation of good paying positions outweighs the environmental impact by a long shot. I also believe the state of Minnesota needs the economical boost (just look at North Dakota). Kory Koch 18055 Echo Terrace Farmington, MN 55024

Kris Beck

41975

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Kris Beck 6970 Chaparral Ln Chanhausen, MN 55317-9226

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kris Emly

39779

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Tourism is so important to MN. The last thing we need is another source of pollution. Please do not let this business destroy our waters and land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Kris Emly 3606 Oliver Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412-1930

41629

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kris Emly Arden Hills, Minnesota

Kris K. Wilmunen

10313

Can you please tell me the process involved in getting a chance to speak at the PolyMet informational meeting that is to be held at the St Paul RiverCenter tomorrow. Thanks, Kristen K. Wilmunen 1010 East White Street Ely, MN 55731 Kris Wilmunen | Engineering Project Manager | Technology, Consulting and Integration Solutions Unisys | Office: 218-251-4217 | Mobile: 218-235-1327 <http://www.youtube.com/theunisyschannel> <http://www.facebook.com/unisyscorp> <http://www.linkedin.com/companies/unisys> <http://www.twitter.com/unisyscorp> <http://www.unisys-com/> THIS COMMUNICATION MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR OTHERWISE PROPRIETARY MATERIAL and is thus for use only by the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail and its attachments from all computers.

Kris Peterson

43731

One of our most precious commodities is water and with the way things are going clear water and air are getting more and more important everyday. For the DNR to be even considering a mining project such as this is not only short sighted, it is wrong. I always thought the DNR was supposed to protect our environment and I hope will continue to do so. Please say NO to Poly Met. Kris Peterson 48 Imperial Dr E W St Paul, MN 55118 651-457-4636

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kris Simonson

47777

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders, I am not a scientist, but I am a citizen of Duluth who drinks water, swims in local lakes and rivers, and who feels compelled to protect the beauty and integrity of the little space on the planet I have made my home. I am writing to ask that you reject the findings and claims of Polymet's SDEIS, knowing that many have raised doubts in regards to the study's merit and thoroughness. There are just too many unanswered questions and there is no study in the world that can provide us with definite answers about long-term outcomes. Our land, water, and health are simply too valuable to gamble with. Being that I am not a scientist, all of the information I have learned about this project has come from others who have expertise in the environmental impacts of sulfide mining. I know that many of these individuals have written to you with their better-informed arguments about why this is a bad idea, so I will not be duplicitous in repeating the same points I have learned from them. All that I can do is write to you as a living being who depends on the health and balance of the ecosystem where I live. All that I can do is appeal to you at an intuitive level from my heart, and for that reason, my letter may be quickly dismissed since we live in a culture that values science over feeling, economics over heart. I am frightened about the potential (perhaps certain) destruction to my home if companies like Polymet move in to expand on toxic and dangerous mining practices, all for the sake of economic gain. If we have any kind of collective conscience and heart (that we are willing to acknowledge instead of silence), then we know that our duty is to protect and preserve life as our first priority, far above any motives for profit or economic gain. Please take a moment to listen to that voice inside yourselves, as well as the voices of other citizens who are expressing this sentiment. Thank you for taking the time to read this and for considering my input amongst the tens of thousands of letters you have received on this matter. Thoughtfully and Sincerely, Kris Simonson 2316 Wilkyns Avenue Duluth, MN 55803 (218) 590-7182

Kris Tromiczak

38833

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Kris Tromiczak 1600 Willis Ave South St Paul, MN 55075-1057

Krishna Woerheide

43612

I don't believe sulfide mining is a viable undertaking in Minnesota's Northland, nor do I believe the companies involved are entirely honest about the economic gains and the destruction they will cause here. In the history of mining, there has not been one case of a sulfide mine that did not contaminate the area waters, sometimes for hundreds of years after the process. To set about this sort of mining in a watershed which empties into one of the world's largest bodies of fresh water is very risky. Polymet has not shown that they can mine safely in this area, history and documents have shown that they have not done so before. The rock piles will need to be treated for 500 years after mining is complete. Are they willing to make that financial deposit before mining commences. Krishna Woerheide 157 Caribou Trail PO Box 278 Lutsen MN 55612

Alphabetical by sender's first name

krista evans

38869

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Krista Weiland

54358

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I have been reading and researching about the proposed mining project in northern Minnesota. After learning more about it I have concluded this project would not be a wise investment for Minnesota. It appears that the benefits of this project will not outweigh the potential risks. My concerns include the following: • Damage to natural resources • The Mesabe Widju of the Ojibwe people would be damaged • Animals losing their habitat • Affect on tourism • Water contamination • Effect on wild rice production This project would damage Minnesota natural resources such as lakes, forests, and wild rice production. It would also affect historic and cultural icons that are crucial to Minnesota. Many plants, fish, and animal species could be affected, which could affect Minnesota as a whole. This project also could affect wild rice production. Minnesota distributes much of America's wild rice. There could be a potential shortage if the wild rice production is disturbed. Another negative effect of this mining is water contamination. If this happened, you may have a whole city without water. It could possibly affect a larger region as well. This proposed project could cause long term unsettlement for animals and for the local residents. The pollution could even affect all of Minnesota residents. I think that there very few short term advantages and many long term disadvantages. I feel that this proposed project should be reconsidered. Thank you for considering my concerns, Krista Weiland (14)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristan A Wegerson 38584

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay, Please accept the attached document "Polymet SDEIS 2014" as my official comments on the PolyMet Project Proposed Action. Sincerely, Kris Wegerson 3726 E. 3Rd St Duluth, MN 55804

Kristen Damberg 15753

See attachment

Kristen Meyer 28943

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest WATER is Minnesota's greatest asset and will be the resource most valued in the years ahead; the mines will come, extract, and go, providing relatively short term benefit and long-term negative environmental impact. Certainly job creation is important, but not at the high cost of threatened water quality for generations to come. Let us be patient and wait until we have extraction technology that can TRULY guarantee no negative environmental impact. Sincerely, Kristen Meyer 5133 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1801 (612) 827-1854

39259

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Hundreds of years (500 according to PolyMet) of monitoring and treatment don't justify the short term jobs/resource use gain. PLEASE take the responsible LONG VIEW and make a stand for the State of Minnesota - today and tomorrow. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Kristen Meyer 5133 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1801 (612) 827-1854

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristen Vieson

41947

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kristen Vieson Minneapolis, Minnesota

Kristen Wernecke

15423

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristin Eggerling

22522

--Original Message-- From: keggerling@gmail-com [mailto:keggerling@gmail-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 5:24 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: I am very concerned about Polymet's proposed sulfide mine. The risk far outweighs the potential benefit. Jobs are important, but few real, long-term jobs will be created. There are many sustainable alternatives to job and industry creation and they can be done with Minnesota companies that keep our money here in Minnesota. Creating jobs that are not sustainable is shortsighted and a waste of our precious resources. Our health and the health of the earth will very likely be negatively impacted. Our ground water, our surface water, our boundary waters are far too critical to gamble. And, the risk will continue for years and years after the mine has closed. How is that fair to our children and our grandchildren and their grandchildren. PolyMet's proposal is fatally flawed. We must be diligent in analyzing their proposal. This diligence reveals how poorly planned this mine is. Please don't sacrifice Minnesota's legacy. It is just not worth it. Sincerely, Kristin Eggerling 425 3rd St SE Hallock, MN 56728-4129

Kristin Foster

43213

Comments on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Directed to: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: First of all, thank you for agreeing to extend the comment period. Well aware that you have received tens of thousands of comments already, and that the comment period is almost closed, I will make my comments opposing the approval of this copper-nickel mining proposal as pointed as possible, leaving greater specificity to the many people already provided it. I am a long term pastor serving an ELCA congregation in Mountain Iron, the "taconite capitol of the world", where iron ore was originally discovered, and I well know the importance of mining in the economics of the households and community I serve. While many of the families who have earned their living from mining are categorically supportive of any mining venture, others recognize that corporate profit from exploiting natural resources does not necessarily coincide with the interests of human health, economic and social justice, and community well-being. The fundamental objections could be summarized as this: limited short term gain at the cost of the risk of incalculable long term damage to human and environmental health. From my understanding of the study, major questions remain in the areas of equitable land exchange levels of toxins including carcinogens in water effect in the health of infants and children damage to endangered, threatened, and special concern plant and wildlife species, including our already declining moose population the effects of the introduction of non-native species in reclamation efforts legality of authorizing an operation where clean-up will be ongoing possible negative effects of this mining on other sectors of the local economy As a pastor in this community, I teach stewardship of all that is entrusted to our care. This includes responsibility for the well-being of future generations of people, and the long term health of the land, water, air, and other creatures upon which we fundamentally depend. In the balance, a gain of 300 or so jobs and their spin-off economic gains for the next 20 years, given the above unanswered questions and risks, does not constitute this stewardship. Thank you, The Rev. Kristin Foster Senior Pastor, Messiah Lutheran Church, Mt. Iron Resident of 8580 Johnson Road, Cook, MN 55723

Kristin Lang

25964

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. We have already seen the damage that this practice can do, including acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination. I am also concerned about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. In conclusion, the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Kristin Lang 5410 Conn Ave NW Apt 302 Washington, DC 20015-2822 (202) 332-2556

Kristin Larsen

42926

These represent a few additional comments from the Friends of the Cloquet Valley State Forest along with 4 articles that stand for themselves that we submit for the record and caselaw regarding the land owned by the Forest Service that Polymet wishes to build on. -

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristin Larson 18346

My name is Kristin Larson and I cede my time to a wonderful DNR, former DNR person.

Kristin Linson 41958

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kristin Linson Maple Grove, Minnesota

Kristin Markert 6548

- Kristin Markert 612-381-2604 home 612-720-7080 cell

kristin palmer 4566

Hello, As a Minnesota resident and supporter of the DNR I implore you to decline PolyMet's proposal for mining. The destruction that will happen (look to all past sulfide mining projects as examples) would destroy not only the livelihoods for the people that live there but also the tourism industry and all the money that brings to the area. The promise of jobs to the area is not permanent, but the pollution will be. The risk of this mining does not out way the benefits. Please do NOT allow this mining project to go forth. Thank you for your consideration, Kristin Palmer 1431 Frankson Ave Saint Paul, MN 55108

Kristin Wharton 45170

To whom it may concern, As a registered nurse who works with pregnant women and children on the North Shore, I am concerned about the potential health impacts of sulfide mining on our communities for generations to come. The impact of sulfide, mercury, and other byproducts of sulfide mining on human health have not been adequately addressed in this process. It is my opinion that a Health Impact Assessment should be conducted on the polymet and other proposed precious metals mines in Northeastern Minnesota. On the North Shore, the Minnesota Department of Health has already identified a high level of mercury in newborns. We are currently a study area of concern. As the fourth generation of my family to live on the North Shore, I can remember back to stories of how my grandmothers father moved to this area after falling ill working in the copper mines of Montana. Clearly mining has changed since it took the life of my great grandfather, months before his daughter (my grandmother) was born. But it is no less dangerous to human health for those of us living in this area. Until the state of Minnesota can assure me that my family, my children, and the future generations of children born on the North Shore will be safe from by products of sulfide mining, it's not a risk that we as a community or state should accept. The potential threat that the polymet mine poses to human health is not a risk that I accept. Respectfully, Kristin DeArruda Wharton, Registered Nurse, International Board Certified Lactation Consultant Po box 1403 Grand Marais, Minnesota 55604 Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristin White

9848

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to discuss my concern regarding the proposed PolyMet NorthMet mine and submit the following as comments for review of the joint Army Corps of Engineers, US Forest Service and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Environmental Impact Study (EIS). For the following 5 reasons I am hoping the DNR will take no action on the mine and prevent PolyMet from opening the NorthMet project. First, I am concerned the EIS is not clear on how long pollution control, reclamation and water treatment will take after the mining operations cease. The EIS estimates that water treatment may take 500 years, but even PolyMet officials have admitted publicly that they are uncertain about the length of time and will not know about potential contaminants until they begin unearthing them. I am gravely concerned about initiating a multi-million dollar project which will have a centuries-long impact on Minnesotans without hard, concrete facts regarding the potential harm to water and river flow in the region. I suggest the DNR prohibit PolyMet operations from commencing until we have more information on the long-term environmental impact. Second, I am concerned the EIS itself contains flawed and/or inaccurate data concerning the effect the mine will have on the Partridge River flow. Recent developments have shown the DNR has admitted that estimates of the proposed mine's impact on the river are nearly three times too low. A study that has a 33% inaccuracy rating should be re-researched, re-reviewed and re-submitted for public commentary as this type of inaccuracy regarding state environmental and fiscal impacts is unacceptable. I would recommend DNR examine the research, redraft the study and analysis and submit the EIS to the public again for a more accurate review of the proposed mine. Third, I believe that the costs of the mine greatly outweigh the benefits and am concerned the DNR did not conduct a proper cost-benefits analysis. Specifically, the small amount of copper and nickel deposits available in the Mesabi range do not warrant excavating 533 million tons of earth. Furthermore, if PolyMet were given notice to proceed, once it began selling nickel on the stock market, the supply would substantially increase, thereby flooding the markets and driving down the price of nickel. This could not only damage the viability of PolyMet as a company, but if the corporation experiences hardship, this could reduce the number of available jobs at the mine. Financial analysts contend that PolyMet has overvalued the price of nickel in its submissions regarding the mine and nickel futures are selling for 60% less than the \$10-14 per pound price PolyMet has presented to the public and the DNR. These are the issues that must be investigated further and examined before any mining is allowed to move forward. Additionally, copper futures have shown a consistent downward trend on NYSE and other markets, evidencing that it will likely not produce the revenue or return on investment (ROI) that PolyMet has alluded to the public and the state. Fourth, because PolyMet does not have a concrete estimate on how long the environmental reclamation will take, it cannot fully guarantee that it will exist for the next 500 plus years required to restore the environment. To illustrate PolyMet's instability, one must look to its corporate leadership. Glencore Xstrata, a company which owns over 25% of PolyMet's stock, has suggested that - if it fully exercised its rights - it would own 34% of PolyMet. However Glencore is owned by Marc Rich, who has been charged with tax evasion and illegal business dealings. Minnesota prevents businesses who commit fraud from doing business in the state, therefore why would we allow a corporation with illicit leadership to construct this mine. Additionally, PolyMet has not operat

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristina Anderson

40430

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Kristina Anderson 6655 Jackson Rd Ann Arbor, MI 48103 US

40431

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Kristina Anderson 6655 Jackson Rd Ann Arbor, MI 48103 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristina Pogorelc

42087

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kristina Pogorelc Grand Rapids, Minnesota

Kristina Smitten

44371

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I ask that our state agencies take the following actions: actions by the lead agencies: • Reject the SDEIS as inadequate and the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful. • Deny the wetlands destruction permit (Section 404 Permit). • Reject the exchange of Superior National Forest Land that would allow the PolyMet project to move forwaRd • Deny PolyMet a state permit to mine. Having worked my entire life both as a public (DNR Waters, Met Council - collective 12 years) and now private sector (brownfields consultant 9 years) balancing environment and economic considerations in use of our land and resources, this SDEIS is not ready for approval. The lack of clarity in long-term environmental and human impacts as well as lack of full analysis of alternatives,leaves large gaps in ability to provide a solid decision. A decision to approve is not acceptable. It is well understood that we continue to use more resource than is sustainable, and as a result our ecological and climatic times are very uncertain. Reckless/Forced decision-making (lack of full understanding of implications) is the way society historically responded to mining and other possibly impacting applications, it is simply unacceptable to relive this precedence. We cannot continue to favor short-lived economic gains compared to long-lived environmental fragility; as the real long-term economic costs are almost incalculable. I expect and ask our state and federal agencies, with the legislative authority in which you are given, to reject the SDEIS based upon the four bullet points above. Sincerely, Kristina Smitten Marine on St Croix, MN
Kristina Smitten 2333 Jackson Circle Marine on St Croix, MN 55047

44372

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I ask that our state agencies take the following actions: actions by the lead agencies: • Reject the SDEIS as inadequate and the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful. • Deny the wetlands destruction permit (Section 404 Permit). • Reject the exchange of Superior National Forest Land that would allow the PolyMet project to move forwaRd • Deny PolyMet a state permit to mine. Having worked my entire life both as a public (DNR Waters, Met Council - collective 12 years) and now private sector (brownfields consultant 9 years) balancing environment and economic considerations in use of our land and resources, this SDEIS is not ready for approval. The lack of clarity in long-term environmental and human impacts as well as lack of full analysis of alternatives,leaves large gaps in ability to provide a solid decision. A decision to approve is not acceptable. It is well understood that we continue to use more resource than is sustainable, and as a result our ecological and climatic times are very uncertain. Reckless/Forced decision-making (lack of full understanding of implications) is the way society historically responded to mining and other possibly impacting applications, it is simply unacceptable to relive this precedence. We cannot continue to favor short-lived economic gains compared to long-lived environmental fragility; as the real long-term economic costs are almost incalculable. I expect and ask our state and federal agencies, with the legislative authority in which you are given, to reject the SDEIS based upon the four bullet points above. Sincerely, Kristina Smitten Marine on St Croix, MN
Kristina Smitten 2333 Jackson Circle Marine on St Croix, MN 55047

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristine Davis

18972

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Kristine Davis 40563 County Road 15 40563 County Road 15 Saint Peter, MN 56082 5072465004

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristine M. Maurer

43335

To whom it may concern: My name is Kristine Maurer and I love Minnesota. I grew up in the twin cities but nothing shaped my life more than the time I spent in the woods, on the prairie, in the streams, and on the lakes of Minnesota. Specifically, time hiking the north shore and camping in the Boundary waters inspired a passion for water resources and ultimately a career in environmental science. Minnesota is home to so many beautiful ecosystems and places that are treasured by millions of people and I feel it is only just that these ecosystems are protected and preserved so that future generations of Minnesotans can enjoy and observe them in the same condition and capacity as we do today. Practices that are inherently destructive to the condition of these ecosystems should not be tolerated. Evidence from peer-reviewed research and the environmental consequences observed in states where sulfide mining has been employed, strongly suggest that allowing this type of mining operation to exist in the same watershed as some of Minnesota's most valued wilderness areas and sensitive ecosystems will be catastrophic to the legacy and condition of these areas. Many of the lakes in Northern Minnesota, including Lake Superior and those in the Boundary Waters, have low alkalinity and therefore have a low buffering capacity against changes in pH. When pH decreases (becomes more acidic), say as a result of sulfuric acid in mining effluence, calcium carbonate becomes less available and the solubility of silica is reduced. These consequences of increased acidity can reduce the viability and success of biota such and snails and clams which need calcium carbonate to build their shells, and to diatoms which need silica to build cell walls. Studies have demonstrated that waters acidified by acid mining drainage (AMD) can cause complete changes in the community composition of diatoms. Diatoms are a main primary producer in oligotrophic (low primary production) systems and alterations in their community composition could cascade into issues and changes throughout the food web. Acidification is not the only problem AMD can cause for Lakes and rivers. Because water bodies in northern Minnesota are oligotrophic and often have long water residency times, the influences of mining contaminants can be long-lasting. Decomposition and growth is slow in these systems which can equate to more accumulation of toxins in sediments and increased bioaccumulation of toxins in the tissues of animals such as fish. These consequences could impact the fishing industry and the health of those who consume fish (eg, humans, birds, other wildlife) from areas exposed to AMD. The removal of wetlands is also a serious concern. Wetlands are like ecological kidneys; filtering and decomposing contaminants and retaining sediments that could otherwise end up in streams, rivers, and groundwater. As a result, they play an invaluable role in the condition and safety of municipal water. Removing over 1,000 acres of wetlands for mining would reduce key habitat for migratory birds and would be detrimental to water quality in the surrounding watershed. I recognize there is potential for job development with the success of sulfide mining. However, its economic return is short term. Like hydraulic fracking, sulfide mining is unsustainable and in the end will leave in its wake irreversible and costly destruction. I urge you to think of the billions of dollars the wilderness areas and ecosystems in northeast Minnesota are worth, not only for their tourism and industry value, but for the ecosystem services they provide (eg, mitigating floods, cleaning ground and surface waters, providing critical habitat), and the intrinsic value they have. Please allow the ecosystems of northeast Minnesota to inspire future generations. Please think of the long term consequences of the action you take. Please set a standard and precedence of intolerance for pra

Kristine Mosher

54488

See attachment

Kristine Norton

46911

I strongly oppose this mining proposal in Minnesota, near the Boundary Waters area. I understand that this company has little experience, is not focused on Minnesota and keeping the area free of contamination, but is instead happy to dig up the land near our pristine wilderness and lakes. I grew up in Cloquet, Minnesota and have spent much time in and near the Boundary Waters Wilderness area. I read, today, in the Star Tribune that PolyMet has a poor environmental and human rights record and has an agreement to sell copper concentrate to China. IS this for real. This is NOT a good move for the State of Minnesota. Sincerely, Kristine Norton, 7007 Cornelia Drive, Edina, MN 55435

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristine Osbakken

18083

I'm Kristine Osbakken. I'm not from Glendale; I'm from Duluth. My Uncle Ole worked for decades as a mining engineer on Mesabi. My Aunt Dagmar and Uncle Leif worked for the railroad that brought the ore to the ships. My dad was turned away -- he worked for the railroad in Two Harbors. He was turned away at the gate when he went to talk to the union organizers. He was never given a berth and he never went back to work at Two Harbors. The PolyMet -- I'm a writer and I'm a teacher. PolyMet SDEIS is not a plan. It's an experiment. It would put Minnesota's clean water at risk forever. The SDEIS makes predictions, but it doesn't provide the basic information to support those predictions. These questions are not answered. How much polluted wastewater is going back and forth through nine miles of pipes? What is the total volume of wastewater in the tailings and the processing residue? Just how polluted are the wastewater and waste rock piles in the pits, pump ponds, tailings basin and the hydro-metallic waste dump? These answers are missing. Without this basic information, we can't estimate what will happen if PolyMet's own perfect assumptions, not based on anything real, don't come true? The SDEIS admits that this is an experiment. On page after page it says that, "In the event the modeling shows violations of water quality, PolyMet will 'adaptively manage the problem.'" This SDEIS is not adequate. To be adequate, it must reveal wastewater volumes and pollutant levels of every step and it must have facilities from day one to meet standards. Once pollution is in the groundwater, it will be too late to fix. It will affect the Partridge, Embarrass, it will affect the whole entire St. Louis watershed. The estuaries, already, people catch and throw those fish. It will make it even more polluted.

18381

Hello. My name is Kristine Osbakken. Peter Shook talked about the effect of pollution on his drinking water and the drinking water of communities below the Embarrass and the Partridge Rivers. I would like to talk about the effect of the mercury pollution on the lower St. Louis River the raised mercury levels at the proposed PolyMet mine will produce, but the PolyMet SDEIS does not adequately address the effect on the lower St. Louis River. The SDEIS states that the sulfide mine and the tailings basin will increase mercury in the Embarrass River by approximately 3 percent per year. That's SDEIS page 5-207. PolyMet claims that this increase in mercury to the Embarrass River won't affect mercury in fish in the St. Louis River because of the water treatment plant that will operate when the mine is closed and the west pit is flooded. Referring to SDEIS page 5-8. However, it will be 40 years until the treatment plant kicks in. What about all the mercury pollution within that 40 years? The fish are not fit to eat in the already heavily polluted lower St. Louis River. People catch and throw. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency studied the St. Louis River mercury crisis and proved that the lower river has higher rates of mercury contamination than nearby waters and then further upstream. The agency, however, did not complete their total maximum daily load study, the TMDL. The PolyMet SDEIS should not be finalized, nor the project approved, until a full study of the TMDL of mercury in the St. Louis River proves that PolyMet increased mercury loadings will not increase fish contamination.

58187

My name is Kristine Osbakken and I would like to speak to the raised mercury levels that the proposed PolyMet mine will produce, but that the PolyMet SDEIS does not address. The spelling of my name is Kristine, with a "K." And Osbakken is O-S-B-A-K-K-E-N. First, the SDEIS states that, "The sulfide mine and the tailings basin will increase mercury loading in the Embarrass River by approximately three percent per year." (Reading.) And this refers to SDEIS Page 5-207. "PolyMet claims that this increase in mercury to the Embarrass River won't affect mercury in fish in the St. Louis River because of a water treatment plant that will operate when the mine is closed and the west pit is flooded," according to SDEIS, Page 5-208. (Reading.) "However, it will be 40 years until the treatment plant kicks in." What about all of the mercury pollution within that 40 years? Fish are not fit to eat and they already have polluted the lower St. Louis River. People catch and throw. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency studied the St. Louis River mercury crisis and proved that the lower river has higher rates of mercury contamination than nearby waters and then further upstream. The agency did not complete their total maximum daily load TMDL study. The PolyMet SDEIS should not be finalized, nor the project approved, until a full study of the TMDL of mercury in the St. Louis River proves that PolyMet's increased mercury loadings will not increase fish contamination. I think I am done. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristine Schmitz

40667

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Kristine Schmitz 2004 Randolph Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1750

Kristine Vesley

43225

Dear DNR Environmental Impact Statement Reviewers and Decision Makers: I have many concerns about PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mine in Northern Minnesota, where my brother lives and where I might someday live. All in all, I believe that the risks and wetland losses outweigh the possible (and short-term) economic benefits. I do not believe such a mine is truly necessary at this point in time; as far as I know, there is not a shortage of either of these minerals and recycling has also not been done maximally. The market urgency just is not there to justify this mine in this water-rich location. As for jobs created. Economic considerations must always take a back seat to environmental-resource considerations. The wetlands and waterways that would be lost and/or contaminated are precious to everyone in Minnesota. I say only partly in jest that if we want to create jobs, let's start a public works program and get all our state's potholes filled. In all seriousness, I am conservative enough that I do not believe the state "owes jobs" to any population or region. I would love a job up near Lake Superior - please help me get one. I have been reading a very interesting book by a conservative author titled "How to Think Seriously about the Planet." The author argues that the political right cannot cede environmental issues to the political left. On p. 149, in a discussion of market solutions to environmental problems, he states: "Minerals are not renewable, and rare minerals that are, or have become, vital to human well-being may be depleted at rates that threaten the long-term interests of our species." He notes that copper wire has been largely replaced by cheap glass fibre and suggests with a sense of optimism that other new materials will soon emerge to replace copper in other products. Even if I thought copper was in short supply, and even if I felt the company were a Minnesota company that would care about its legacy here, I would oppose this project. There is no way PolyMet could provide financial assurances sufficient for a real disaster, and we all know real disasters can and do happen. Some disasters cannot be cleaned up with dollar bills. I leave the technical arguments to the many fine tribal and other scientists who have devoted themselves to this cause. I have learned enough to worry about the water issues, including any potential mercury and other pollution of the treasure that is Lake Superior. Sincerely, Kristine Vesley 1598 Edmund Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55104 (651) 645-2606

Kristy M O Neill

42662

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kristy Mock 41928

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Kristy Mock Cologne, Minnesota

Kristy Snyder 58066

No mine pollution! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Kurt 43702

I am not convinced that the SDEIS adequately considered alternatives to the project as designed. The option of an underground mine needs more consideration. The SDEIS did not demonstrate that the technology proposed to prevent acid mine drainage will work at scale and over the many decades necessary to protect Minnesota's water quality. Nor did it demonstrate that the funding will be available to implement that technology over the next several centuries. Kurt Alan Rusterholz 171 Vernon St St Paul, Mn. 55015 Sent from my iPhone

Kurt Seaberg 44647

The proposed Polymet copper/nickel sulfide mine is a bad deal for Minnesota. The number of jobs generated will be small and temporary and the risk of irreparable damage to Minnesota's environment will be enormous. There has never been a sulfide mine operation anywhere in the world that has not leaked poisons into the watershed. We cannot jeopardize the water quality of our state for the next 500 years. Please deny the permits for this and any other future sulfide mining operation anywhere in the state. Sincerely, Kurt Seaberg, 2000 Seabury Ave, Minneapolis, MN 55406

Kurt Wetzel 54911

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ky Christenson

39957

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Ky Christenson 12309 fiona ave N White Bear Lake, MN 55110 6124371860

Kyle Crocker

20189

--Original Message-- From: kcrocker@paulbunyan-net [mailto:kcrocker@paulbunyan-net] Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 5:59 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: I have lived nearly all my adult life in northern Minnesota. During this time I have active in my local lake association, serving as its informal 'science officer.' In this capacity, and in work with other conservation efforts, I have learned a great deal about lake and wetland ecology and hydrology. I have also learned - painfully - about the deep inadequacies of much historical data and the short-comings of many EIS findings. The Supplemental Draft EIS for the PolyMet proposal for the sulfide mining operation based in Hoyt Lake is very deeply flawed. As has been shown, much of its data on the hydrology of the sensitive areas concerned is outdated and/or misconstrued. This is especially true of the proposal to dump tailings from the mining process on top of the former LTV Steel.s tailings basin, which was built in the 1950s on top of three streams, and was designed to leak. There is also general inattention to contingency planning for a number of very possible failures that could have devastating effects on the whole of the St Louis River watershed, as well as related one and Lake Superior itself. Recent events in several extraction industry operations have demonstrated that 'customary practices' assumed safe often lead to 'accidents' and failure to plan complete contingency scenarios have had serious toxic, long-term consequences. With PolyMet the 'long-term' runs to hundreds of years, far beyond any immediate benefits the project might produce. I worked for the State of Minnesota for nearly 30 years, a professor with MnSCU. I have also worked closely with many DNR employees, and count them as friends and colleagues. While I am proud of these activities, I have also witnessed many mistakes, poor decisions, confused priorities, and other organizational failures. Even the seemingly smallest of these can have irreversible consequences for people and our environment. A case in point. When MnDoT took over the jurisdiction of several railroad easements, it also inherited the engineering problems of this once vital industry. On the lake where I was raised, MnDoT's failure to address severely compromised drainage under one of these rail beds brought unprecedented flooding in 1996- The loss of native shoreland vegetation and the erosion has brought problems to this habitat and those of us who live in that can never be corrected. This case represents the smallest kind of parallel to the potential catastrophe of the PolyMet proposal. The slightest inattention to existing or unforeseen practicalities can be compounded beyond any hope of remediation. Life is always about risk calculation. The PolyMet SDEIS does not begin to properly evaluate risk, much less plan for an array of potential and very long-term failures. It must be withdrawn and completely re-envisioned, not simply redrafted. If and when it is resubmitted, the DNR must utterly divorce its science from short-term political distortion. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Sincerely, Kyle Crocker 806 Balsam Ridge Rd NW Bemidji, MN 56601-5587

Kyle Gillis

42492

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As Trout fisherman and BWCAW user I STRONGLY urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Kyle Gillis 2645 New Century Pl E Maplewood, MN 55119-6026 (651) 925-6502

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kyle Lindy 47620

Comment is from Kyle Lind 4176 143rd St w. Rosemount, MN 55068

Kyle R. Crocker 23928

Mar 4, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have lived nearly all my adult life in northern Minnesota. During this time I have active in my local lake association, serving as its informal 'science officer.' In this capacity, and in work with other conservation efforts, I have learned a great deal about lake and wetland ecology and hydrology. I have also learned - painfully - about the deep inadequacies of much historical data and the short-comings of many EIS findings. The Supplemental Draft EIS for the PolyMet proposal for the sulfide mining operation based in Hoyt Lake is very deeply flawed. As has been shown, much of its data on the hydrology of the sensitive areas concerned is outdated and/or misconstructed. This is especially true of the proposal to dump tailings from the mining process on top of the former LTV Steel's tailings basin, which was built in the 1950s on top of three streams, and was designed to leak. There is also general inattention to contingency planning for a number of very possible failures that could have devastating effects on the whole of the St Louis River watershed, as well as related one and Lake Superior itself. Recent events in several extraction industry operations have demonstrated that 'customary practices' assumed safe often lead to 'accidents' and failure to plan complete contingency scenarios have had serious toxic, long-term consequences. With PolyMet the 'long-term' runs to hundreds of years, far beyond any immediate benefits the project might produce. I worked for the State of Minnesota for nearly 30 years, a professor with MnSCU. I have also worked closely with many DNR employees, and count them as friends and colleagues. While I am proud of these activities, I have also witnessed many mistakes, poor decisions, confused priorities, and other organizational failures. Even the seemingly smallest of these can have irreversible consequences for people and our environment. A case in point. When MnDoT took over the jurisdiction of several railroad easements, it also inherited the engineering problems of this once vital industry. On the lake where I was raised, MnDoT's failure to address severely compromised drainage under one of these rail beds brought unprecedented flooding in 1996- The loss of native shoreland vegetation and the erosion has brought problems to this habitat and those of us who live in that can never be corrected. This case represents the smallest kind of parallel to the potential catastrophe of the PolyMet proposal. The slightest inattention to existing or unforeseen practicalities can be compounded beyond any hope of remediation. Life is always about risk calculation. The PolyMet SDEIS does not begin to properly evaluate risk, much less plan for an array of potential and very long-term failures. It must be withdrawn and completely re-envisioned, not simply redrafted. If and when it is resubmitted, the DNR must utterly divorce its science from short-term political distortion. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Kyle R. Crocker 806 Balsam Ridge Rd NW Bemidji, MN 56601-5587 (218) 444-2589

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kyle R. Crocker

49486

Mar 4, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have lived nearly all my adult life in northern Minnesota. During this time I have active in my local lake association, serving as its informal 'science officer.' In this capacity, and in work with other conservation efforts, I have learned a great deal about lake and wetland ecology and hydrology. I have also learned - painfully - about the deep inadequacies of much historical data and the short-comings of many EIS findings. The Supplemental Draft EIS for the PolyMet proposal for the sulfide mining operation based in Hoyt Lake is very deeply flawed. As has been shown, much of its data on the hydrology of the sensitive areas concerned is outdated and/or misconstrued. This is especially true of the proposal to dump tailings from the mining process on top of the former LTV Steel's tailings basin, which was built in the 1950s on top of three streams, and was designed to leak. There is also general inattention to contingency planning for a number of very possible failures that could have devastating effects on the whole of the St Louis River watershed, as well as related one and Lake Superior itself. Recent events in several extraction industry operations have demonstrated that 'customary practices' assumed safe often lead to 'accidents' and failure to plan complete contingency scenarios have had serious toxic, long-term consequences. With PolyMet the 'long-term' runs to hundreds of years, far beyond any immediate benefits the project might produce. I worked for the State of Minnesota for nearly 30 years, a professor with MnSCU. I have also worked closely with many DNR employees, and count them as friends and colleagues. While I am proud of these activities, I have also witnessed many mistakes, poor decisions, confused priorities, and other organizational failures. Even the seemingly smallest of these can have irreversible consequences for people and our environment. A case in point. When MnDoT took over the jurisdiction of several railroad easements, it also inherited the engineering problems of this once vital industry. On the lake where I was raised, MnDoT's failure to address severely compromised drainage under one of these rail beds brought unprecedented flooding in 1996- The loss of native shoreland vegetation and the erosion has brought problems to this habitat and those of us who live in that can never be corrected. This case represents the smallest kind of parallel to the potential catastrophe of the PolyMet proposal. The slightest inattention to existing or unforeseen practicalities can be compounded beyond any hope of remediation. Life is always about risk calculation. The PolyMet SDEIS does not begin to properly evaluate risk, much less plan for an array of potential and very long-term failures. It must be withdrawn and completely re-envisioned, not simply redrafted. If and when it is resubmitted, the DNR must utterly divorce its science from short-term political distortion. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Kyle R. Crocker 806 Balsam Ridge Rd NW Bemidji, MN 56601-5587 (218) 444-2589

Kyle Richard Kopp

43021

Attached is my comment on the SDEIS of the Northmet mining operation -Kyle Kopp

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kyle Strohmaier

44471

To whom it may concern: Though I was born in the Twin Cities area, I was only a few weeks old the first time I went “up north”. My grandparents built a home near Biwabik in 1958, and my parents purchased a neighboring property in more recent years. The area of our state near Hoyt Lakes has been my favorite place on Earth for as long as I can remember. The lakes and rivers have played a primary role in so many people’s enjoyment of northern Minnesota. But enjoyment is not the only thing that the water provides. Freshwater is essential to the survival of countless species, and it is growing scarcer day by day. Because most water on Earth is not freshwater, and most freshwater is contained in glaciers, only a fraction of a percent of the water on our planet is available for supporting humans – population 7 billion and growing. Among the world’s freshwater lakes, Superior is the largest by surface area and third-largest by volume. The idea of endangering one of the most important freshwater sources on our planet by approving the NorthMet mine proposal is dubious at best. It is an accepted fact that the byproducts of sulfide mining pose an environmental threat for hundreds of years. It is unsurprising, then, that the practice of sulfide mining has an ugly track record of harming ecosystems worldwide. Even in areas that lack a delicate and pristine water table like the one that surrounds the proposed NorthMet site, sulfide mining has wreaked havoc on the environment. There are three ways in which a disaster like these might be prevented in the case of the proposed NorthMet mine. The first possibility for avoiding environmental havoc is for PolyMet to monitor the NorthMet site and actively prevent any acid mine drainage. PolyMet is a Toronto-based company founded solely for the purposes of extracting resources from Northern Minnesota. A large portion is now owned by Glencore Xstrata, a huge Swiss-based company whose track record is riddled with environmental and social irresponsibility (“Controversial” would be the mildest adjective with which to appropriately describe this secretive multi-national). It is nothing short of ludicrous to think that, hundreds of years from now, either PolyMet or Glencore Xstrata will not only exist but also take responsibility for an area from which they’ve long since squeezed their last profits. The second possibility is that, given the unlikelihood of centuries of active intervention, PolyMet leaves the NorthMet site with a sound infrastructure to passively prevent acid mine drainage. I am currently completing a Master’s Degree in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Minnesota. For my research, I work in a lab which specializes in the mechanical design of hydraulics – extremely durable equipment. As a mechanical engineer, I can assure you that nothing is designed to function for hundreds of years. Nothing. One can attempt to design for long periods of operation, but it is impossible to guarantee such durability. Especially with the sensitive implications protecting freshwater resources, it is either naïve or willfully disingenuous for any engineer to proclaim confidence that his apparatus for acid mine drainage prevention will remain sound for centuries. This brings us to the final way to avoid polluting the water of Northern Minnesota – do not approve the NorthMet mine proposal. I must make it clear that I am in no way “anti-mining”. My grandfather was an engineer for Minntac, and my mother and uncle worked in the taconite mines near Virginia, Minnesota. Mining is an essential part of producing the goods we use. But sulfide mining is fundamentally different than taconite mining. I am sympathetic to the economic woes of the Iron Range in recent years, but we must remember that the decision on whether to approve this mine has global impacts. I am twenty-five years old – I have a lot of life ahead of me. My unborn children and grandchildren have their entire

Kyle Wagener

38960

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Kyle Wagener 4520 W 44th St Edina, MN 55424-1001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Kyra Quillen

11343

Kyra Quillen Adv. Science Miss. Olson 1/29/14 Copper Mining Copper mining is when people are removing copper from mines. Minnesota is considering this option to create more jobs. They are also doing this so that Minnesota would have more copper in their possession. I feel that although this would create jobs, it would not be good for Minnesota. This is what copper mining is and what my opinion is towards it. The NorthMet Project is substandard for Minnesota. Even though the PolyMet Company will provide jobs for 20 years to many people, the taxpayers will be responsible for cleaning up mining sight. This will cost the taxpayers billions of dollars which would force our economy into a recession. This is one of the reasons I am against copper mining in Minnesota. Another reason why this is not in the best interest of our state, is because copper mining will ruin 26 square miles of our beautiful forests. Copper mining will pressure Minnesota to tear down this area and we have already lost plenty of our forests. We will not only be tearing down 26 square miles of our illustrious forests, but much more to build homes for the miners. This is another reason why I am not in favor of this project. If we go through with this plan, the mining will cause 500 years worth of polluted water. This is due to all of the mining equipment and vehicles that will be used in this area. Who is going to keep a close eye on the pollution. The Local hydrologists will be responsible not the PolyMet Company. We will only get 20 years of mining out of this area and it will ruin a great deal of our water. This will definitely destroy this area and will end with a very sizable mess with lots of pollution. This is my third reason that I think this is an atrocious idea. To conclude this is a terrible idea, the PolyMet company will make the taxpayers pay for all of the clean up. We will end up with 500 years of polluted water and over 26 square miles of destroyed forests. This is an unacceptable idea and I think that there should be no hesitation to completely dismiss the copper mining project. Then we can continue to focus on less destructive business proposals. Sources <http://www.miningtruth-org/> HYPERLINK "<http://www.google-com/url.q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.polymetminning-com%2Fnorthmet-project%2Foverview%2Fandsa=Dandsntz=1andusg=AFQjCNFKipKIK8m9NNWkFm53fKOjR4IIQQ>"<http://www.polymetminning-com/northmet-project/overview/> HYPERLINK "http://www.google-com/url.q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.startribune-com%2Flifestyle%2Fhealth%2F234755311-htmlandsa=Dandsntz=1andusg=AFQjCNH3GRrz9u9U4v_WxaNHuEt0i4z4qg"<http://www.startribune-com/lifestyle/health/234755311-html> <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/volunteer/julaug12/nonferrous.html> ` HYPERLINK "<mailto:17kyraqui@flaschools-org>"17kyraqui@flaschools-org HYPERLINK "<https://docs.google-com/logout>"Sign out View in: Mobile | HYPERLINK "[https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/unsupported.continue=https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1P8BPPWMLzLFJQ-b0zC46q1XFqR3S2YHrh4kr6pFMrvo/edit.override%3Dtrueandcancel=https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1P8BPPWMLzLFJQ-b0zC46q1XFqR3S2YHrh4kr6pFMrvo/edit.override%3Dtrueandcancel=https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1P8BPPWMLzLFJQ-b0zC46q1XFqR3S2YHrh4kr6pFMrvo/mobilebasic](https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/unsupported.continue=https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1P8BPPWMLzLFJQ-b0zC46q1XFqR3S2YHrh4kr6pFMrvo/edit.override%3Dtrueandcancel=https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1P8BPPWMLzLFJQ-b0zC46q1XFqR3S2YHrh4kr6pFMrvo/mobilebasic)"Desktop ©2012 Google

L J

45046

The polymet proposal would be terrible for the environment and would contaminate our most precious resource-WATER. Forget the short-term profits and think about the enormous expense of trying to somewhat reverse the damage in years to come. I am against the polymet plan and ask that you reject the proposal. Leila Jindeel

L Wilbert

39705

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms L Wilbert 1887 Silver Bell Rd Apt 314 Eagan, MN 55122-3109

Alphabetical by sender's first name

L. Becker Grandle 39983

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, L. Becker Grandle 5116 Irving Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-1126

L.L. Kauffman 13363

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota, as described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should NOT be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be funded. This is important information needed for proper evaluation of the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms L.L. Kauffman 643 Meridian Cir Unit F Cold Spring, KY 41076-4200

Laird Beaver 42418

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Laird Beaver 5624 Melody Lake Dr Edina, MN 55436-2419

Lake Superior Binational Forum 54762

See attachment

LaMont Johnson 47635

My name is LaMont, I read some of the papers and articles that were handed to me and i feel like the mining could open up more job opportunities and could be very beneficial. hope this email helped in some way. Have a good day. Thanks. 8375 Woodcrest Dr Apt 4 48185 Westland, MI.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lance Groth

45639

I am opposed to sulfide mining in Minnesota, for the following reasons: 1) Sulfide mining has never been done, anywhere in the world, without significant environmental damage and water pollution. Never, anywhere. Why would Minnesota gamble that somehow, some way "it will be different this time", when the stakes are a precious and fragile natural environment that is the crown jewel of Minnesota and the clean water that makes it so. Clean freshwater is a precious commodity in the world, and in the coming decades and centuries, with the advent of global warming and an increasingly crowded and polluted world, will become the most precious commodity of all. Wars will be fought over water. To sacrifice it for a handful of jobs and some tax revenue is simply foolish. 2) 300 jobs. When I first saw that number, I thought it was a joke. We're talking about potentially trashing a beautiful ecosystem for 300 jobs. It wouldn't be worth it for 3000 jobs, but 300 is insignificant. I'd be embarrassed to trumpet that as a reason to do this. 3) Centuries of waste water treatment, 200-500 years worth (but they aren't really sure how long, that's just their best guess). I can't believe anyone would seriously entertain the notion of an ongoing project of any kind that would need to be maintained without interruption for *centuries*. The Roman Empire existed for 500 years in total, with the advantage of existing during a time of only a glacial rate of change in conditions and with a monolithic state that could order anything it wanted, and we think we're going to keep a single water treatment operation going for that long. There is no guarantee that the United States or the State of Minnesota as a political entity will still exist in 500 years, and history teaches us that it is very unlikely. Certainly the companies involved will not exist for even a quarter of that time. Long after everyone involved today is dead, future generations will be left holding the bag for a polluted mess, and what recourse will they have. None at all. 4) The cutoff wall. Polymet says they will build a five mile cutoff wall anchored in bedrock to contain water that flows through the tailings. But how can they guarantee there will be no fractures anywhere in the bedrock or the wall, before, during or after construction. People I've talked to who live there and have been involved in mining say that the bedrock contains many fractures. It only takes one to leak. Polymet's entire plan, including the wall, requires perfection to succeed. You don't have to be an expert in anything to know that perfection cannot be achieved. 5) Financial guarantees. At a recent legislative hearing, talk of financial guarantees amounted to vague hand waving about financial instruments and an admonition that "this will be addressed during permitting." Try again. Given a requirement of centuries of ongoing cleanup efforts, any talk of financial instruments that will endure for centuries is laughably foolish. The entire global financial system nearly collapsed in its entirety in 2008- The risk is still just as high, and will grow along with the hypercomplexity and interdependency of the global system. Complexity is the enemy of stability; hypercomplexity inevitably results in a catastrophic failure somewhere in the system. No one can guarantee anything stretching centuries into the future, least of all in financial terms. In any case, no amount of money can compensate for the degradation of ecosystems. Once the groundwater is contaminated, the damage is done and cannot be undone. 6) Most of the benefits do not stay in Minnesota. PolyMet is a Canadian company that has never operated a mine (.) and that's where the profits will go. Glencore is a Swiss company with commitments to sell copper to China, and that's where the copper will go. Minnesota gets some crumbs in exchange for trashing its environment. That's a bad deal. 7) Glencore's record is abysmal. Th

Lance Hentges

42422

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Lance Hentges 928 Franklin Ter Minneapolis, MN 55406-1101 (612) 387-6724

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lance Johnson

18227

I'm Amanda Johnson and I'm giving my time to Lance Johnson. Lance Johnson, L-A-N-C-E, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I want to thank the DNR, US Army Corps of Engineers and the US Forest Service for the years of diligent work that have gone into this environmental review process. In the last couple of days, I noticed a story saying there's a specific data point regarding groundwater contribution to the Birch River. The SDEIS modeling shows groundwater contributing .5 cubic feet per second of flow to the Partridge River. Additional data from a new stream flow gauging stage and different location miles away shows the groundwater contribution of between 1.3 and 1.8 cubic feet per second. However, drain sensitivity analysis scientists utilize numbers as high as 2.4 cubic feet per second. At the 2.4-cubic-feet-per-second level, the model showed no negative effects. This is a testament to the extensive modeling that has been done on this project that in my opinion has gone above and beyond what is needed for this phase of the project. I would like to state that in my opinion, this -- is that the SDEIS is more than sufficient and it is time to expedite the final EIS in preparation for this project. I'd also like to touch on the socioeconomic aspect of this. I'd like to mention what a project would bring to the Iron Range. After graduating from college, a lack of job opportunities on the Iron Range forced me and my family to relocate to the Minneapolis/St. Paul area, where we were for about 12 years. Approximately five years ago, I was able to relocate my family back to the Iron Range because of some companies up there that are willing to reinvest in Northeastern Minnesota and the Iron Range by utilizing new technology to redefine what is possible in the mining and processing industry of the Iron Range. PolyMet will do the same. PolyMet will provide fantastic opportunities on the Iron Range by providing great-paying jobs for their direct-hire employees and -- and not just those 320 jobs, but -- and employees of Iron Range contractors and engineering firms, vendors, and other support industries. PolyMet will also generate millions of dollars in taxes for the State of Minnesota, and more importantly, millions of dollars that will go directly to the school districts and improving educational opportunities for our children. Let's move forward with this project. Thank you.

Lance Kupka

18097

My name is Lance Kupka and I live in Aurora, Minnesota. I teach at Mesabi East and I am very proud to be the president of the -- co-president of the Mesabi East Teachers Union, Education Minnesota, Local 1255. I enjoy the natural beauty of the state and believe mining can co-exist. I want to talk to you tonight about how the PolyMet project can make a huge, positive impact for our schools. It is estimated that PolyMet will pay 15 million dollars in state taxes annually, once mining begins. Six million of those dollars are considered an occupational tax, which is distributed statewide. And 40 percent of the six million will go directly to the elementary and secondary education statewide fund. That means 2.4 million dollars more in our school coffers. This money will help provide more programs for our schools, more technology for our schools, and ultimately more opportunities once -- for the children once they graduate. Seven million of the 15 million in state taxes is a net proceeds tax. It will be distributed locally. 20 percent of that pie, or 1.4 million dollars, goes directly to schools in northeastern Minnesota. Ten percent, or \$700,000, will go to the Northeast Range School District. Take each of those numbers times 20, because the mine is being permitted to operate for 20 years, and you get some even more staggering numbers. 48 million dollars for schools statewide. 28 million dollars for schools in northeastern Minnesota. 14 million dollars for schools in the Northeast Range School District. I will do a little bit more math for you and add those numbers up. That's 90 million dollars, for a total of nearly one billion dollars more for our schools in Minnesota. We know that Minnesota has some of the strictest environmental standards in the nation. We know that state and federal regulators have looked at this project from all angles and have published a comprehensive document that shows exactly how the mine will operate. We know that the mine can operate safely and that PolyMet has committed to monitoring and treating the water for as long as need be. What is the decision? This mine will be safe. It will generate great income for the local workforce, and as I have outlined in detail above, it will have a tremendous positive impact on our schools and on our children for decades to come.

Larry

9503

The SDEIS does not address any contingencies for possible problems for the next 200 years at the mine site and the next 500 years at the tailings pond. This is pure foolishness and should not be accepted until potential problems and their solutions are considered. Also, this SDEIS assumes these sites will be superfund sites, paid for by the taxpayers in the future, since no company in existence today can predict they will be in business 40 years from now, much less 200 to 500 years. Based on what I see in the SDEIS I would not be surprised if the government ends up building the reverse osmosis system when it is needed. Politicians seem more interested in reelection and immediate tax revenue than protecting the environment. I am not optimistic on the outcome of this review process and the impact on Minnesota waters. We are headed down the same path as Montana. Larry Kraemer 1025 Maple Grove Rd Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry A. Stone 4289

---Original Message--- From: Larry Stone [mailto:lstone@alpinecom-net] Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 7:45 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: polymet Ms Fay: I'm writing to comment on PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine. As a frequent visitor to northeastern Minnesota, I'm attracted by the clean water and wild character of the region. The proposed mine would jeopardize those natural resources. The supplemental draft EIS does not give adequate assurances either that the mining itself could be carried on without environmental damage, or that the site could be reclaimed in a way that would guarantee long term stability and environmental integrity. I do not believe that the short term gains of extracting the minerals would justify the potential for permanent, long term damage to the natural resources that are the backbone of Minnesota's economy. Thank you for your consideration. Larry A. Stone 23312 295th St Elkader, IA 52043 563-245-1517 cell 563-419-6742
Lstone@alpinecom-net

Larry and Val Johnson 17301

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: According To the SDEIS: PolyMet's water pollution from the permanent mines site waste rock pile would need treatment for at least 200 years and pollution from the tailings piles would require treatment for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping out of the mine pits would "continue in perpetuity." Forever. According to Minnesota Administrative Rules 6132-3200 CLOSURE AND POSTCLOSURE MAINTENANCE. Subpart 1 Goal: The mining area shall be closed so that it is stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free. How can 200 to 500 years of water treatment be considered maintenance free. Please protect Minnesota's water, our most important resource and deny permits for this proposal. Thank You, Lawrence L Johnson 3421 East Alger Grade Two Harbors, Mn 55616 HYPERLINK "mailto:silvercreek73@gmail-com"silvercreek73@gmail-com 218-834-5456

Larry Anderson 39454

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Larry D. Anderson D.V.M. Larry Anderson 1385 Peninsula Road Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Beck

39786

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Larry Beck 8876 Compton Ln Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-3397 (651) 451-3273

Larry Bogolub

18280

My name is Larry Bogolub. It is B, as in boy, O-G-O-L-U-B. And I am making a statement for my son, Louis Bogolub, who is 16 years old, who wrote this letter to the editor of our local newspaper. "Over the past four summers I have gone on multiple trips to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area (BWCA). The trips have been some of the most memorable weeks in my life. The beauty and peacefulness of the lakes, rivers and forests on which I traveled are unmatched by anything else I've experienced in my 16 years. I sincerely hope that the future visitors will be able to experience the BWCA in the same way. It is because of this hope that I am against the proposed copper-nickel mining in northeastern Minnesota. The potential for harm to the BWCA is too high. It would be shameful to risk the eternal well-being of a national treasure for a short-term economic expansion. With the hustle and bustle of our daily lives, the BWCA is one of the few places where one can truly escape from it all. It is a testament to the wisdom and foresight of the American people that we protect this area for future generations." (Reading.)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Bogolub

40064

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

42272

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Larry Bogolub 1424 Lincoln Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Chial

41974

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Larry Chial Moorhead, Minnesota

Larry Cuffe

18128

Thank you. My name is Larry Cuffe, C-U-F-F-E, and I'm a resident of the City of Virginia and I'm also on the City of Virginia City Council. I've been here ever since this place opened up, and I have a speech prepared and something to talk about here, but it's going to be redundant of what everybody else has already said. I'm a fourth-generation Iron Ranger. My father is of Italian descent and my mother is Ojibwa. We have a very strong family background, a strong family heritage. Mining has been in our family for years. My grandfather was a miner, my other grandfather was a miner. We all shared those experiences. If it wasn't for mining, my grandfather wouldn't be here, my father wouldn't be here. My family would not be here, and if you look at the iron ore mining and compare it to the PolyMet Project, there is a comparison here. Now, there's been a lot of talk about opposition about the water, about not having the study done properly, but what I'm telling you right now, we live in the United States of America. The most advanced industrialized nation in the world. We have the cleanest water. We have the cleanest environmental protection. We have the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency that's a pain in our butt, but it's necessary because they do their due diligence. I rely on experts to make decisions. Every time you take a risk in life there's a risk. There's never going to be an absolute, but when you take every precaution and you spend hundreds of millions of dollars and 10 years of investment in order to do something that's going to be economically boon to a community that is dying on the vine. The City of Virginia had a population when I was growing up of about 18,000 people when the mines were booming and the construct was going on. Now, we have about 8,800 people. We have a housing crisis in Virginia. These houses are abandoned. People left because there are no jobs. This United States of America is built on the people. And I heard it spoken from other kind -- everybody here, it's -- it's the people working together. Well, we have a community here; Virginia, Eveleth, Gilbert, Biwabik, Aurora, Hoyt Lakes, all across this Iron Range is based upon our bread and butter, our way of life in order for us to live. Mining is the major contributing factor to our ability to survive and to raise our family. We as a City Council, we as a family, all my friends, we all support the PolyMet Project. There's a lot of things to say about the water, the quality. I read through the EIS study. I find that this is just -- they've done their due diligence. Let's move forward.

Larry Derksen

41599

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Larry Derksen New Ulm, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Dolphin 45336

To: Minnesota DNR From: Larry Dolphin 54769 180th St Austin, Minnesota 55912 E-mail address: alphaflpr@gmail-com Subject: Comment on Proposed Polymet Environmental Impact Statement I will keep this brief. We are blessed with some of the most abundant freshwater in the world. Why would we want to jeopardize the purity of our water. This is what concerns me most about the Polymet proposal is the need for Polymet to treat the water for at least 500 years and provide the financial wherewithal to accomplish it. It is not realistic and in fact it is ludicrous to expect that to be accomplished. Based on that information alone I believe the permit cannot be awarded. "A society that is satisfied with short term economics while deciding the source of its own survival cannot last" --Mary Berry- Water is essential for all life. Respectfully submitted, Larry Dolphin

Larry Hennis 6706

Please - no mining is necessary. We need to stop selling out our futures to short sighted, short term profit interests. The environment is just too important to allow a project like this. Thank you. - Larry Hennis ljhennis@fastmail.fm Larry Hennis 630 S Aspen Ct Saint Peter, MN 56082-1687

17041

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Larry Hennis 630 S Aspen Ct Saint Peter, MN 56082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Hennis

50314

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Larry Hennis 630 S Aspen Ct Saint Peter, MN 56082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Hylton 17246

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Larry J Ronning 42672

See attachment

Larry Johnson 19521

I'm Larry Johnson from Superior, Wisconsin, and I believe that we all use copper nickel in our lives, so we need to get it from somewhere. So is it okay to get it from somewhere else? And the nickel, don't forget about the nickel. We have to import 100 percent of the nickel in this country right now. I love the Boundary Waters, I love the environment, and this will be the cleanest place to get it, and it will benefit all of our citizens in this area. So that's my statement. Thank you.

Larry Kraemer 42639

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Krohn

39498

Hello, Thank you for the concern, research, and dedication of your team for the citizens of Minnesota, as well as the well-being of this country. Having attended most presentations, talked to professionals in the mining industry, researching past and present mining operations, having read the documentation as outlined in the SDEIS, it is my professional opinion we can be assured the impacts to the air, water and land will be minimal, and most likely superior to the existing ecology. This SDEIS demonstrates PolyMet can develop this resource in a sustainable manner with logical, engineered solutions proposed for any potential impacts. PolyMet will generate millions of dollars in local and state taxes for the support of our communities and educational institutions. The result of this project will contribute to the state and local economy at this time when we need jobs and a sustainable economic growth. This project, using the existing infrastructure and land is the ultimate in recycling. I am impressed by the extraordinary precautions proposed by PolyMet such as proven reverse osmosis technology and look forward to having them in our community. I am confident the professional team assembled by PolyMet will provide financial assurance to cover all required closure costs. Sincerely, Larry Krohn 506 Mission Road, West Bloomington, Minnesota 55420 Rockbottom506@me-com

39539

Hello, I would like to thank you for the great job you are doing. I am writing in regards to the PolyMet mining project in northern Minnesota, I am in full support of this project, I started out skeptical. However after reading the ESS reports and all of the steps PolyMet has taken to ensure no water contamination, safe holding ponds and safe mining practices, I feel they have gone above and beyond. I am now in Full Support of this project, for jobs, MN growth, revenue, even a kickback will go to MN schools (Land Use Trust /PSF from the founding of MN 1858). It looks like a win win to me. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Larry Krohn Bloomington, Minnesota

Larry Long

18154

I'm so honored to be here. Today we lost a very great American, Pete Seeger. And I stand before you in the spirit of Pete and I speak this in song. So this is a song that I wrote for this gathering. (Sings a song).

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Nelson

16147

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Larry OConnell

15302

To Whom It May Concern: I have done a lot of studying of this project because I have friends that live in the area of Hoyt Lakes. Polymet in my opinion has done all of it's homework. I am convinced they have the technology, financial means, and moral intentions to properly operate safely the proposed mine.. If you haven't visited the "Range" lately than you should take a trip up there (unless of course you live north,east,or west of the site) This area needs the economic input that Polymet will provide. The jobs that polymet provides are only the beginning of the job growth for this area. The housing market will benefit as well as retailand the list goes on . The facts of other mines whether good or bad are only relevant if Polymet plans to do the same things that they did. Polymet has in my opinion gone above and beyond anything that any other mine has ever done, to insure safe clean nontoxic mining. Besides the fact that they are willing to put money in an escrow account in case that any emergency may arise. Signed Larry OConnell

Larry Penk

54128

I do not support nor do I believe the review process has been sound. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Perrott 32366

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Don't allow it. Please. Sincerely, Larry Perrott 500 Maple St Farmington, MN 55024-1565

Larry Petersen 26357

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Larry Petersen 1000 NW 3rd St Gresham, OR 97030-6910 (503) 666-8656

Larry Popovich 7630

To the DNR, First of all, may I commend your agency on all of the hard work done in this process to date. Being in a business that works with the DNR, the MPCA and EPA, I can say first hand that the methods used by the agencies promote "best practices" for operation of companies in Minnesota. This will be no different for Polymet and the production of copper/nickel and precious metals on the area of Northeastern Minnesota. Technology continues to advance and so it will with the Polymet project. As required, they will be monitoring their process and doing the correct treatments to minimize any effects of mining. As time passes, technologies and treatments will continue to improve and we will end up with an even greater outcome. The "do nothing" option offered up by protesters of the project is the worst approach possible. We have the perfect opportunity to have a business come in to a brownfield site, prepare the site and do treatment on it for years to come. The money paid out in taxes and fees will support this treatment, along with millions of dollars for the communities and schools in our state. Let us not forget the jobs that will come with it, along with spin-off jobs resulting in mining; these communities desperately need help, as they have suffered with declines in many areas for years. We must support this project and will the laws in place and the great people we have at the agencies monitoring this process, we will have a successful outcome. Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion, Larry D. Popovich Lead Production Coordinator Laskin Energy Center Minnesota Power/Allete Extension 4804 (218-225-4804) Cell 218-491-3222

Alphabetical by sender's first name

larry ronning

40845

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. We have heard of the problems with sulfates and their longterm effects on our watersheds. I have heard nothing of all the other chemicals that are required to extract metals from the tailings. What other chemicals will be used and therefore added to our water.. Thank You, Larry J Ronning 1203 Ronning Dr Two Harbors Mn. 55616 Sincerely, larry ronning 1203 Ronning Dr Two Harbors, MN 55616-3013 (218) 834-3249

Larry Smith

37868

We are homeowners on White Iron Lake in Ely, Minnesota. We are writing to comment on the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). We are very concerned about plans to develop copper/nickel mining in our area. Specifically we are opposed to the PolyMet mine proposal. We are opposed for the following reasons: 1- Permanent water pollution will occur – Copper/Nickel mining is different from iron ore mining. To our knowledge this type of mining has never been done without doing severe environmental damage. And to do this type of mining here so near to the Boundary Water is risky at best Why would we take a chance of permanently polluting this wonderful ecosystem. As Lutheran Pastors we are personally aware of the current copper mine remediation going on north of Chelan, Washington. Holden Village is completely closed to visitors as crews try to clean up and reroute creeks. We will face similar problems in our area if copper and nickel are mined here. It is virtually impossible to prevent seepage from the mine and tailings. Perhaps millions of gallons of seepage from tailings and the mine site itself will enter ground water without being treated. PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid will last for at least 500 years. The Gutenberg printing press was invented 500 years ago. The United States of America is 238 years old. How can we possibly plan for pollution that will last over 500 years. 2- Mining companies do not have a good history of protecting the environment - Just this week we have learned that one of the nation's largest coal producers will pay a \$27-5 million fine and spend \$200 million to reduce illegal toxic discharges into hundreds of waterways across five Appalachian states. Who will pay for the ongoing cleanup here. This type of mining company behavior does not bode well for copper/nickel mining in our area. 3- PolyMet fails to plan for inevitable accidents and failures – Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. There are no details in the PolyMet plan how to deal with these situations. 4- Social costs and decline of property values – We are not convinced that local Ely people will benefit from copper/nickel mining. PolyMet does not commit to the number of jobs available for local people. There may be an influx of the number of people coming to Ely, but these folks will come and go elsewhere when the mining jobs aren't here. Mining is a Boom Bust economy. Ely will not benefit in the long run. Those of us that have property on the area lakes will likely suffer decline in property values. We have planned retirement on White Iron Lake for 25 years and have recently built a new home here. Polluted waters will make our property and home undesirable. And the attraction of the Boundary Waters will decline. 5- Inadequate comment period - Please increase the length of the comment period for the SDEIS from 90 days to 180 days. Allow for more comment time. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. For these and other reasons we are opposed to copper/nickel mining in our area. Sincerely, Pastors Larry and Susan Smith 3217 Big Rock Dr Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Wamstad

6019

From what I've read, I believe PolyMet should be allowed to proceed with their mining operation. New jobs have a trickle down affect and it appears this company has done it's homework. I support PolyMet and believe they will follow all established rules and regulations. Larry Wamstad Sent from my iPad

Larry Wannebo

37902

We do not support the PolyMet Mining project, now or in the future. It is apparent that science and the politics don't mix well; they represent different worlds. Neither do harmful chemicals and pure water. Sometimes, it takes many years to see the negative impacts in our waters. But, you should learn from your mistakes when it comes to damaging Minnesota's waters. There are many examples to learn from in Minnesota. Cities used to drain sewage into rivers and lakes. It was acceptable science of the time. Highway departments built curb and gutters to drain road run-off (oil, gas, salt) right into the lakes and rivers. It was a cheap way to make roads safer. Businesses, like 3M, disposed of "waste products" into the soil and ultimately, into ground water. Profits were so huge that the cost of clean-up was just the cost of doing business. Did you learn from your mistakes. From experience, you should know that you are not as smart as you think. When someone dangles dollars and votes in front of politicians, the politicians cause the water to boil like a school of piranhas. Politicians subtly threaten environmental staff to approve bad ideas in the name of economic development. It is wrong that environmental issues are decided by politicians for short-term economic gains. A wise person said: "I believe there is only one conflict, and that is between short-term and long-term thinking. In the long term, the economy and the environment are the same thing. If it is unenvironmental is it uneconomic. That is a rule of nature." Mollie Beattie (1947-1996, former director US Fish and Wildlife Service If the state agencies and politicians do not approve of the project, I assume that PolyMet will sue the good people of Minnesota. This would be a bullying tactic. But, it might be better to be tied –up in court for a few years, rather than have our waters destroyed for ever. The preponderance of evidence in the PolyMet case, both scientific and social evidence, proves that the vast majority of the informed citizens in Minnesota do not want to risk the long-term quality of their water and related eco-systems for a few hundred short-term jobs. Everything else discussed in this search for a solution is nothing but smoke to confuse the issue. If approved, PolyMet will be followed by applications for more exploitation of our natural resources in the name of jobs. This is the REAL cumulative impact of a PolyMet mine. We urge MDNR to deny the permit to mine and all of the other permits associated with this project. Larry and Marilyn Wannebo 39911 County Road 66 Manhattan Beach, MN 56442 218-533-4622

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Werner

16197

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

larry yank

42117

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr larry yank 171 McKnight Rd N Saint Paul, MN 55119-4663

Larry Zelenz

10724

After reviewing the fact sheets and executive summaries on this project, it seems to me that what may be critical is how effectively Polymet's performance is monitored with regard to the safeguards they intend to put in place. Woefully underfunded government agencies, constrained by bureaucracy with weak punitive powers may be ineffective in assuring that the stated standards are met. I would suggest that Polymet be required to fund an independent group that includes representatives from the DNR, USFS, USACE, MPCA and citizens representing environmental groups with interest in the region acting jointly, to monitor the project on a full time basis in perpetuity. This entity should have the power to curtail or shut down operations and have standing with regard to directing punitive measures if Polymet fails to meet stated environmental safeguards. Larry Zelenz 323 Wildwood Drive Duluth, MN 55811 HYPERLINK "mailto:larry.zelenz@gmail-com"larry.zelenz@gmail-com 507-382-7793

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry Zelenz

39524

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Larry Zelenz Larry Zelenz 323 Wildwood Drive Duluth, MN 55811

48769

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Larry Zelenz Larry Zelenz 323 Wildwood Drive Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Larry-bob Roberts

43139

The potential benefits in terms of a small number of jobs over a short range of time and extracted minerals versus the long-term impact of pollution is not worthwhile. I know that people who have been examining the environmental impact reports much more than I do have much more insightful things to say, so I won't elaborate further here. I hope you will carefully examine the issues of whether the estimates of 90% of the water being captured are at all accurate and experimentally verifiable, or are just plugging in the required numbers to come to the desired result. Larry Roberts

Laska Nygaard

43221

I neglected to include my name and contact information below. They are: Ms Laska Nygaard 1088 Hyacinth Ave E St Paul, MN 55106 612-518-8371 [HYPERLINK "mailto:laskaandbrent@comcaStnet"](mailto:laskaandbrent@comcaStnet)laskaandbrent@comcaStnet Thanks. _____ From: laskaandbrent@comcaStnet To: "NorthMetSDEIS dnr" <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 3:47:03 PM Subject: polymet - paying for the pollution Do not permit the PolyMet mine. The proposed PolyMet mine is not the way to test out the first sulfide mine in Minnesota. The proposed location is located in sensitive environmental areas in Minnesota. These are precisely the types of areas that we need to protect and maintain in Minnesota. These are the areas we need to protect in order to protect citizens' health, in order to keep the tourist industry we hAve Minnesota has a history of thinking carefully and not permitting to-good-to-be-possible projects; it has a history of protecting its people and assets. This history must be continued. There is no way to guarantee that PolyMet would complete 200 to 500 years of necessary cleanup. There is no way to be certain 200/500 years in the future the extent of the damages that would need to be assessed and addressed. Duration of the environmental harm. If PolyMet is allowed to have the mine, Minnesotans and Americans will be required to have a polluted area of a current NATIONAL FOREST for 200 to 500 years. A national forest is intended to be protected. Treating it in a way such that it is harmed for ten to 50 generations puts unacceptable burdens on those generations: (1) the area would not be free from harm and therefore unable to rehabilitate as a safe environment over the lengthy period of time; (2) there is no telling whether the procedures and actions necessary to keep on cleaning the pollutants for 200/500 years would be completed, as we cannot see into the future; (3) there is no way to ensure PolyMet would pay for the cleanup or other remedies for the environmental damage. Perhaps 100 years would be a different matter, given that the actual people involved in the operations would be removed from the polluting acts by approximately only 5 generations, and we can only hope the world will not have changed as drastically by then. Forcing 500 years' of Minnesotans to suffer for the decision of making money now over a period of a mere 20 years - ONE generation - is illogical. Forcing them to live on hope of having the damages taken care of is illogical. The number of things impossible to foresee and that therefore could go wrong in 500 years is incalculable. Under the proposed plan, water treatment at the mine would be required for 200 years, and 500 years at the facility. So we know the duration would be AT LEAST 500 years, and we know the pollution would be BAD;they could be much worse. 200 years ago the world was not industrialized, the levels of pollution we have now were inconceivable then. We now have the ability to inflict progressively more and worse environmental harm more efficiently, quickly and easily, only we have many times more the population than 200 years ago and many times less the clean, healthy environment. No telling how our ability to exploit will grow, no telling how damage in one area can affect another. Betting on cleaning up over 200 and 500 years to be the same as now is fool-hardy. The world will be a very different place by the time those eras are reached. Money is good. I do not begrudge PolyMet it's wanting to make money. I begrudge it wanting to make money in such an inherently dangerous fashion, in an area of vulnerable environment, in an industry in which the history of cleanup is poor, such that states in which such mines exist/have existed before (and so suffer from pollution, particularly water pollution) have suffered from the pollution AND companies have failed to pay for and ensure the cleanups. When the companies cease to exist, what can a state or a peop

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laska Nygaard

43233

Do not permit the PolyMet mine. The proposed PolyMet mine is not the way to test out the first sulfide mine in Minnesota. The proposed location is located in sensitive environmental areas in Minnesota. These are precisely the types of areas that we need to protect and maintain in Minnesota. These are the areas we need to protect in order to protect citizens' health, in order to keep the tourist industry we have. Minnesota has a history of thinking carefully and not permitting to-good-to-be-possible projects; it has a history of protecting its people and assets. This history must be continued. There is no way to guarantee that PolyMet would complete 200 to 500 years of necessary cleanup. There is no way to be certain 200/500 years in the future the extent of the damages that would need to be assessed and addressed. Duration of the environmental harm. If PolyMet is allowed to have the mine, Minnesotans and Americans will be required to have a polluted area of a current NATIONAL FOREST for 200 to 500 years. A national forest is intended to be protected. Treating it in a way such that it is harmed for ten to 50 generations puts unacceptable burdens on those generations: (1) the area would not be free from harm and therefore unable to rehabilitate as a safe environment over the lengthy period of time; (2) there is no telling whether the procedures and actions necessary to keep on cleaning the pollutants for 200/500 years would be completed, as we cannot see into the future; (3) there is no way to ensure PolyMet would pay for the cleanup or other remedies for the environmental damage. Perhaps 100 years would be a different matter, given that the actual people involved in the operations would be removed from the polluting acts by approximately only 5 generations, and we can only hope the world will not have changed as drastically by then. Forcing 500 years' of Minnesotans to suffer for the decision of making money now over a period of a mere 20 years - ONE generation - is illogical. Forcing them to live on hope of having the damages taken care of is illogical. The number of things impossible to foresee and that therefore could go wrong in 500 years is incalculable. Under the proposed plan, water treatment at the mine would be required for 200 years, and 500 years at the facility. So we know the duration would be AT LEAST 500 years, and we know the pollution would be BAD; they could be much worse. 200 years ago the world was not industrialized, the levels of pollution we have now were inconceivable then. We now have the ability to inflict progressively more and worse environmental harm more efficiently, quickly and easily, only we have many times more the population than 200 years ago and many times less the clean, healthy environment. No telling how our ability to exploit will grow, no telling how damage in one area can affect another. Betting on cleaning up over 200 and 500 years to be the same as now is fool-hardy. The world will be a very different place by the time those eras are reached. Money is good. I do not begrudge PolyMet its wanting to make money. I begrudge it wanting to make money in such an inherently dangerous fashion, in an area of vulnerable environment, in an industry in which the history of cleanup is poor, such that states in which such mines exist/have existed before (and so suffer from pollution, particularly water pollution) have suffered from the pollution AND companies have failed to pay for and ensure the cleanups. When the companies cease to exist, what can a state or a people can do to make it meet its obligations to clean up, moral, ethical and financial. All cleanup costs - those for the 200 and 500 year durations - should be paid by PolyMet up front. If this is not feasible for PolyMet, then PolyMet should understand that the plan is not feasible. Note in addition that the costs of clean up are often underestimated, particularly given the impossibility of knowing actual d

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laszlo Fulop

40180

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura and Mr. Neal Deaton

40138

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The most precious and life-giving commodity that we have on the planet is water. No amount of rationalizing can prove that this proposed project will bring about more benefits than irreparable damage. Sincerely, Mrs Laura and Mr Neal Deaton 3820 Forestview Ln N Plymouth, MN 55441-1337

Laura B Melander

54740

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44421

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting. 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be. 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data. 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage. Sincerely, Ms Laura Berglund 1180 California Dr Saint Paul, MN 55108-2261

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44428

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have been stuck with billions in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1) Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2) Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3) Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Sincerely, Ms Laura Berglund 1180 California Dr Saint Paul, MN 55108-2261

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44438

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. I am particularly concerned about the public health effects of contaminants that will be generated by the PolyMet project. Sulfates, sulfides, mercury and methyl mercury, and asbestos fibers are not things I want in my groundwater or surface water, the air I breathe, or the food I eat. Please conduct a detailed, thorough, comprehensive health impact assessment of the proposed project. Sincerely, Ms Laura Berglund 1180 California Dr Saint Paul, MN 55108-2261

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44444

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44483

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft. 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment. 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations. 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment. I ask you to consider what has happened with similar mines in other states. Summitville Gold Mine, Colorado The company filed for bankruptcy, leaving cleanup costs to the public. Costs expected to be about \$235 million and take at least 100 years. Zortman Landusky Mine, Montana In 1998, the company abandoned the site and filed for bankruptcy. After several lawsuits against the mining company and its creditors following the company's bankruptcy, Montana's taxpayers are still liable for anywhere from \$8 million to \$90 million. Gilt Edge Mine, South Dakota The parent company, Dakota Mi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44487

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44490

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standaRd The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this teSt PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams grams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untreated every year. In fact, the SDEIS predicts that many years after closure this could violate the sulfate standard to protect wild rice, requiring additional measures (5-142). The SDEIS is contradictory, on the one hand relying on mechanical water treatment for hundreds of years in order to seemingly meet the sulfate standard, but also describing possible passive treatments that may be developed that would seasonally violate the protective sulfate standards. The EIS should eliminate that contradiction. Lastly, the SDEIS inadequately characterizes wild rice waters downstream of the PolyMet sites. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Council has provided additional wild rice sites other than those included in the SDEIS. The EIS should be revised to include these additional wild rice waters. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standaRd The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this teSt PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams grams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44496

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project. 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Sincerely, Ms Laura Berglund 1180 California Dr Saint Paul, MN 55108-2261

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44556

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby communities, and describe contingency plans to address the risk to public health and worker safety if asbestos-like fibers are detected during construction, operation, closure and post-closure 3) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate inaccurate characterizations of the University of Minnesota mesothelioma study. Specifically, eliminate statements that imply that commercial asbestos is the primary risk factor for mesothelioma risk Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please require PolyMet to prove there is no added mesothelioma risk to workers and the public. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine workers as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers pre

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Berglund

44565

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please fix the inaccurate water data and redo the water model in PolyMet's mine plan. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data. 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013- 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEI

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Carrero

12055

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

30211

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I have read that PolyMet believes that it will have sufficient safeguards in place to prevent contamination; however, I do not have confidence that this is the case. It is my understanding that there is potential for contamination to occur for the next 500 years and I don't think it is realistic for us to believe we can prevent any water pollution from occurring over such a long period of time. Over 500 years, there will be many variables that we cannot predict. This is too big of a risk us and for future generations. I read that the jobs created by this project will last for 20 years. That seems great now but, if you look at the big picture, I do not believe it is worth the risk. Sincerely, Laura Carrero 956 Gorman Ave Saint Paul, MN 55118-1412 (651) 457-7980

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Dahl Popkes

41069

To Ms Lisa Fay and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: I am registering my OPPOSITION to the proposal by PolyMet to engage in sulfide mining in the state of Minnesota. The very FACT that sulfide mining produces corrosive acid destruction to our lands and waters should be enough reason to say NO to PolyMet. I urge our Department of NATURAL RESOURCES to keep protecting our environment; allowing this mining will do exactly the opposite. We live in Cook County, on Birch Lake, on the Gunflint Trail. Like many of our neighbors in Cook County, our lakes are our ONLY source of water. Yes indeed, Birch Lake is clean and clear and, using only a modest filtration system, perfectly safe to drink. The fact that water contaminated by sulfide mining will require treatment for as many as 200 to 500 years makes it abundantly clear to me that only a few will 'benefit' from the economic ramifications of PolyMet's industry, but we ALL will pay the environment price. That is certainly not fair, nor does it make sense. Please do not allow PolyMet to proceed. Sincerely, Laura Popkes 69 Birch Lake Rd Grand Marais, MN 55604 218-388-9491

Laura Espondaburu

40661

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Laura Espondaburu 1224 E 22nd St Minneapolis, MN 55404-2945 (612) 205-3572

Laura Ferenci

57977

Our resources cannot be contaminated. Please do not allow PolyMet to mine. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Feuerborn

40861

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Dr Laura Feuerborn 8816 38th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98126-3619 (206) 854-4182

Laura Flynn

40000

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Laura Flynn 5805 Prince Dr NW Byron, MN 55920-4106 (507) 775-6489

Laura Gauger

41963

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Laura Gauger 1321 E 1st St Apt 201 Duluth, MN 55805-2442

57355

see attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Grangaard

15993

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Minnesota’s public lands and water resources are part of what makes our state so incredibly unique. They are assets both now and in the future, and across the country and the world we are known for our blue waters, our beautiful forests, and our wilderness. It just seems so shortsighted to cause such an enormous blight on such an amazing resource for the short-term good of a relative few. Speculating on how this mine could be made safer than the examples of the past is not worth the potential destruction it could have on our state’s natural resources. Mining in this way has yet to be done safely. Even if PolyMet states that they have a solution, do we really want them to debut their solution in a location that could destroy so many of the resources around it, if their claims are incorrect. Trusting a company to provide cleanup for the next hundreds of years is tenuous at best. Economic growth is important to consider, but at what expense over the next short term period of time (20 years seems to be the popular number), when that expense could impact us far beyond what we can see. It’s just not worth the uncertainty and the risk to move forward with this. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Laura Grangaard
Laura Grangaard 1900 Colfax Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55403

Laura Hedlund

43850

We need to think of more than our needs RIGHT NOW. How can we with open eyes and a full heart even consider something SO RECKLESS as the polymet proposal which will pollute for more than 500 years. The need for jobs is based on economic system which we can change. There has been a slow movement toward local beer creating more than 500 jobs. We do not have to sacrifice our environment for temporary and PERCEIVED economy gains. let's start doing the hard work to fight for a just working economic system. I love the Made On the Range website. Let's support real, sustainable jobs that do not compromise our environment. We all do better when we all better. The pollution from the polymet proposal is likely to impact fishing and hunting rights - the true sustainable economy. Please say no to recklessness. Laura Hedlund 1364 Wilderness Run Drive Eagan, MN 55123 651 755 5253

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura L. Hagen

45686

4/12/14 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Re: NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Dear Ms Fay, I am a biological sciences major and environmental science minor at University of Missouri-Columbia and am writing to you about my concern with the NorthMet Proposed Action in Superior National ForeSt With my interest and concern with the environment, I believe that there should be no action taken in the Superior National ForeSt I am mainly concerned with the effects that the copper-nickel mining would have on wildlife habitat, native species of the area, nature of the land, and water quality. First, the amount of wetlands that would be destroyed is incredibly significant and would affect the organisms that inhabit them. Many species such as the lynx, bald eagle, gray wolf, eastern heather vole, wood turtle, yellow rail and many more could be affected by the mining. The executive summary itself says these species may be affected by the project and that restoration of the areas after the project could take decades. These species may not even be able to re-inhabit the areas, due to extinction or altered adaptations due to changes in the area. Aquatic organisms that find their home in the streams and rivers connected to the wetland would most likely be adversely affected with the change in streamflow, loss of connectivity of the streams and the poor water quality. Although there are no known endangered or threatened species in the area that would be affected, there is no way to predict how the species already present would be affected. There may be more species added to the threatened species list once the mining would begin. Another concern is the affect on the water quality in the area. There are already high levels of mercury in fish tissue without mining operations. The copper-nickel is locked in to the rock with sulfides. When sulfide comes into contact with oxygen, it produces sulfuric acid and releases soluble metals including mercury, iron, copper and nickel. This would increase the already high levels of mercury in the water. Contaminants like these could leach into groundwater and surface water even after the mining operation would end. This could be lethal for the citizens of the area, as mercury targets the nervous system of humans as well as aquatic organisms With an increase in sulfides in the water bodies, the wild rice that is grown in the area would be adversely affected and possibly wiped out. This wild rice feeds many in the region, including tribes in the area, citizens of Minnesota and migrating birds. PolyMet themselves say that treatment of the water will continue for decades and possibly even centuries. Economically, the PolyMet mining would create many jobs for local citizens. This is an incredibly valuable reason to establish the mining operation. Citizens of Northern Minnesota need jobs and there would be \$332 million made per year from the extracted minerals. Although these are significant short-term benefits they are outweighed by the long-term costs. It will cost \$200 million to close the mine after 20 years of operating and an estimated \$3-5-6 million to annually treat the water, which could take decades or centuries. Overall, the costs to remedy the damage done by the mine would cost more in the long run than the earnings during the 20 years of operations. There are also factors that are of crucial importance that are difficult to put a price tag on. What is the value of native species and a thriving national park. What is the value of clean water and the health of our children and grandchildren. These are the questions that must be considered before deciding to build the NorthMet mine. Overall, I believe that the NorthMet mine operation shou

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Malwitz

44159

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Laura Millberg

40882

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Economic development that threatens tourism and many of our natural resources is not a good decision for the state of MN. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Laura Millberg 1504 Summit Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2241

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Platcek

40095

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Laura Platcek 331 3rd Ave Two Harbors, MN 55616-1626 (218) 834-0788

Laura Salyards-Fryberger Mullen

57271

Dislike anything that requires 500 years of environmental cleanup for not many MN jobs over not many years by comparison. Also think that human ingenuity will find a better way to mine Minnesota's copper in the future that will be better for all – Protect our water please . Wait for a better way.Laura Salyards-Fryberg MullenPO Box 3167 Duluth, MN 55803

Laura Schauland

9408

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Schauland 9609 Arrowhead Road Isabella, MN 55607

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Schauland

18713

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Schauland 9609 Arrowhead Road Isabella, MN 55607

50788

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Schauland 9609 Arrowhead Road Isabella, MN 55607

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Smith

47912

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. We can't allow bad assumptions in something this important to our environment or economy. If these numbers are so fuzzy, can we trust any of their numbers. Make them do it right. Thank you. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Smith 2127 Iglehart Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Smith

48377

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. We can't allow bad assumptions in something this important to our environment or economy. If these numbers are so fuzzy, can we trust any of their numbers. Make them do it right. Thank you. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Smith 2127 Iglehart Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Smith

52405

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. We can't allow bad assumptions in something this important to our environment or economy. If these numbers are so fuzzy, can we trust any of their numbers. Make them do it right. Thank you. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Laura Smith 2127 Iglehart Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104

Laura Stramer

58153

I oppose the the PolyMet open pit mine for the following reasons: 1. Pollution on an unprecedented scale in MN, and in perpetuity, according to PolyMet's own revised environmental impact statement and review of existing U.S. sulfide mining superfund sites. 100% of sulfide mining operations in the U.S. have violated water quality standards and are currently the costliest to the U.S. Taxpayer of all superfund liability, estimated by the EPA at between 20-54 billion dollars. 2. I oppose the permanent loss of our water quality in the most important fresh water resource on the planet, The Great Lakes. This project would impact Lake Superior, the largest fresh water lake in the world by surface area, and impact the St. Louis River watershed, its largest tributary and home to multiple species of fish. In addition this mine would destroy more than 1300 acres of high value wetlands and convert more than 6,650 acres of what are now public and tribal lands to private mining company property. Drinking water would be subject to toxic levels of mercury, arsenic and manganese. The mine would produce high concentrations of sulfuric acid and result in acid mine drainage, leeching chemicals out of rock which are toxic to water, ecosystems and toxic to wild rice. 3. For too long tribal peoples have been the test case against corporate rape of the land. The very placement of reservations was influenced by the distribution of wild rice, fishing and hunting places. The treaties of 1837 and 1854 which have been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court guarantee the tribal rights of hunting, fishing and ricing upon these lands, rivers and lakes. The PolyMet open pit mine would interfere with these treaty rights by ceding surface rights of tribal lands into corporate hands and polluting tribal lands and waters of the Anishinaabe. The PolyMet mine and tailings would also increase mercury levels in the downstream reservation waters of the du Lac nation and places where the Grand Portage people fish. I oppose the mine project in support of the position that the Wild Rice/Sulfate Water Quality Standards of the Clean Water Act which was previously upheld in multiple courts must be maintained to ensure the health and well-being of the Ojibwe-Anishinaabe nations and the affected Fond du lac tribes downstream. I would also remind decision makers that according to Federal Land Management policy, National Forest Management policy, and National Environmental policy, full consultation with affected sovereign tribal governments is required for consensus on matters concerning tribal nations.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laura Whitney 41613

Dear DNR: I do not support Polymet as environmental risks outweigh benefit locally. Laura Whitney 330 North 60th AVE E Duluth MN 55804

Laura Wolden 46192

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the SDEIS. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring long-term if not permanent pollution to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Thousands of Minnesotans are in opposition to this mining project because it will damage the very important and limited public resource of water. We do not want to live with the consequences of poor research and decisions, nor leave this legacy for the future. Sincerely yours, Laura Wolden Laura Wolden 7780 E Rockmont Rd Poplar, WI 54864

46193

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the SDEIS. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring long-term if not permanent pollution to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Thousands of Minnesotans are in opposition to this mining project because it will damage the very important and limited public resource of water. We do not want to live with the consequences of poor research and decisions, nor leave this legacy for the future. Sincerely yours, Laura Wolden Laura Wolden 7780 E Rockmont Rd Poplar, WI 54864

Laura Zimmerman 40318

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Laura Zimmerman 3515 KINSROW AVE APT 210 EUGENE, OR 97401 US

Laura-Christina Cobb 26314

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I'm writing about the PolyMet Mining Corporation North Met mining project's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining would put at risk the wetlands, lakes and waterways throughout the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, and most significantly, Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Heavy metal contamination and acid mine fluids have polluted waters everywhere that sulfide ore mining has been done. We know what's at stake, and we know the irreversible damage that'll be done. Do not allow PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine: it promises to ruin this extraordinary natural area - that belongs to the public - and is definitely not in the public interest. Thank you for making the right decision for the greater good. Laura-Christina Cobb Sincerely, Laura-Christina Cobb 260 E 10th St New York, NY 10009-4802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laureen Guyer

16567

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Our forests in Minnesota are more precious than gold. We depend on a clean environment for so many things: the air we breathe, the water we drink, the foods we grow, and the fish and game animals who thrive here. The birds, fish, insects and other animals also depend on a clean environment to thrive. There is nothing more important or precious to living things than a clean environment. Minnesota's forests and farmland are important not only to those of us who live and work here, they are important to our country, indeed the world, to provide wild places to visit and oxygen to the atmosphere. The mines PolyMet proposes are not conducive to any of the above. Please reject their proposals as a citizen in good conscience and for the future generations who want nothing more than a chance to live healthy. Sincerely yours, Laureen Guyer Laureen Guyer 419 S 19th Ave E Duluth, MN 55812

49977

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Our forests in Minnesota are more precious than gold. We depend on a clean environment for so many things: the air we breathe, the water we drink, the foods we grow, and the fish and game animals who thrive here. The birds, fish, insects and other animals also depend on a clean environment to thrive. There is nothing more important or precious to living things than a clean environment. Minnesota's forests and farmland are important not only to those of us who live and work here, they are important to our country, indeed the world, to provide wild places to visit and oxygen to the atmosphere. The mines PolyMet proposes are not conducive to any of the above. Please reject their proposals as a citizen in good conscience and for the future generations who want nothing more than a chance to live healthy. Sincerely yours, Laureen Guyer Laureen Guyer 419 S 19th Ave E Duluth, MN 55812

Laurel & Bill Ehlert

39997

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Laurel and Bill Ehlert 3908 Avondale St Minnetonka, MN 55345-1803 (952) 200-2091

Laurel Hyvonen

42621

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laurella Scott

15982

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Bywater

42302

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Lauren Bywater 25 Bowling Green Close Birmingham, ot B23 5QU GB

Lauren Gedlinske

21340

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lauren Gedlinske 13476 Georgia Ct Apple Valley, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Gedlinske

49878

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lauren Gedlinske 13476 Georgia Ct Apple Valley, MN 55124

Lauren Hammer

17671

Feb 15, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, The law requires that you thoroughly evaluate the environmental effects of any proposal, particularly in high quality wetland habitat under federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest-more than 900 acres of wetlands with an additional ten square miles downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that need this habitat include: Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, Common Loons, Black-backed Woodpeckers, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawks and Boreal Owls. As a concerned citizen of the USA, I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering mankind's future. Sincerely, Ms Lauren Hammer 2900 4th St Apt 16 Santa Monica, CA 90405-5513

Lauren Lederle

9606

Hello, I was born and raised in MN. I now live in California, and I come home every summer to travel to the boundary waters with friends and family. The BWCA is my true home in MN, and I know many other MN natives feel the same way. The tourism that the BWCA, not to mention the clean water and plant and wildlife, provide much more for the state of MN than a Mine ever will. The polymet mine risks the safety of drinking water for northern parts of the state indefinitely. Please keep the BWCA safe, as a place where young minnesotans can go to be stewards of the wilderness, and a place that inspires them to become environmental leaders where ever they go. If this mine is allowed to move forward it would be a tragedy for me personally, for the state of MN and for future generations. Please reconsider. Sincerely, Lauren

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Satterlee

41007

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing as a life-long resident of Minnesota, including a 4-year resident and frequent visitor of Duluth and the North Shore of Lake Superior. The backbone of Northern Minnesota's beauty and economy is the integrity of its environment. We must protect its integrity from contamination that may take hundreds of years to reverse, if it is possible to reverse at all. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lauren Satterlee 6301 St Johns Ave Minneapolis, MN 55424

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Satterlee

41008

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing as a life-long resident of Minnesota, including a 4-year resident and frequent visitor of Duluth and the North Shore of Lake Superior. The backbone of Northern Minnesota's beauty and economy is the integrity of its environment. We must protect its integrity from contamination that may take hundreds of years to reverse, if it is possible to reverse at all. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lauren Satterlee 6301 St Johns Ave Minneapolis, MN 55424

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Satterlee

49091

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing as a life-long resident of Minnesota, including a 4-year resident and frequent visitor of Duluth and the North Shore of Lake Superior. The backbone of Northern Minnesota's beauty and economy is the integrity of its environment. We must protect its integrity from contamination that may take hundreds of years to reverse, if it is possible to reverse at all. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Lauren Satterlee 6301 St Johns Ave Minneapolis, MN 55424

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lauren Satterlee

49092

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am writing as a life-long resident of Minnesota, including a 4-year resident and frequent visitor of Duluth and the North Shore of Lake Superior. The backbone of Northern Minnesota's beauty and economy is the integrity of its environment. We must protect its integrity from contamination that may take hundreds of years to reverse, if it is possible to reverse at all. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lauren Satterlee 6301 St Johns Ave Minneapolis, MN 55424

Laurence Risser

39815

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. For 350 jobs we are willing to sell the environmental integrity of the BWCA. Never has a more short-term, ill-conceived bargain been made since Esau sold his birthright to Jacob. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Laurence Risser 4904 Thomas Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1804 (612) 922-6596

Laurentian Chamber of Commerce

54763

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laurice Jamieson

39616

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

47431

I have serious concerns about the inadequate Financial assurance and the careless disregard for potential disastrous environmental effects. This should not go forward without public discussions about these issues. Legislator Kahn has brought up the need for a third party insurer. The proposal is sorely lacking in both instances, it's inadequacies are dangerous. Please do not proceed with such a poorly thought out proposal. You owe further examination of these issues to the citizens of Minnesota. Sincerely, Laurice Jamieson 610 SE Sixth Street Minneapolis MN 55414

Laurie Bailey

42715

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laurie Bruno 44384

From: laurieb@tcq-net [mailto:laurieb@tcq-net] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 9:44 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Polymet mine To [Decision Maker], The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on Alces Americanus, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. - Laurie Bruno 7532 Oakland Ave So Richfield, MN 55423

Laurie Gaudino 38884

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Laurie Gaudino 2545 Anderson Rd Duluth, MN 55811-3808 (218) 341-4544

Laurie Matson 40020

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Laurie Matson 409 5th Ave SW Waseca, MN 56093-2105

Laurie patrick 38888

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Laurie patrick 430 Wedgewood Dr Mahtomedi, MN 55115-1787

Laurie Sugiarto 47609

Please do not allow the PolyMet mine to be built. I prefer to have clean water and no mining. I am an avid Northern Minnesota recreational user and also with rental property in Cook County, MN. Please do not allow this mine to happen. Protect our wilderness and our water. Thank you, Laurie Sugiarto 4200 49th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Laurie Valesano

40112

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Lawrence A Martin

54486

See attachment

Lawrence Aho

54718

See attachment

Lawrence Eisinger

42500

Please see the attached document.

Lawrence F Eisinger

42864

See attachment

Lawrence L Johnson

42628

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lawrence Morgan 58025

As a taxpayer of Minnesota this toxic mine would take our minerals for export and leave the rest of us with the financial burden. =Corporate profits over the health and beauty of our state! No to the destruction and desecration of Minnesota! And no to a precedence it would start. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Lawrence Severt 54156

No I don't! I don't believe the mining industry is capable of honesty. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Lawrence Spears 57609

The Spears 2132 Miller Creek Drive Duluth, MN 55811-1882 212-727-8462 [HYPERLINK "mailto:spears@btinet-net"spears@btinet-net](mailto:spears@btinet-net) January 9, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 Saint Paul, MN 55155-4025 [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) Subject: Oppose PolyMet NorthMet Copper-Nickel Mine Lisa Fay, We oppose the issuance of the permit for any PolyMet NorthMet Copper-Nickel Mine near Hoyt Lakes. The sulfur pollution is long-term and devastating to the environment. The promised mining jobs are few, short-term and phantom. The copper extracted is very small. The benefits to Minnesota will be minimal. The mining company is likely to disappear in bankruptcy leaving no protection against the long-term environmental destruction. There is no demonstrated significant national resource interest in this mining in Minnesota. Please deny the permit for any PolyMet NorthMet Copper-Nickel Mine near Hoyt Lakes. Joanne and Larry Spears Cc: Senator Franken Senator Klobuchar Representative Nolan

Lawrence Suchy 39845

Dear sirs: my wife and I have a second home on Echo Trail north of Ely. We spend more than half of each year there. I've read all available articles on the proposed mine, and heard many diverging opinions on that mine. I believe that there is too much to lose in the environment if something goes wrong during the life of the mine, and the centuries after. As now proposed, I wish for the proposed mine to be turned down. Respectfully yours. Lawrence Suchy 10803 Linwood Forest Drive, Champlin, mn. 55316- Sent from my iPhone

Lawrence Thompson 11894

Feb 14, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. PolyMet wants to mine in wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) proposes NO mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to wetland destruction, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will damage the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: BLACK-BACKED WOODPECKER, SPRUCE GROUSE, NORTHERN GOSHAWK AND BOREAL OWL. Thank you. Sincerely, Dr Lawrence Thompson 1069 Felicia Ct Livermore, CA 94550-8134

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lawrence Thompson

26213

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Sulfide mining in Minnesota by the PolyMet Mining Corp would threaten wetlands, lakes and rivers in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have deep concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health because acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters everywhere sulfide ore mining has occurred. Therefore, the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine would be completely against the public interest. Sincerely, Lawrence Thompson 1069 Felicia Ct Livermore, CA 94550-8134 (925) 455-9473

Leah Robshaw

20202

Dear DNR leadership, I am writing to ask that you do not allow PolyMet Mining to open up a Copper-Nickel mine in Northern Minnesota. I am thankful that the USFS does not believe that the mineral estate gives PolyMet the right to surface mine NFS land to access the minerals below. I believe national lands should be used to support the long term interests of the plants, animals and people of the United States. The proposed Copper-Nickel mine does not achieve this goal. I reviewed the environmental impact reports compiled by the Environmental Impact Statement. I am concerned about the destruction of wetland habitat within the Embarrass River and Partridge River watersheds which will disrupt the plants and animals who live there. Likewise, the increased levels of aluminum and lead in the water impacts the entire food chain of species - including birds of prey and larger carnivores. I am also extremely wary of the so called financial assurances that PolyMet would set aside to mitigate further environmental destruction. The amount of funds needed to clean up a mine site and/or prevent intense pollution is not a known amount. What if the amount of funds PolyMet agrees to set aside is not enough. What if they go bankrupt and jump ship mid way. Who is left to foot the bill. Taxpayers. PolyMet is not interested in this mining project because they care about the long term economic or environmental health of this region. They care about the profits they can make. They will exploit every loophole and squeeze taxpayers of every dollar possible so they can increase their profit margins. Please help conserve and preserve our government lands and watersheds for future generations. Do not approve the PolyMet Copper-Nickel Mine. Sincerely, Leah Robinson 3210 W 44th St Minneapolis, MN 55410 612-729-9831

Leah Rogne

43366

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed PolyMet Mining project in northern Minnesota. I do not believe that the risk to the environment, particularly to the water in the region, is justified. I have not seen evidence that the company has the capacity to monitor and remediate the problems that are expected to occur for centuries to come. The natural resources in this region are too precious and the health of humans and animals too much at risk. Please do not allow this project to move forward. Thank you. Leah Rogne, Phd 3460 N. Range Line Road Gheen, MN 55771 Phone: 218-787-2212

Leah Stroup

41559

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Hello- Thank you for reading our plea - Lake Superior is one of Minnesota's most authentic and pristine attractions to people and nature. Please do not ruin this treasure all for just a short term goal - One day, if this type of disregard for mother nature's gems continues, nothing will be left or sacred. Do not continue the world's ugly trend and invest instead in keeping our lands healthy for generations to come. All of our children's future sincerely depends on this battle cry. Please do not turn a blind eye or risk being added to a long list of the world's worst offenders. Mother nature does not forgive, forget nor revive after assaults made that cannot be undone. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Leah Stroup 6224 Magnolia Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-6314 (612) 978-6860

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leah Stroup

41562

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Hello- Thank you for reading our plea - Lake Superior is one of Minnesota's most authentic and pristine attractions to people and nature Please do not ruin this treasure all for just a short term goal - One day, if this type of disregard for mother nature's gems continues, nothing will be left or sacred. Do not continue the world's ugly trend and invest instead in keeping our lands healthy for generations to come. All of our children's future sincerely depends on this battle cry. Please do not turn a blind eye or risk being added to a long list of the world's worst offenders. Mother nature does not forgive, forget nor revive after assaults made that cannot be undone .. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Leah Stroup 6224 Magnolia Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-6314 (612) 978-6860

Lee Ann Landstrom

16124

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lee Ann Landstrom 52604

Protect our water. Hooded Mergansers swim in northeastern Minnesota's pristine marshes, ponds, and rivers, feeding on fish, crayfish, frogs, and insects. PolyMet Corporation is proposing to destroy thousands of acres of pristine habitat to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St Louis River - a major waterway that flows over 180 miles to Lake Superior. PolyMet's proposal calls for 20 years of mining, and they acknowledge that 500 years of toxic runoff will need to be collected and treated. Just like the Hooded Merganser, our children and grandchildren all deserve clean water. Let clean water be our legacy - not toxic pollution from mining. I'm tired of permanently destroying and poisoning the environment in the name of JOBS.

Lee Beaty 48019

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The entire process is Far Too Risky. The most important resource on earth is WATER. We need clean water to survive. It is also the "crown jewel" of our state. Do not allow anything to jeopardize our most precious resource. We must protect the people, environment, wildlife, etc. We must think in terms of the long-run, not the short-sited monetary gains which will help only a small handful of MN residents for a short while. And then "poof" we'll be left with devastation on many fronts: our land, our pristine water, our tourism industry (long-term income), and our great Northern Sanctuary. Remember that old saying: "Penny Wise and Pound (\$\$) Foolish". Please Do Not Grant PolyMet Any Permits for anything until you have in your hands thoroughly-documented, absolute, and long-term evidence/facts that their processes are 100% safe. Please not sell out the well-being of Minnesota and all her inhabitants for a small pocketful of cash. It is critical that we protect our resources, not squander them. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Lee Beaty (concerned citizen of MN and resident since 1968) Lee Beaty 2801 42nd Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55406 612-721-7108

Lee George Aide 44083

Dear Minnesota DNR: I am requesting that the PolyMet Mining Project be stopped because of the great environmental cost. This area of Minnesota is internationally known and very ecologically fragile. The cost are too great to move forward on this project. I am requesting that PolyMet be terminated as it now stands. Thank you and best regards, Lee George Aide 5549 Dupont Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55419

Lee Gilbert 54481

See attachment

lee k anderson 4367

It would be a major mistake for this new mine proposal to be approved. We do not need 200 or more years of cleanup which might never work. Remember when they told us it would be safe to dump Iron Ore tailings into lake Superior. The 300 or 400 good paying jobs for 20 years is a terrible trade for long term pollution exposure we face. There are 1,000's of good paying jobs in North Dakota. The Range needs to realize that it's major resource is the adventure people have in visiting the Wilderness and not another Pit. This only benefits the owners of the mine and the world does not need any more copper and other metal that will be recovered. Look at the price of copper today and who needs another mine producing more. Please don't allow this to go further. LA

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lee Kaplan

48708

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a resident of Northeastern Minnesota, I am disturbed by the deception used in promoting the PolyMet Mining proposal. Despite their repeated insistence that mining has been done safely in Minnesota for years and that we have the strictest environmental regulation in the country, they are doing everything they can to bypass these regulations with a completely untested technology that is nothing like the mining practices that have been used in the state before. This technology threatens our water supply, along with the timber industry, the tourism industry, wildlife, and our basic way of life in this part of the state. While sulfide mining has never been tried in Minnesota, its history in other parts of the country is clear - acid mining byproducts and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining techniques have been used. I am, frankly, amazed than anyone who is not directly on the payroll of PolyMet would think this is a good idea. Please stop this absurd project before it is too late. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Lee Kaplan 2175 Pinewood Rd Duluth, MN 55803-8722

Lee Keeley

16179

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lee Schatschneider

616

I am confident that PolyMet will be long gone and Minnesota will be left holding the cleanup bag in this case. Our country has been around for ~225 years - less than half the time that PolyMet has admitted will be needed to mitigate water pollution. It truly is crazy that this is the best plan they have to offer. If PolyMet cannot offer a plan that could mitigate the pollution threat in a more reasonable timeframe that would lend confidence that a) pollution will actually be dealt with and B) the mining company will actually pay for it - then I am strongly against this plan. I would say that 50-75 years would be more reasonable - with commensurate costs to fully mitigate in that timeframe. As it currently stands, the future costs of mitigation seem WAY undervalued and are so far in the future - it truly is unfathomable to human beings. I am firmly against this proposal as it currently stands. Sincerely, Lee Schatschneider 420 7th Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55413

LeeKeeley

15804

Lee Keeley 16525 Birch Briar Trail Plymouth, MN 55447-3600 Thank you. HYPERLINK "[http://www.WanderingWWW.Wandering Watershed Woman LeeKeeley lekelee@aol-com](http://www.WanderingWWW.WanderingWatershedWomanLeeKeeleylekelee@aol-com) ---Original Message--- From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> To: Lee Keeley <lekelee@aol-com> Sent: Thu, Feb 20, 2014 1:30 pm Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Leh Leh Win

54235

Dear Ms. Fay, I'm a student at Humboldt High School in St. Paul Minnesota. I would like to inform about the problem with the environmental impact statement on PolyMet Mine. As a student at an environmental school I'm concerned about what PolyMet Mine will do to our environment. The map on the PolyMet Mine set is wrong. The map mislead the public so they don't know about how dangerous it can be and their children lives. They need to fix the map and give people the right information. For the safety of everyone and benefit everyone in the future. Thank for taking your time to read this letter. Sincerely, Leh Leh Win

Leif Bjornson

16075

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Leif Bjornson 5151 Alameda St Shoreview, MN 55126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leif Bjornson

49912

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Leif Bjornson 5151 Alameda St Shoreview, MN 55126

Leif Eugen

40356

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Leif Eugen ginstvägen 3 Ystad, ot 27171 SE

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leila Jindeel

52398

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Leila Jindeel Leila Jindeel 1626 London Road #741 Duluth, MN 55812

Leisha Ingdal

14886

To Whom It May Concern, The people of Minnesota deserve better than a short term employment gain at the cost of polluted water for 200 years. It is astounding to me that we are even considering allowing this mining to happen. As you are well aware, clean water is becoming the single most important issue worldwide. Look at what is going on in California and the chemical spill in Charleston, WV where residents are not confident in their water supply. And also remember that people are still suffering from the BP oil spill and the man that "wanted his life back" is now involved with Polymet. Do not take a short term gains approach. Our resources need to be managed well because our children and grandchildren deserve to live in a clean environment where they can breathe clean air and drink the water. You are responsible for keeping our environment clean for all. Leisha Ingdal New Brighton resident _____ Company registration details and disclaimer: [HYPERLINK "http://disclaimer.csmbaking-com/"http://disclaimer.csmbaking-com](http://disclaimer.csmbaking-com/)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Len & Mimi Jennings

21834

The proposed Poly Met mine should not go forward because the SDEIS, which is seriously flawed, has not shown that mining of precious metals in rocks with sulfide can be done safely in this environment, without serious water contamination and destruction to wetlands and habitat. Recent DNR documents agree that the water flow model of the current SDEIS is inaccurate. This calls into question many of the forecasted impacts to water quality, wetlands, and rare habitats. With more water moving through the site, polluted water from pits and waste rock will more easily and quickly reach lakes and rivers. It is thus likely that more area will be polluted, and that the pollution will be greater than anticipated. The SDEIS seriously underestimates the destruction of wetlands, and has an almost “fantastical” proposal for mitigation. The size of the potential wetland destruction (up to 6000 acres) is breathtaking. Much of the modeling was based on inaccurate water flows, so more wetlands would likely be destroyed. Secondly, bogs and coniferous swamps which will be affected, are extremely difficult to restore. Do we actually know it can be done. In addition, the land swap is not a swap of equal value. Habitat destruction is also not adequately addressed. In addition to the issue of more water flow than expected destroying more wetlands than expected, the number of trucks going back and forth, the 24/7 noise and vibrations of running the plant and the mine will disrupt habitat. The assumed performance of water capture systems in the SDEIS is of 90% or greater. This high level of performance is not realistic. Engineering controls include the seepage capture system at the flotation tailings basin, the cap and liner system and the hydrometallurgical tailings basin, and the discharge control feature for the west pit lake. Failure or under-performance of any of these features will result in water quality impacts that are not described in the SDEIS. How can we know we can treat polluted water for several hundreds of years, let alone into “perpetuity”. Think of how much change occurs in our lives in just 50 years, let alone 500- The assumption that human constructed water capture and treatment facilities will last 100 years is not believable. Do we seriously think Poly Met is going to be around 300, or 500 years from now. False Assumption: We’ve studied this for so long that we know enough and should just get going. Actually, the opposite is true. If Poly Met were able to mine without problems, their project would have been approved years ago. We should not take one of the most beautiful, natural areas of the world and will destroy it forever. Do we really want to pollute our rivers, underground water and Lake Superior. This is the opening to vast areas of mining. Should we aspire to be the next Pennsylvania or West Virginia. The beauty of this area is what makes our state unique. I see a lot of “magical thinking” (predicting) in this project. It’s not worth the risk. Len Jennings, 2222 Hillside Ave, St Paul, MN 55108

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Len Anderson

19512

LEN ANDERSON: My name is Len Anderson. I live at 130 Twin Lakes Drive, Cloquet, Minnesota. I would like to speak to the lack of cumulative impact in the EIS. Cumulative impact is mandated by NEPA, and I think the attempts at cumulative impact were not adequate to what NEPA policy demands. I'll give examples of that. Cumulative impact for sulfate and methylation of mercury I think is one of the biggest weaknesses of the document. The cumulative impact is calculated and discussed for the Partridge River and the Embarrass River and then stops at the mouth of each of those rivers, and it appears that the authors think that the movement of sulfate stops at the mouth of those rivers, but in fact, it continues all the way down the St. Louis River to the estuary, and the modeling for cumulative impact of sulfate on methylation of mercury needs to be done all the way down to the estuary. We have fish consumption advisories. This body of water is listed under 303(D) of the Clean Water Act as impaired from mercury, and our children are being born with dangerous levels of mercury in their cord blood. There is no TMDL yet for the St. Louis River, even though it has been a work in progress for 16 years. The MPCA said in February of 2013 that we do not know enough to do a mercury TMDL for this watershed, but now as I read the SDEIS, they claim that we know enough about mercury in this watershed to permit this mine which will be generating mercury and sulfate. Somebody is wrong. Is it that we don't know enough for the TMDL? Or if that's the case, how do we know enough to permit the mine? The mercury TMDL is scheduled for the Embarrass chain of lakes for 2015. If permitting cannot wait, if we have to permit it now, then the adaptive water management plan has to be changed so that it can accommodate recommendation from those TMDLs. Cumulative mercury impacts were addressed in the EIS but there was no accommodation made for the recommendations that would come out of the TMDLs, and that change has to be made in the adaptive water management plan. A permit must not grandfather in mercury and sulfate releases that then compromise those TMDLs. I'd like to also address the need for an extension of this comment period. I can give an example from the impact of sulfate on wild rice. We all know that at certain levels, sulfate damages wild rice. The State of Minnesota Legislature allocated funding for two years of study of sulfate impact on wild rice. Those two years are coming to an end now. The Wild Rice Research Team will be doing a review of study results and preliminary recommendation from the last two years of research in the spring of 2014. For example, the projected seasonal release of high sulfate water appears in the EIS to be just a wild guess about when it would, if ever, be appropriate. There is no research cited that if you release large amounts of sulfate water in the months of September and October, that you're home-free for impacting the sulfide in the sediments of those waters. Nathan Johnson has been researching the seasonality of sulfate impact on sediment chemistry but is not complete and he's not even referenced in the EIS. Sometime this spring, we should get those results, and our 90 days are going to be up. So I am asking for an extension of the comment period, and I'm just giving that one example of additional research that is coming -- really significant research that's coming online sometime shortly after the comment period is over. Thank you.

Len Jennings

21780

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Would you really consent to getting into "bed" (business) with GlencoreXstrata, the company whose CEO Ivan Glasenberg, worth \$6-6 billion, reaped a 2013 dividend of \$182 million after receiving \$173 million for 2012- Whose vilified ex-BP boss, Tony "I want my life back" Hayward, hired to oversee environment and safety, was given a British university award as a "distinguished leader" but whose award ceremony was stopped on multiple occasions by jeers and walk-outs. The above company is so corrupt, so wallowing in cash, that it could hire this man (He entered a yacht race while BP Horizon gushed.) without a question. This guy in Minnesota. He's not us. Doesn't get us. How will this company guarantee our lakes and waters for the next 500 years. Please look again. (Warning: Hold your nose.) Len Jennings 2222 Hillside St Paul, MN 55108 612 963 2733

40091

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Len Jennings 2222 Hillside Ave Saint Paul, MN 55108-1609

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Len Jennings 49272

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Would you really consent to getting into "bed" (business) with GlencoreXstrata, the company whose CEO Ivan Glasenberg, worth \$6-6 billion, reaped a 2013 dividend of \$182 million after receiving \$173 million for 2012- Whose vilified ex-BP boss, Tony "I want my life back" Hayward, hired to oversee environment and safety, was given a British university award as a "distinguished leader" but whose award ceremony was stopped on multiple occasions by jeers and walk-outs. The above company is so corrupt, so wallowing in cash, that it could hire this man (He entered a yacht race while BP Horizon gushed.) without a question. This guy in Minnesota. He's not us. Doesn't get us. How will this company guarantee our lakes and waters for the next 500 years. Please look again. (Warning: Hold your nose.) Len Jennings 2222 Hillside St Paul, MN 55108 612 963 2733

Lena K Gardner 58099

I believe that it is an error to base a decision that will have such big impacts on a flawed water study. I encourage the MNDNR to consider the impacts of long term pollution. And that cost isn't worth the short-term employment gains, especially at a time when the company PolyMet is showing signs of economic instability and historically when mining companies go bankrupt. The public foots the bill and leaves an even worse economic situation.

Lenore Reeves 41936

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lenore Reeves 19934 Hickory Stick Ln Mokena, IL 60448-1368

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leo Babeu

19307

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Although I write you as a member of Water Legacy, I also write as a concerned citizen of northeast Minnesota, as a trained environmental scientist who is familiar with the need to evaluate the veracity of data, hydrological and biogeochemical activity models and their assumptions and flaws, and most of all as a disappointed witness to the kind of political pressure being brought to bear on our regulatory structure and your fellow professionals entrusted with environmental review of this landmark project. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Leo Babeu 7100 Mikkonen Road Two Harbors, MN 55616 218 834 2247

42517

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leo Babeu

43116

Dear Lead Agency contacts: My name is Patricia Schmieder, of 7100 Mikkonen Rd Two Harbors MN 55616- I want to list the areas of my greatest concerns about the issues inadequately addressed or left out of the Polymet NorthMet Mine SDEIS 1- I want to see considerably more analysis of the details of the greenhouse gas emissions impact of all the activities, from electrical to mechanical to long-term treatment systems of the 200 plus year horizon of all activities related to the project. 2- I would like to see better details and more complete impact analysis on the health risks from the following: fugitive air emissions of dust and asbestos-like fibers, the exposure profiles for workers and residents of the area evaluation of the cancer risk from the exposures to fibers, dust, nickel, and other contaminants expected to arise from the mine activity. the risk to drinking water from priority pollutants like arsenic and other minerals (eg manganese), both in local surface waters such as Colby Lake, and in ground water susceptible to mine and waste rock pad and tailings pond leaks and seepage the risk of both new sources of mercury and the prospects for increased mobilization of mercury already in the receiving waters, eg the Embarrass River, the Partridge River, the St Louis River, and the Lake Superior Basin. That mobilization can be expected to involve both increased methylation of historical loads of mercury and new mercury inputs, as well as bioaccumulation by migrating and resident fish species. 3- I would like to have the authors justify the use of active treatment processes for resolving potential contamination over the 200-500 year horizon. This is in direct conflict with stated statutory provisions for permitting a mine project. 4- I object to the replacement of intact functioning wetlands with less diverse and healthy wetlands within the watershed and find the replacement of over 2/3 of the acreage of wetlands outside the Lake Superior basin to be of very low functional ecological benefit. Additionally, the 5,000 plus acres that will be indirectly impacted by redirection of ground water and other impacts are not subject to replacement or a mitigation plan in the SDEIS. 5- The land exchange with USFS provides fragmented tracts, does not maintain the value of public assets, gives us public land with severed mineral rights and thus poor protections, and comes nowhere near replacing the ecological functions lost in the St Louis River Watershed. 6- I use predictive models in my own work. I understand that all models are wrong, but some are useful. I find the use of a water quality model that can't predict current WQ parameters to be highly problematic. Please beef up and redo the application of the GoldSim if necessary. 7- Most of the optimistic projections for the protection of water quality in the receiving waters around this project rely heavily on estimates of average and seasonal flows over, through, and under the site. Accurate groundwater flow rates are crucial to realistically predict pollution and seepage from PolyMet's mine pits and waste rock piles to the Partridge River. As I understand it, the XPSWMM model underestimates by at least three-fold the volume and rate of flow across the relevant site terrain. I recognize that these models can be improved, but the data for improving them and the ensuing adjustments of base flow and the assumptions they change about water quality impacts must be thoroughly, systematically evaluated to determine what the real impacts on metal solutes contamination and elevation of sulfate in the downstream reaches may be for the centuries beyond active mine operation. 8- Please amend the SDEIS to adequately enumerate fully the direct and indirect potential losses to hunting, fishing, and gathering rights, as well as access to culturally sensitive areas, for the tribal members who ha

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leo Babeu

43383

Hello Lead Agencies, MDNR, USACE, and USFS: My name is Leo Babeu, and I reside at 7100 Mikkonen Rd, Two Harbors MN 55616- I have worked in both federal and state environmental protection entities (primarily in research, not regulation), so I am well aware of the burden placed upon the employees of such agencies. I also have a high regard for the vast majority of individuals working for these institutions, often under significant implied pressure to move projects along to some deliverable outcome. My sharp criticisms of the Polymet environmental review process is focused on what I perceive as the dangerous outcome and precedent for future negative outcomes that I believe the process embodied in the SDEIS produces for Minnesota's ecosystems and residents. I do not mean to say that any lead agency's employees willfully produced an overly optimistic or inadequate document, rather that a host of factors led to a collective process and product that portrays an unprecedented project and proponent, whose outcome is fraught with risk and uncertainty, as technically and ecologically tenable for the proposed project area. This comment period should have been expanded for at least another 60 days. The DNR Commissioner has repeatedly emphasized the need for comments to be technically relevant if they are to be useful. That means plowing through 2,169 pages of material which is not in a format the average lay person can readily absorb. Given that at least 30% of Minnesotans have very poor internet service, ie no broadband, the process of reviewing and responding to the SDEIS is a greater burden for many outside the Metro areas. These extra days of review would really make but a small difference in the total project development time, and would assure every relevant perspective is heard. Pressure to bring this project to fruition should not be allowed to disadvantage the average citizen, who is not to blame for the checkered past of the 2009 DEIS or subsequent work required to address the original inadequacies of the review process. I am very disappointed in the co-lead agencies' resistance to extending the comment period, and the holding of the three public hearing so soon after the release of the SDEIS. I also wish to request that you consider each area of concern that I and others raise in the context of what's best for the public, as opposed to how the status of the lead agencies may be affected by the critique. The 33 pages of Appendix A raise concerns that you already have a rubric for sorting a host of relevant public comment concerns into schematic boxes that you believe have been adequately responded to in the 155 or so thematic responses that you have prepared. How will you weigh the validity of those most frequently and intensely expressed concerns as you move forward. Reliance on reference in the thematic responses to the section and page where an issue is addressed becomes, at some threshold of expressed public concern, an insufficient response to a broadly perceived weakness in the evaluation of the project. What are the metrics and feedback built into the next stage of environmental review that could give weight to public perception of future mine related externalized financial and environmental costs, such that additional supporting materials should be made public, or further studies and revision and ground-truthing of models required. Having made my biased critique of the comment process and the institutional resistance to careful weighing of those comments, I offer my own issue specific concerns over the SDEIS. However, it requires me to step back and consider the totality of the problems entailed in reviewing a proposal to site, operate, close, and eventually reclaim a copper-nickel mining operation near the Laurentian Divide in a water-rich environment. The issue that this SDEIS cannot and does not address is the existential case of whether, all knowable physical and socio-economic facts and historical trend

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leo Bulger

11705

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

leo gross

6606

To whom it may concern, I am Leo Gross Jr. I've been paying attention to what has been going on with polymet for a few years now. Polymet can do the process safe I don't see any reason it should not go forwaRd I believe the SDEIS is complete and gives regulators what they need to give polymet the permits to move forwaRd I have family and friends that live on the range and they could use the good paying jobs in that area and we all know the state can use the extra revenue. I've seen what a lack of good paying jobs can do to a town after we lost 3 OSB mills here in northern MN. Leo Gross Jr 27087 Obrien CK RD NE Hines, MN 56647 Sent from Windows Mail

Leo Trunt

42856

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leonard Anderson

43200

My name is Leonard Anderson and as I mentioned in my previous comments, I have a M.S. in Biology from St Mary's University in Winona Minnesota, with an emphasis in aquatic and terrestrial ecology. My professional career was teaching at the high school and college level. I have studied the ecological dynamics of the St Louis River watershed for forty years. I apologize for sending these additional comments in at the very last minute, but there has been two big developments in the last two days that have a strong bearing on the PolyMet proposal. First, was the EPA announcement that they have dropped their approval of the Mesabi Nugget variance for how much sulfate they can dump into Second Creek which is a tributary of the Partridge River. One aspect of that variance that is now disallowed, was to allow them to store high sulfate waters during the summer growing season and then dump high sulfate loadings in the fall. The PolyMet proposal submits on page 5-216 of the SDEIS that they will use the same seasonality approach for their release of sulfate to waters used for the production of wild rice. They have no data to show a complete year long surface water sulfate-porewater sulfide mass balance to support such a high sulfate release after the growing season. They must be forced to meet the wild rice sulfate standard of 10 mg/L at a minimum, at all times. The second big development in the last two days was the release yesterday, 3-12-14, by the MPCA of the Preliminary Analysis of the Wild Rice Sulfate Standard Study. Table #1 of that report shows that for wild rice the protective concentration for sulfide lies in a range between 150 and 300 micrograms/L derived from the hydroponic exposure experiments". Figure 3 shows that as sediment porewater sulfide concentrations increase, there is a decrease in wild rice coverage in the field. They conclude that the "field data as represented in Figure 3 are broadly compatible with the likely protective sulfide concentration range of 150 to 300 microgram/L. It shows that wild rice coverage decreases as sulfate concentrations increase. Then on page 16, they tie sulfate to sulfide production. They say, "Higher quantile percentages predict that sulfide concentrations of 150 to 300 micrograms/L relate to sulfate concentrations below 10 mg/L. This is supported by Figure 10 which shows a decline in wild rice coverage with even small increases in surface water sulfate concentrations. In conclusion, from the lab to muck, this research has shown that surface water sulfate by way of porewater, sulfide damages wild rice. If you are going to deviate from that conclusion, you have to integrate a complete suite of factors, including stream velocity and wave action, upwelling of ground water, abundance of dissolved iron, oxygen penetration of sediments, presence of available carbon and temperature. The PolyMet proposal has not done that for either the Partridge or Embarrass River rice beds and therefore should be held to releases of 10 mg/L or as this new research indicates, less than 10 mg/L of sulfate. Now that we are relating sulfate to sulfide, we need to look at the impacts to freshwater fauna as well. We need to consider animals living immediately on or in the sediments that would be contacted by sulfides produced in the porewater. Macro invertebrates such as Ephemeroptera and Odonata larva are present in PolyMet receiving water sediments. Also fish lay their eggs on those sediments. Remember that sulfate levels below 10 mg/L produced sulfide concentrations between 150 and 300 micrograms/L. The EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for sulfide is only 2 microgram/L. This is backed up by research. Colby and Smiiti-i (1967) found that concentrations as high as .1 to .02 mg/L were common within the first 2 mm of water above the sediment. Walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum*) eggs held in trays in this zone did not hatch. Adelman and Smith (1970) reported that th

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leonard Anderson

47782

My name is Leonard Anderson and as I mentioned in my previous comments, I have a M.S. in Biology from St Mary's University in Winona Minnesota, with an emphasis in aquatic and terrestrial ecology. My professional career was teaching at the high school and college level. I have studied the ecological dynamics of the St Louis River watershed for forty years. I apologize for sending these additional comments in at the very last minute, but there has been two big developments in the last two days that have a strong bearing on the PolyMet proposal. First, was the EPA announcement that they have dropped their approval of the Mesabi Nugget variance for how much sulfate they can dump into Second Creek which is a tributary of the Partridge River. One aspect of that variance that is now disallowed, was to allow them to store high sulfate waters during the summer growing season and then dump high sulfate loadings in the fall. The PolyMet proposal submits on page 5-216 of the SDEIS that they will use the same seasonality approach for their release of sulfate to waters used for the production of wild rice. They have no data to show a complete year long surface water sulfate-porewater sulfide mass balance to support such a high sulfate release after the growing season. They must be forced to meet the wild rice sulfate standard of 10 mg/L at a minimum, at all times. The second big development in the last two days was the release yesterday, 3-12-14, by the MPCA of the Preliminary Analysis of the Wild Rice Sulfate Standard Study. Table #1 of that report shows that for wild rice the protective concentration for sulfide lies in a range between 150 and 300 micrograms/L derived from the hydroponic exposure experiments". Figure 3 shows that as sediment porewater sulfide concentrations increase, there is a decrease in wild rice coverage in the field. They conclude that the "field data as represented in Figure 3 are broadly compatible with the likely protective sulfide concentration range of 150 to 300 microgram/L. It shows that wild rice coverage decreases as sulfate concentrations increase. Then on page 16, they tie sulfate to sulfide production. They say, "Higher quantile percentages predict that sulfide concentrations of 150 to 300 micrograms/L relate to sulfate concentrations below 10 mg/L. This is supported by Figure 10 which shows a decline in wild rice coverage with even small increases in surface water sulfate concentrations. In conclusion, from the lab to muck, this research has shown that surface water sulfate by way of porewater, sulfide damages wild rice. If you are going to deviate from that conclusion, you have to integrate a complete suite of factors, including stream velocity and wave action, upwelling of ground water, abundance of dissolved iron, oxygen penetration of sediments, presence of available carbon and temperature. The PolyMet proposal has not done that for either the Partridge or Embarrass River rice beds and therefore should be held to releases of 10 mg/L or as this new research indicates, less than 10 mg/L of sulfate. Now that we are relating sulfate to sulfide, we need to look at the impacts to freshwater fauna as well. We need to consider animals living immediately on or in the sediments that would be contacted by sulfides produced in the porewater. Macro invertebrates such as Ephemeroptera and Odonata larva are present in PolyMet receiving water sediments. Also fish lay their eggs on those sediments. Remember that sulfate levels below 10 mg/L produced sulfide concentrations between 150 and 300 micrograms/L. The EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria for sulfide is only 2 microgram/L. This is backed up by research. Colby and Smiti-i (1967) found that concentrations as high as .1 to .02 mg/L were common within the first 2 mm of water above the sediment. Walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum*) eggs held in trays in this zone did not hatch. Adelman and Smith (1970) reported that th

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leonard Madsen

9818

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Leonard Madsen Leonard Madsen 233 Page St E Saint Paul, MN 55107

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leonard Major

45027

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please specifically address the issues of 1) the long-term need for protection from the toxic material in the crushed and pulverized mining wastes produced by the proposed PolyMet mine and 2) the degree of effectiveness of their proposed system for keeping the entirety of the wastes produced over the lifetime of the mine separated from and completely sealed off from the natural environment over the time-period the wastes will remain toxic. Please consider the very serious likelihood that the approval of the PolyMet mine will require between 200 to 500+ years, or between 10 to 25+ generations, of scrupulous, 100% effective large-scale environmental protection to keep huge areas of northern Minnesota ground water free from highly toxic pollutants. If there were even a moderate or mild possibility that this mine could exact such a burden upon your great grandchildren's great grandchildren's great great grandchildren, conservatively estimated, with the risk of failure being devastating destruction to our precious natural resources and life supporting eco-systems, how can you possibly not exercise the utmost due diligence in determining the long-term consequences of approving the PolyMet mine proposal. Putting the viability and environmental safety of a great portion of northern Minnesota at risk for a period of 200 to 500 years or longer is a moral and ethical responsibility that tens of thousands of Minnesotans like myself believe absolutely overrides the economic benefits of 20 years or so of operating the PolyMet mine. I look forward to your response to my concerns in a revised PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. Sincerely, Mr Leonard Major 8435 Red Oak Dr Mounds View, MN 55112-6148 (763) 717-9168

Les Herman

44368

Mining all across northern Minnesota should be allowed. The people need the jobs, and the State needs the Tax revenue. I know that between the State and the companies they will do a fantastic job to protect the environment, and as the mining is going on and after, access to hunting and fishing areas will be improved. Thank-you for the chance to state my opinion,

Les Herman

HYPERLINK "mailto:lesherman10@yahoo-com"lesherman10@yahoo-com

Lesley Stansfield

39627

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lesley Stansfield 681 27th St San Francisco, CA 94131-1811 (415) 641-8824

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leslie Amundson 3607

My concern is that ALL previous mines like this proposed one have had failures, with toxic chemicals leaking into the water supply - 100% failure rate. Leslie Amundson
1124 Rose Place Roseville MN 55113

Leslie Baken 24432

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I am writing to comment on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. 1- Sulfide mining is untested in Minnesota, a region rich with wetlands. This project unjustifiably threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. 2- Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I oppose the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine. This is definitely not in the public interest nor it is an environmentally sound venture. Our wetlands, including Lake Superior and The Boundary Waters are national resources which must have their protection above all other interests. This area is both a critical source of fresh, clean water to its residents and the local environment, and contains unique and pristine national parks. Sincerely, Leslie Baken 4316 Glencrest Rd Golden Valley, MN 55416-3319 (763) 374-2381

Leslie Davis 44929

Earth Protector, Inc. P.O. Box 11688 622 Lowry Avenue North Minneapolis, MN 55411 612/529-5253 March 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Comment on PolyMet Draft Environmental Impact Statement Dear Ms Fay, When I came to Minnesota with my family in August 1962, and saw the vast fields of corn and soybeans, the enormous water resources of Lake Superior and the Mississippi River, and our under-ground water supplies, it was breathtaking. One day I took my family to the Mississippi River shoreline in the Twin Cities where we saw signs that read, don't swim in the river, don't eat the fish, and don't drink the water. The Mississippi River. How could that be. This wasn't Bayonne, New Jersey and the Hudson River. It was the Mighty Mississippi in pristine Minnesota. An open sewer in the heartland that rivaled any sewer in the eaSt Who did it. Why was it allowed. Why is it still allowed. What I learned over time was that our impressive resources were polluted with chemicals ranging from arsenic and atrazine to lead and mercury, and hundreds more. How could that be. Who was protecting these resources. How could companies like 3M and Koch Refining each be allowed to take 3 billion gallons of publicly owned under-ground water for practically nothing, turn it into toxic slop after using it in their manufacture processes, and then dump it into the Mississippi River where it makes its way to Lake Pepin in Wisconsin and on to likely add to the dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico. I found that all much more breathtaking than my first impression of Minnesota's resources. Over time I learned how this happened, and how it continues to happen. It's because the people want it. The people want it and Koch Refining and 3M are delighted to provide it. They also provide thousands of jobs, lots of taxes, stock for shareholders and pension plans to fatten up on, and an army of governmental lobbyists and lawyers to make certain that no one stands in their way of providing their products without interruption. Because the people want it. The people want the gasoline from Koch Refining, the tape from 3M, the electricity from the nukes, the chicken legs from the anti-biotic stuffed chickens raised in confinement barns, and the pieces of hogs whose only chance in life to see the sun is if it's out on their trip to the slaughter house and the horror awaiting them. The people want it and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Pollution Control Agency (PCA), Army Corps of Engineers, and a multitude of other agencies, screeners, and authorities, at every level of government, make sure they get it. That's their job. Make sure that industry can provide what the people want. For example, the people of Minneapolis want to dump their garbage, with minimal effort, into a big bucket, and have the garbage fairy take it away to a huge burner in the heart of the city, where it's burned for them, and the most toxic air emissions mankind ever produced are spewed from huge smokestacks, directly into the air intake ventilation systems of nearby buildings and neighborhoods, and onto the pitchers mound of their neighbor, the Minnesota Twins ballpark. The people want it that way and the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Metropolitan Council, Pollution Control Agency, state legislature, all made sure they got it and that they're protected. Now PolyMet says the people want copper, as if there's not enough copper available from around the world. Copper for wind turbines, lap tops, electric cars, and other gadgets. Now the multitude of companies waiting in the wings for PolyMet to clear the way for them so they can also please the people with gobs of copper, enlisted their union allies and their connections, the school leaders destined to get a piece of the action, and all their political friends, union buddies, and r

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leslie Distad

11721

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Leslie Stewart

41881

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Leslie Stewart Saint Paul, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lester Haveri

37831

I have the misfortune to have a polymet employee,neighbor from hell -thief,liar anything to get more land,along with another land trickster accompless polymet worker. I don't know if polymet looks for people of this callibr,the trickster likes to attact old land deads (back then the lag. and lat. numbers had to be figred out with pencle and paper) -with the gps all of the real old deads are off -but the land was bought,and aggred apon by the seller and the buyer - my neighbor from hell destroyed the old property fence which was older then he was and then lied about it's even being there - all the good neighbors know better. The point is can we trust polymet land trust with people like that or is that the norm for this kind of company.

40165

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described.I believe polymet,LTV are just company raiders that have a bad track recoRd I worked for Erie Mining and then LTV for 33 1/2 years. First off the concentrator was leaking acid years ago,and all floor wash goes out to the tailings pond,which was course to-fine ground waste rock,the water flowed through the dike,and into the Embarrass. Polymet is way to slopply to trust the prime wildlife habitat , the moose ,deer herds ,large fish in the old abanboned ore pits,and the birds from the eagles ,partridge, ducks, geese and many kinds of small birds. I have seen wolves,fox,and bear on the property . With the more dangerous chemicals ,needed for polymet to extract the metals thay want , would poison the water supply of the whole state. I have the misfortune to have a polymet self proclaimed big shot neighbor or better known as the neighbor from hell ,and if he is a preview of coming events ,polymet shoud not be permitted to operate in this state. People what don't respect property lines, destroy boundry fences = are criminals,thieves = this is to important ,to trust tricktters ,thay want more freedees, and thay don't plan to pay any cleanup for the mess thay will cause to the habitat, all the wild habitat will die,the ground water will be poisoned for five houndred years may be forever. Sincerely, Mr Lester Haveri 5179 Road 51 Aurora, MN 55705-8434 (218) 229-2784

Letitia Noel

41608

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Letitia Noel 55 W Goethe St Chicago, IL 60610-7406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Levi Hurley

6308

My mailing address is 13 Oxford Place, St Albert, AB T8N 6K5 Thank you for hearing my comments. Levi From: Levi Hurley [mailto:marcuus@shaw.ca] Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 9:33 PM To: 'NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us' Subject: I Support Polymet To Whom It May Concern; I believe Polymet have met every requirement to make this a viable and safe project. It has been at least 6 years of work, with all requirements being addressed and resolved. I would not support the permitting approvals if I thought this had been a rushed and potentially flawed process. On the contrary, it has been a long and well managed one. I can't fathom why the project would not be permitted and move forward in the near future. The local area can certainly use the employment opportunities in these trying times. Levi Hurley St Albert, Alberta, Canada

6310

To Whom It May Concern; I believe Polymet have met every requirement to make this a viable and safe project. It has been at least 6 years of work, with all requirements being addressed and resolved. I would not support the permitting approvals if I thought this had been a rushed and potentially flawed process. On the contrary, it has been a long and well managed one. I can't fathom why the project would not be permitted and move forward in the near future. The local area can certainly use the employment opportunities in these trying times. Levi Hurley St Albert, Alberta, Canada

Lewis Hotchkiss

41655

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Leya Klingsporn

39266

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Leya Klingsporn 1830 County Road D W Saint Paul, MN 55112-3515 (651) 955-3914

Liese Reisinger

39803

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Liese Reisinger 2215 Blaisdell Ave Minneapolis, MN 55404-3359

Lila&Virg Boehland

14595

SDEIS Input, Has PolyMet done this type, sulfide mining, of extraction before. Does PolyMet have a track record How long have the primary 20 executives for PolyMet been working together. What other mines has PolyMet worked with. What other mining operations have the people in charge of PolyMet worked for. How have those other mining operations done. Is there a track record for the type of mining that PolyMet is proposing. Where has PolyMet operated, successfully, in the past Who are PolyMet's environmental protection employees. Where have PolyMet's environmental protection employees been employed most recently. What other mining companies have PolyMet's environmental protection employees worked at over the past 20 years. Thank you, Virgil Boehland 9 Amber Lane Esko, MN 55733 218-260-0784

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lilli Sprintz

16245

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Lilly Bubser

57946

We love nature! Don't ruin it! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Aletemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lilly Otto

52545

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404 " Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation " wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please: • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance. • Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS. • Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect " wetlands losses. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin. • Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands. Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Lily

54194

I think the mine is a bad idea. It does not guarantee any longterm jobs and will destroy the already striving economy and culture up there. There is evidence that it's not going to work so don't do it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lily 54347

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager I think that if the Polymet Mining plan were followed exactly then everything would wonderful, but it seems like that is unlikely. Although the jobs the project promises would be good for Minnesota, likely quite a few would temporary jobs, and it seems like there wouldn't be very many permanent jobs. So the jobs wouldn't really be very beneficial to the state if they are just temporary. The environmental effects of this mine seem as if they would be devastating and permanent, impacting the state for hundreds of years. It seems extremely unlikely that it would be possible for Polymet to continue the water rehabilitation for the two-hundred plus years that would be needed. As someone who lives in Minnesota, I was sad to see that the plan for this mining includes the complete destruction of nine hundred and thirteen acres of wetlands. Especially since wetlands hold so many of our native plant and animal species. I was also sad to see that the plan included the possible destruction of several already endangered species and eleven different plants, since wildlife means so much in Minnesota. Yet another thing that I was appalled to see, was that the mining might prevent the control of Invasive species, while so many native ones would be destroyed. Another major concern of mine was that there seemed to be a pretty large amount of the Superior National Forest that would be destroyed once the mining was done. I read a public opinion piece that stated that the value of these minerals will only increase over time, since I believe this is true I think that the mining should be halted until Polymet can come up with a plan that significantly decreases the harmful lasting effects. As a young adult who cares about the future, I was appalled and alarmed that the plan included some possibly harmful and lasting air pollution that would be incredibly hard to undo in the future. Especially after the PolyMet had moved on to another project. I have the same concern about the pollution that would be deposited in the rivers in Minnesota, because water is a necessity of today and tomorrow. And once water is polluted it becomes harder and harder to undo, just like air pollution. Please don't go forward with this mine. I don't think the harmful outcomes make it worth it. Sincerely, Lily

Lily Nelson-Pedersen 39805

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Lily Nelson-Pedersen 1366 School House Rd Grand Marais, MN 55604-2278 (218) 370-8283

Lin Hipp 39350

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Lin Hipp 33129 Nueman Trl Lindstrom, MN 55045-9121 (651) 308-8787

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lin Hipp 39351

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Lin Hipp 33129 Nueman Trl Lindstrom, MN 55045-9121 (651) 308-8787

Lincoln Brown 18289

Lincoln Brown. I am six. I just turned six in January. I just think that they shouldn't be mining that.

Linda & Michael Sweno 42686

See attachment

Linda A Forsland 20058

I will make this short. Copper nickel mining is not worth the price we will have to pay. 20 years of jobs is not worth potentially ruining our water for 200-500 years. We don't even know if Polymet will be around to clean up any mess. It is just not worth it. Linda and Jim Forsland 8124 W 102nd Street Bloomington, MN 55438 Linda Forsland Executive Offices Fairview Southdale Hospital 952-924-5772 952-924-5382 (fax) Think before printing this e-mail, is it necessary. Think Green. Fairview Southdale Hospital is a 2009 recipient of the Minnesota Hospital Association's Patient Safety Excellence Award, for best practices in patient safety The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, including 'protected health information'. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy and delete this message from any computer and contact us immediately by return e-mail.

Linda and Ed Hendrickson 57260

We urge you to reject the Polymet mining proposal for these reasons:1.If this project goes ahead, then in subsequent years even lower grade [ILLEGIBLE] of ore will be targeted with even more dire consequences.2.The state doesn't even make taconite plants meet all their environmental standards which is bad enough already.3.Once the environment is destroyed for a few short term jobs, you can't get it back.Linda & Ed Hendrickson7405 Hwy 8Saginaw, MN 55779

Linda Blaine 3638

Dear DNR, Your job is to protect MN's natural resources. In this state, clean water and air are your main jobs. The mining proposed in Northeast MN will almost certainly pollute our water- likely for 500 years. This must not happen. I believe that anyone who is rushing to facillitate the mining is in a rush to line their pockets with MN gold. The minerals aren't going anywhere, let us wait to extract them when it can be done with No harm to our clean environment. Job Number 1 for the DNR: protect our natural resources. Sincerely, Linda Blaine 2658 E Hwy 61 Grand Marais, MN 55604 Lake Craft [HYPERLINK "mailto:lakecraft@boreal-org"](mailto:lakecraft@boreal-org)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Centorrinio

40481

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Linda Centorrinio 10002 TERRY ST FAIRFAX, VA 22031 US

Linda Cooke

29961

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is a dangerous chance to take with our precious water resources. It threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I am deeply concerned about this project's very likely harmful impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: damage to human health, risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, and cumulative damage to the environment from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Linda Cooke 8570 Greenway Blvd Apt 306 Middleton, WI 53562-4738

Linda Dehrer-Wendt

43833

My address is 1111 105th Street West Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077 [HYPERLINK "mailto:ldehrerwendt@gmail-com"ldehrerwendt@gmail-com](mailto:ldehrerwendt@gmail-com) Linda <https://mail.google-com/mail/u/1/e/gtalk.35C> Have a Great Day. Be practical as well as generous in your ideals. Keep your eyes on the stars, but remember to keep your feet on the ground. - Theodore Roosevelt On Thu, Mar 13, 2014 at 1:07 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

43855

We understand the need for jobs, but the potential downsides of an environmental disaster are just too great. We were assured by BP that everything was safe. We were assured by Exxon that everything was safe. Both those were disasters that are still with us today. The risks are just too great.. We are losing natural habitats daily. We have to put a stop to it.. Take pride in Minnesota and what we have and are. Protect Minnesota Linda <https://mail.google-com/mail/u/1/e/gtalk.35C> Have a Great Day. Be practical as well as generous in your ideals. Keep your eyes on the stars, but remember to keep your feet on the ground. - Theodore Roosevelt

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Dietz Fredlund 54787

See attachment

Linda Esala 16168

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Linda Forcier 7055

I strongly oppose the proposed mining of copper etc in northern Minnesota. The paper has reported it will bring 300 jobs for 20 years to the area. This is very shortsighted compared to the hundreds of years of possible pollution. After 20 years the area will not only be possibly devastated by pollution but also be more destitute of jobs than now. Especially if the mining decreases tourism. The risks to trees, wild rice, animals, birds, and even people cannot be ignored. With the global threats related to earth warming, this is not the right time to add to the problems. We should be learning from the W. Virginia spill that companies will NOT be around to clean up. Thank you. Linda and John Forcier, 5411 O'Brien N, Stillwater MN 55082, 651-439-6366

Linda G Powless 57234

Please do not allow PolyMet in No Minn. Our land & waters must be preserved. I was raised in the copper country of NE Mich and know how the land/water is ravaged – and the money sent elsewhere. Linda G. Powless 4912 Wyoming St Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Garrison

41903

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Linda Garrison Winona, Minnesota

Linda Glaser

21514

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I'm very concerned and horrified that we are considering the PolyMet sulfide mine proposal. Is it right to put our water resources at risk, when clean water is a when the risks will impact generations long after we are long gone. No amount of clean up money can restore the loss and contamination of ground and surface waters, along with the loss of forests, wetlands, and wildlife. Land dominated by leaching mine waste rock piles, tailings basins, and open pits is no longer usable. PolyMet's SDEIS needs to be shelved. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't even analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't even examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. We can't accept a proposal that allows pollution to seep from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Linda Glaser Linda Glaser 4215 Luverne Street Duluth, MN 55804 218 525-4986

42747

See attachment

42748

See attachment

42749

See attachment

42798

See attachment

54549

I am very concerned that the SDEIS states that 200-500 years of clean up will be required. Yet the MN Rule 6132.3200 does not allow perpetual treatment. It requires that once a mine is closed, it must be maintenance free. This proposal is irresponsible and frightening. Please address this issue before giving permission to mine.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Gridley 42010

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Linda Gridley 607 Clifford St Saint Paul, MN 55104-4907 (651) 341-0908

Linda Hamilton 54914

See attachment

Linda Hansen 40989

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linda Hansen Linda Hansen 2021 Carnelian Ln Eagan, MN 55122

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Hansen 49090

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linda Hansen Linda Hansen 2021 Carnelian Ln Eagan, MN 55122

Linda Henderson 38719

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. Think of the future generations. We only have one world. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Linda Henderson 4510 N Greenview Ave Chicago, IL 60640-5476 (773) 784-2613

Linda Hendrickson 54139

We do not support sulfide mining in NE Minnesota. If this project goes ahead, it will pave the way to mine even lower grade ore bodies causing even more damage. DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROJECT! Reduced population = reduced demand. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Linda Herron 40593

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Herron 43058

March 2, 2014
Tim Dabney
U.S. Forest Service
Superior National Forest
8901 Grand Ave. Place
Duluth, MN 55808
Dear Mr. Dabney,
As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, I believe in supporting what is best for the people of Minnesota. We are known for our strong environmental laws which were legislated to protect our beautiful natural resources. Unfortunately, these laws have not been uniformly enforced. In this regard, I have some comments on the proposed PolyMet NorthMet Mine Proposal as described in the SDEIS. I am concerned about the loss of high-quality wetlands in exchange for moderate and low-quality wetlands in the land exchange. Wetlands keep our waters clean, prevent soil erosion, sequester carbon dioxide and provide vital habitat for waterfowl and other wildlife. These some 6,000 + acres will be adversely affected both directly and indirectly by the NorthMet Mine. How are carbon releases from impacted wetlands measured? How can we allow for such a large loss of wildlife habitat and the negative impact on wildlife travel corridors? Where is the data on the effects on migratory bird species? Additionally, I have difficulty understanding how MN Rule 6132.3200 can allow for a perpetual water treatment following a mine closing. It seems to be a matter of semantics whether it is called "long term" or perpetual: 500 years says perpetuity to me. Thirdly, what are the contingency plans for accidents which occur at most mines of this type? Such accidents include pipeline spills, failure of water treatment systems, accidental releases of contaminated water and tailings basin failures. What about the known fractures and faults in the area of the tailings basin? Contingency plans need to be detailed in the SDEIS so that the citizens of Minnesota have all pertinent information before permitting begins. In conclusion, when the risks to the environment over hundreds if not thousands of years are weighed against the relatively short term and unimpressive economic gains, it is clear that the public will not benefit. I urge you as one of the agencies responsible for the protection of our precious resources, to refuse the land exchange and thereby deny the permitting process to the PolyMet NorthMet Mine. Thank you for your consideration of my request,
Linda Herron
2617 E. Fifth St.
Duluth, MN 55812

49592

Dear Mr Dabney, As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, I have been examining the SDEIS pertinent to the PolyMet NorthMet proposed mine and the US Army Corps of Engineers Clean Water Act Section 404 wetlands dredge and fill permit. I find that due to the following, I am unable to complete my examination by the March 13, 2014 deadline: 1- the SDEIS is extraordinarily long 2- it is complicated and difficult for a non-scientific person to understand; it appears to be written for the scientific community rather than the general public 3- information on geological conditions such as earth fractures under tailings pits is missing 4- water flow data on the Partidge River has been questioned by the tribal community and therefore this data needs to be re-examined by the USACE 5- data on carbon losses due to destruction of wetlands is missing In light of these reasons, I ask that a 90- day extension be made for comments on the SDEIS and the Section 404 wetlands permit. Thank you for considering my request as quickly as possible. Sincerely, Linda Herron 2617 E. Fifth St Duluth, MN 55812

54677

See attachment

Linda Huhn 42499

Please see the attached document.

42860

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Huhn

43056

Ms. Lisa Fay DNR Mining Project Manager
Mr. Ken Westlake TJSRP
Mr. Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineer
SMr. Tim Dabney TJS Forest Service
Dear Madame and Gentlemen,
As a life-long Minnesota (65) years I want to express my great concern about the well documented dangers of sulfide mining, and ask you to reject the Poly Met NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. Research and experience show the proposed mining operation would probably poison our groundwater forever. I'm a regular consumer of hand harvested Minnesota wild rice, which I understand cannot grow in water with elevated sulfate levels. I'm not too excited about elevated mercury levels in children either. This type of pollution would also have a negative effect on tourism and fishing, making it additionally an economic issue. I hear that recent news of internal DNR documents show serious flaws in the research on this project, leading me to question whether any research was based on sound science. Please do the right thing for our beautiful Minnesota environment, for our economy, for our food sources and for future generations. Please reject the Poly Met NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you for your attention to this issue. Sincerely, Linda M. Huhn

Linda Johnson

15390

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources
To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According to the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The eroding conditions of the planet demand that we are prudent in our activities from now on. With an increasing world population, we need more not less from our natural resources. The top of the list is water to sustain life and likewise, air. There seems to be a growing 'need' to have mined products like copper, uranium, etc to create and power all of our 'first world' wants (not truly needs). Of course I understand that the materials are vital for our world today, but I'm sure there are remedies to be found that are better for the environment, even if it's costlier. This shouldn't be an all or nothing situation. Before any mining is allowed in a protected area, it should be mandatory to use known methods that are better, not cheaper. Owners and others who profit should pay in advance for truly independent inspections with 'conflict of interest' clauses enforced. There have been many cases of the mine owner(s) reaping the profits and not helping the workers when there are accidents. This should be fixed, now. Safety trumps profit. Regulators should also be required to fully disclose the dangers and provide (at the owners expense) for monitoring and care for anyone impacted by the mining activities such as cancer clusters for instance. If this mining activity is allowed, we will be poisoning our environment further, including the non replaceable fresh water which is a known casualty already. 500 years cleanup. If we continue on this path, we may not be around in 500 years. I believe it is immoral to continue plundering for profit without having the ability to successfully mitigate the results. This has to be evaluated carefully. I believe it is in the best interest of our State and the Country to say no; or at least not until you can prove a more successful mitigation for this project. A very limited number of people will reap the lucrative benefits while destroying an environment that benefits everyone, practically forever. If they can't do it responsibly now, they should be denied a permit at this time. Short and quick profit resulting in destroying pristine lands forever is penny wise and pound foolish.. A slowdown on this may provide the opportunity for entrepreneurs to develop and implement better

54144

NO I don't support mining. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Laumb

45949

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Ms Fay, My husband and I own a cabin on the shores of White Iron Lake, which is a prime walleye lake east of Ely, Minnesota. We have spent the last eleven years investing several hundred thousand dollars in the local economy while developing this valuable property. We feel we have much at stake in the protection of our investment and our enjoyment of the clean waters of this lake where one day we plan to retire. There is currently exploration and development occurring just south of White Iron Lake around and under Birch Lake. The waters flow north in this area and the Kawishiwi River flows directly from Birch into and through White Iron Lake on up to Farm, Garden and Fall Lakes into the BWCA. The proposal made by PolyMet, if approved, opens the door to mining all along Birch Lake, South Kawishiwi and other areas on north to the BWCA. We have seen the devastation that copper/nickel mining has caused in areas such as Sudbury, Ontario, Canada and how a community suffers when left to clean up the waste of companies who have no interest in the area once they have taken from it what they want. We do not feel that any precautions PolyMet is proposing will be adequate to prevent devastation to the land and waterways as well as the economy in our beautiful area. As you know, if there is the slightest chance that waters will be polluted the fishing guides, resorts and outfitters will lose much more revenue than the region will gain from the few hundred permanent jobs PolyMet is proposing for the area. If you were planning a fishing or camping trip would you go to a region where there is a "possibility" of polluted water. Had we known of the proposed copper/nickel mining eleven years ago, we would not have chosen this area to build our cabin. Real estate values could suffer dramatically, which will affect the tax base for waterfront properties in the region as well as homes and businesses in the cities in these regions. If the drinking water is affected, that will add even more devastation to the area. Other items that need to be considered are the effects from noise and air pollution. With the amount of mining that is proposed, this type of pollution is inevitable to an area where people come to enjoy clean air and peaceful quiet days. Please consider all of these aspects in addition to the other provisions that PolyMet has failed to address adequately in their proposal. As in all things it is better to be proactive than reactive when it comes to the environment and our natural resources. Thank you, Linda Laumb 7870 Guild Ct. Apple Valley, MN 55124

Linda Malick

39296

Dear Lisa Fay, I am strongly opposed to the copper, nickel, paladium, and gold mines propped by Twin Metals and Polymet that would be located south and west of Ely, Minnesota. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is America's most visited wilderness area and one of the oldest designated wilderness areas in the nation. Despite what proponents of the copper-nickel mines say, creating new mines within 50 miles of Ely would be extremely detrimental to our local economy. The mines will not only be an eyesore, they will also increase rail and truck traffic, which would negatively affect tourism in the area. The noise from drilling and moving material destroys the wilderness experience on the southern end of the Wilderness area near Spruce Road and Birch Lake. Most importantly, there is no evidence that our most precious resource, the interconnected system of pristine waterways, will adequately be protected. Acid mine drainage in our waters is unacceptable. Sulfide-bearing rock brought to the surface will turn into sulfuric acid and leach into our waterways, resulting in irreparable damage to our biotic community. **DO NOT ALLOW ANY HARD ROCK MINING WITHIN 50 MILES OF ELY MINNESOTA..** Thank you, Linda Malick - Linda Malick 715 386 5962 malicklinda@baldwin-telecom-net

Linda Morgan

40890

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Like many people, I am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Linda Morgan 10 Cherrywood Ct San Pablo, CA 94806-3767 (510) 236-4022

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Morgan

40892

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Like many people, I am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Linda Morgan 10 Cherrywood Ct San Pablo, CA 94806-3767 (510) 236-4022

Linda Morris

9817

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linda Morris 3229 Colorado Ave S 3229 Colorado Ave So St Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Morris

18611

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linda Morris 3229 Colorado Ave S 3229 Colorado Ave So St Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Morris

18917

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Linda Morris 3229 Colorado Ave S 3229 Colorado Ave So St Louis Park, MN 55416

39888

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Linda Morris 3229 Colorado Ave S St Louis Park, MN 55416-2052 (763) 525-0311

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Morris

50687

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Linda Morris 3229 Colorado Ave S 3229 Colorado Ave So St Louis Park, MN 55416

Linda Raab

40005

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Linda Raab 12656 Florida Ln Saint Paul, MN 55124-5332

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Rolf

18955

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Linda Rolf 1900 1st Ave S Apt 26 Minneapolis, MN 55403 7636567758

Linda Ronchetti

12736

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: To give away our natural heritage for the generations to come, for a few years of profit and destruction is maimed thinking. Please put the environments health, over a few years of profit, as the priority. I am totally against this fiasco and will consider moving away if it comes to pass. We all know this has never been safely done so how can they have the gall to state they can do so. And even if they would have the money to clean up the mess, I personally do not want the mess to destroy MN treasures of clean water, the woods, my wild rice, my clean air etc for generations to come. We have a responsibility to the people who come after us and to the earth. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Linda Ronchetti 15 N. Erie Street Aurora, MN 55705 2182293782

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Rossin 27586

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining in Minnesota threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It is a known fact that acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. What can be so important about this mine's harvestings that we are willing to pollute our land and the water we drink again and again. The serious consequences of such a project as sulfide mining, especially in our wilderness areas, is incomprehensible to me, which leads me to having grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Linda Rossin 13 Alpine Dr Lake Hopatcong, NJ 07849-1248 (973) 663-1645

Linda S Budd 54695

See attachment

Linda Salazar 39868

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Linda Salazar 5352 Nokomis Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-2059

39875

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Linda Salazar 5352 Nokomis Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-2059

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Sarat

40837

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Linda Sarat 131 Vineyard Dr Rochester, NY 14616-2007 (585) 663-5113

Linda Sexton

40877

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Other Americans, along with Minnesotans want to protect clean water. PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota is too risky. Risking high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest makes no sense. PolyMet targets the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. People as well as wildlife depend on clean water; once ruined, we may spend decades getting it cleaned-if ever it happens at all in our children's lifetimes. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. Please reject PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Linda Sexton 702 Morningside Dr Norman, OK 73071-4920 (405) 360-1067

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Spyhalski

40041

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Stop this mine and the damage it will do to our environment. The state will have to spend taxpayers money to clean up the mess made by this mine. Sincerely, Ms Linda Spyhalski 11136 187th Ave NW Elk River, MN 55330-7805

Linda Stephan

29364

I sent a form letter, but would like to add: It seems absurd to risk YOUR spectacular heritage, the Boundary Waters Area, in order to allow a private entity to exploit it for short term profit. The risk is just too great. The area in question attracts many tourists and sportsmen to your state. Birders too, and I am one. We spend alot of money there. This is a long-term benefit to you and it will cease if the area is defiled. Thank you. Linda Stephan, HYPERLINK "mailto:lstephan9942@gmail-com"lstephan9942@gmail-com. On Mon, Mar 3, 2014 at 5:37 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Linda Tauer

39741

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Linda Tauer 909 1st Ave S Sleepy Eye, MN 56085-1803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linda Tyssen

10739

On Saturday, February 1, 2014 2:17 PM, Linda Tyssen wrote: I am all in favor of the PolyMet project. I believe the PolyMet officials have followed the procedures to the letter. Both sides of the issue have had ample opportunity to voice their opinions. As a 30-year reporter at the Mesabi Daily News and a proud member of the Steelworkers Union, I have seen the boom times and the bust times in the mining industry. In the mid-1980s scores of Mesabi Iron Range people lost their jobs at the mines and moved away from the area, with the closure of the Butler Taconite on the west end and of Reserve Mining Co. in Babbitt on the east end, and in 2001 the permanent shutdown of LTV, the former Erie Mining Co., was devastating news for thousands of Range people. PolyMet would be - no, will be - vital to the future of the Mesabi Iron Range. Thank you. Linda Tyssen Gilbert 780-5428

Linda Unsworth

42088

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Linda Unsworth Minneapolis, Minnesota

Linda Uscola

9600

Dear DNR: No one seems to be emphasizing that in MN the environment IS also an industry .it's called tourism. Why risk this major industry, which affects thousands of small businesses and individuals, to aid a private, big business. Virtually all big businesses involved with the environment promise to protect it. Just like BP did in the Gulf. No matter how much BP pays back to those communities/individuals, BP will never make up for the damages their greed caused. Please, protect our environment AND THE TOURISM INDUSTRY. Say no to Polymet. Sincerely, Linda Uscola 15732 130th St Menahga, MN 56464

Linda Wadsworth

39795

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Linda Wadsworth 10311 230th St N Scandia, MN 55073-9550 (651) 433-5101

Linda Wiig

42939

I have attached my comment regarding this mine application. I hope that the state DNR will see its way to addressing more concerns that many people have in regards to the development of this type of mine. Thank you, Linda Wiig Sent from Windows Mail

Alphabetical by sender's first name

lindag lindag 13483

Hello, I have retired as of 12/31/13- To contact Operations staff, please email [HYPERLINK "mailto:fdmoperations@ucsc-edu"](mailto:fdmoperations@ucsc-edu)fdmoperations@ucsc-edu. Or contact Woody Carroll at 459-4062- Thank you. Linda Garfield

LindaMay Patterson 37204

Mar 1, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, As a Minnesotan, I am very concerned about protecting our clean water. I am particularly concerned about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe this statement is inadequate at best and terribly flawed. It should not be approved because various environmental disasters have proven that trying to contain contaminated water and soil over the long term is impossible. It is only a matter of time before a failure occurs releasing toxins into the surrounding water and soil. Why our state would let PolyMet mine in high quality wetland habitat only proves that at little money and a few jobs is more important than our long term concern for the environment. This mine would be in the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. Why would you risk destroying this area. Also consider that all the chemicals and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that would be unleashed into our environment affecting the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. The food chain would be disrupted, birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Just think 20 years of mining and (350 jobs over the short term) threaten hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. The trade-off of some copper and jobs IS NOT worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms LindaMay Patterson 1919 Cabernet Ln NW Rochester, MN 55901-1906 (507) 206-0209

Lindsay Dean 18327

My name is Lindsay Dean. And I pass my time to Don Arnosti.

42605

See attachment

Lindsay Groves 52189

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lindsay Groves 1246 Minnow Cove Skaneateles, NY 13152

Lindsay Sovil 4055

Hello, I am writing to state that I am completely opposed to the PolyMet project in northern Minnesota. Copper mining absolutely does not belong in this water-rich area. The pollution generated by the mine would cause damage for over 500 years, or forever. I live in Ely, MN and I value the clean water in our area. The few short term jobs created by this project in no way compensate the state of Minnesota for the loss of one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the country. For centuries into the future, the people of this state will be regretting what this generation did in the name of a brief period of profits. Sincerely, Lindsay Sovil 1197 Kawishiwi Trail P.O. Box 757 Ely, MN 55731 (218) 365-2525

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linne Jensen

47517

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: I have reviewed information provided by a number of organizations concerning copper-nickel mining in northern Minnesota. I am concerned about the damage such mining has historically done to the landscape and to the health of area residents. In addition, I am concerned about the pollution that is left behind for hundreds of years after mining ceases, especially water pollution. Northern Minnesota is the site of 3 major watersheds. We and many states downstream from us need fresh clean water. In particular, I am concerned that the proposal under consideration from PolyMet for a facility in the Hoyt Lakes area will cause unmitigated damage, and that it will be followed by other such proposals from other corporations which will cause additional damage. Northern Minnesota is NOT the area in which to provide mining rights to an outside corporation that cannot possibly provide adequate stewardship for the water and environment in this area. Jobs are important. I support jobs in northern Minnesota that are sustainable to all life in the area, and I encourage the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to take a leadership role in promoting sustainable industry. I request that the MDNR deny approval for all copper-nickel mining projects in northern Minnesota. Thank you for taking comments and for including my comments in your deliberations. Linne Jensen 20 Park Drive Northfield MN 55057

54483

See attachment

Linnea Mohn

46301

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My name is Linnea Mohn. After careful review it seems plain to me that the risks outweigh potential benefits of this proposal as it currently is. There are so few places left in MN (in the world for that matter) that even come close to pristine. The BWCA is it and we have to protect it for future generations to know what was and what could be again. This plan is dangerous and the potential long term damage is terrifying. We can do better. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linnea Mohn MN Resident and lover of the north woods. Linnea Mohn 5648 21st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Linnea Mohn

46303

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My name is Linnea Mohn. After careful review it seems plain to me that the risks outweigh potential benefits of this proposal as it currently is. There are so few places left in MN (in the world for that matter) that even come close to pristine. The BWCA is it and we have to protect it for future generations to know what was and what could be again. This plan is dangerous and the potential long term damage is terrifying. We can do better. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams • The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Linnea Mohn MN Resident and lover of the north woods. Linnea Mohn 5648 21st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417

Lisa

54331

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, Hello Ms. Lisa! I am a student Southwest Junior High, in Forest Lake, Minnesota. I am in eighth grade. I wanted to give you my input on how this could effect Minnesota. I have done much research in order to write to you, and what your plans are for the mining that may begin to occur. You make the plans sound very "green" as one would say. I have also gathered the information that there will be a few (or more) rivers affected, and a good amount of forests. Please consider how each decision you make will affect the people not only just in your area, but also the entire state, nation, and potentially the entire world. I know it seems quite drastic, but always consider what could happen. I think that having the mining start will benefit Minnesota's economy, but will it benefit our wildlife? Who knows, maybe it will affect more things than you know. Some of the advantages would be that it will be a big moneymaker, it will supply many jobs, and it will help our economy. Some disadvantages will be the wildlife, pollution, and nature in general will be affected. The cultural resources in the area will be affected. Mostly the historic and cultural resources. There will also be a lot of noise, dust, visual obstructions, and access restrictions to certain areas. People may not like that who live near to the area. They may think you're invading their space, which will not be such a plus for you. Like I said before, please plan out every single detail before any harsh decisions are made. The Land Exchange offers that are being made seem quite drastic. Sounds like you need a whole lot of land. The land you all are using is going to take up a lot of space. Be careful, and consider the outcome. Like I said earlier, it will not only affect this one area, it will affect possibly all of Minnesota and all of the states around it. Please take notice of all of effects, and be wise. Sincerely, Eighth Grade Student

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Atkins

40309

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Lisa Atkins 185 Hall St Brooklyn, NY 11205 US

Lisa Boulay

48119

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, We are in no hurry to get minerals out of the ground. Deny PolyMet permits till they prove that it can be done safely. The wetlands of Minnesota are no place for an experiment. The minerals in the ground will still be there 100's of years from now. So have PolyMet prove their operations before they are given a permit. I have not seen the estimate of how much money PolyMet would have to escrow to clean up the site. How do you estimate how much it would take to monitor for 500 years. I will not be around then but our future generations will. They deserve a safe place to live as I do. The health risks of the mine have not been adequately study. We need to know the cancer risks. I am not against jobs. It has not been shown that this will bring high numbers of long term jobs. The risk to the environment is not worth the few jobs it would provide " this is not your grandfather's iron mine ". I could keep going but I think you got my point. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS. We all are here to protect our planet. You can do your part and protect Minnesota and all who live here by rejecting the PolyMet mine. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands. Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Respectfully, Lisa M Boulay Lisa Boulay 6214 Lavinia RD NE Bemidji, MN 56601 (218) 760-1502

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Boulay

48470

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, We are in no hurry to get minerals out of the ground. Deny PolyMet permits till they prove that it can be done safely. The wetlands of Minnesota are no place for an experiment . The minerals in the ground will still be there 100's of years from now. So have PolyMet prove their operations before they are given a permit. I have not seen the estimate of how much money PolyMet would have to escrow to clean up the site . How do you estimate how much it would take to monitor for 500 years . I will not be around then but our future generations will.They deserve a safe place to live as I do. The health risks of the mine have not been adequately study. We need to know the cancer risks. I am not agianst jobs. It has not been shown that this will bring high numbers of long term jobs. The risk to the environment is not worth the few jobs it would provide " this is not your grandfather's iron mine ". I could keep going but I think you got my point. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS. We all are here to protect our planet. You can do you part and protect Minnesota and all who live her by rejecting the PolyMet mine. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Repectfly, Lisa M Boulay Lisa Boulay 6214 Lavinia RD NE Bemidji, MN 56601 (218) 760-1502

52497

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, We are in no hurry to get minerals out of the ground. Deny PolyMet permits till they prove that it can be done safely. The wetlands of Minnesota are no place for an experiment . The minerals in the ground will still be there 100's of years from now. So have PolyMet prove their operations before they are given a permit. I have not seen the estimate of how much money PolyMet would have to escrow to clean up the site . How do you estimate how much it would take to monitor for 500 years . I will not be around then but our future generations will.They deserve a safe place to live as I do. The health risks of the mine have not been adequately study. We need to know the cancer risks. I am not agianst jobs. It has not been shown that this will bring high numbers of long term jobs. The risk to the environment is not worth the few jobs it would provide " this is not your grandfather's iron mine ". I could keep going but I think you got my point. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS. We all are here to protect our planet. You can do you part and protect Minnesota and all who live her by rejecting the PolyMet mine. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Repectfly, Lisa M Boulay Lisa Boulay 6214 Lavinia RD NE Bemidji, MN 56601 (218) 760-1502

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Coons

16965

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Coons 418 W. Pleasant St Manakto, MN 56001

50256

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Coons 418 W. Pleasant St Manakto, MN 56001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Daniels

41714

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Lisa Erickson

39542

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. "PolyMet's own study says that the water from the mine site would need at least 500 years of treatment." Wisconsin has banned this type of mining until it can be proven safe. Proven safe, this is what needs to start happening before corporations, American, Canadian, and any others, are allowed to act. In the courts we know it's innocent until proven guilty; this does not work with choices like these that severely impact, our clean water, health, threatened wildlife, and our needed and declining wetlands. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Lisa Erickson 5651 Fremont Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55430-3163 (763) 486-9731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Fitzpatrick

18864

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is happening) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Lisa Fitzpatrick Lisa Fitzpatrick 5229 Peabody St Duluth, MN 55804

42610

See attachment

Lisa Fralish

41857

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lisa Fralish 1086 Como Pl Apt 5 Saint Paul, MN 55103-1374 (507) 381-6334

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Heyman

38741

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Jurgens

45527

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Jurgens 2213 West 18th Place Apt #3F Chicago, IL 60608

Lisa Kucukdogerli

40440

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Lisa Kucukdogerli 235 Westlake Ctr Daly City, CA 94015 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Luttinen 2075

I object to the PolyMet mine proposal. They will never follow through on keeping our water safe for 20 years let alone 500- No Mine. Lisa Luttinen Grand Marais, MN Sent from my iPhone

Lisa Nebenzahl 43479

Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Nebenzahl 7210 Dupont Avenue South Richfield, MN 55423

Lisa Neste 42160

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Lisa Neste 4437 Garden Club St High Point, NC 27265-1196

Lisa Proechel 42817

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Pugh

21449

Good evening, I'm writing to state my opinion on the proposed copper mines in Northern Minnesota. I will be brief. Who I am: I am a 27 year old woman, originally from the Twin Cities area. I graduated from the U of MN with a degree in Fisheries and Wildlife. I've worked for several government agencies over the last 8 years and am currently working for a non-profit expeditionary learning school based in Ely, MN. I have been living and working just outside of Ely since 2011- My line of work: I lead wilderness expeditions from 4-50 days in length in the BWCAW and Superior National Forest. Our students range in age from 14-60- Teenagers, families, young adults, military veterans, educators, adults, struggling youth and anyone in between represent our student population. We travel by canoe, dogsled, nordic skis, snowshoes, sea kayaks, and on foot. The majority of our expeditions are run unsupported. Students come to our school for self-discovery, to reveal character, to challenge themselves, to see and appreciate the beauty and majesty of the wilderness, among other things. We have been here changing lives since the 1960's and plan to continue our good work well into the next century. What I ask: I need to know exactly what to expect from PolyMet. Even though the mines will not be located within the BWCAW, their proposed locations have the potential to cause irreversible harm to the surrounding watershed(s). I need to know, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that this company will not contaminate our water. I need a guarantee backed by conclusive, repeatable scientific analysis that what PolyMet is proposing will not contaminate our water. I am asking for the best possible collection and analysis of data from unbiased sources about how this mining operation could impact our environment and thus, our quality of life. I need to know that if it is deemed safe by our government that PolyMet has a plan to be financially responsible for the entire operation from start to well beyond the finish and that taxpayers would never be liable for cleaning up mine pollution. Bottom line: The BWCAW and community that surrounds it, is of tantamount importance to me, both personally and professionally. If the proposed mines risk contaminating the waters that flow where I live; where my community of friends and neighbors live; where my students come to learn their potential, then we cannot allow it. We, as Minnesotans, need to protect the resources that serve us. I am not saying "no" to economic opportunity, but I am taking a stand against potential groundwater contamination, waste-rock pollution, taxpayer liability, long-term water monitoring and treatment, unstable employment opportunities, and unpredictable outcomes. I do not believe it can be done safely and I am asking of my government to consider our long-term safety and the safety of our resources above all else. Thank you for your time, Lisa - Lisa Pugh 952-237-6714 [HYPERLINK "mailto:lisa.a.pugh@gmail-com"lisa.a.pugh@gmail-com](mailto:lisa.a.pugh@gmail-com)

Lisa Salazar

39467

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lisa Salazar 1125 Balclutha Dr Apt 107 Foster City, CA 94404-1733

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Umhoefer

17030

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Umhoefer Thomas Circle Minneapolis, MN 55410

17031

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lisa Umhoefer Thomas Circle Minneapolis, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Umhoefer

50304

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Lisa Umhoefer Thomas Circle Minneapolis, MN 55410

50305

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Lisa Umhoefer Thomas Circle Minneapolis, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Welch 40843

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Lisa Welch 118 Cashin Dr Fayetteville, NY 13066-1514 (315) 406-1610

Lisa Wersal 6147

Lisa: Please find below comments regarding the proposed Polymet mine in northern MN. We know that, by their own admission, Polymet's system will allow millions of gallons of untreated wastewater, with heavy metals and acid, into our surface and groundwaters. Eventually, this water may make its way even to Lake Superior. Are we prepared, not only for the cleanup costs, but for the inevitable lawsuits that we will face, from residents and businesses, and possibly other states surrounding Lake Superior. We just don't know how bad the damage will be, and that's worrisome. Better to let Polymet work out the kinks of their new, untried system, SOMEWHERE ELSE. Our nickel and copper deposits are not going anywhere. Mining companies will be back with more proposals. We don't need to rush. Lisa Wersal 4525 Birch Ridge Rd Vadnais Heights, MN 55127 651-407-6247 wersa007@umn.edu

42743

See attachment

54667

See attachment

57619

Dear Lisa: I am amazed that the copper-nickel mining proposal has gotten this far. I can't imagine that any other industry would be allowed to suggest a project that will require 500 years of water cleanup. It's unfathomable. Computer models show that water from the mine and the processing plant will be contaminated with heavy metals and sulfates. PolyMet's own mine plan shows that millions of gallons of polluted water will seep off site, untreated. Additionally, millions of gallons of polluted water will be treated for hundreds of years. It's ludicrous to suggest that water can be contained well enough for over 500 years to make this project safe. Think of the recent floods of Duluth. Natural forces always surprise us with their capacity to overflow, wash out, or flood away the "failsafe" structures we have built. There's no precedent anywhere of a mining company being able to capture all the contaminated water and treat it properly, least of all a company like PolyMet that has never operated a mine before. Lisa Wersal ***** Lisa Wersal 4525 Birch Ridge Rd Vadnais Heights, MN 55127 651-407-6247 wersa007@umn.edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lisa Wersal 57872

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Ellen Thrasher 100 Hinkle Ct Lipan, TX 76462-2222 (682) 552-3027

Lisa Workman 54693

See attachment

Lise Abazs 47929

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am an organic farmer and a wild rice harvester and I live in the Lake Superior watershed. My occupation, my recreation and my sustenance depend on a healthy environment. The proposed PolyMet sulfide mine would irrevocably change the character and health of this region. When I received my Environmental Science degree many years ago, I learned that ecosystems are interdependent in ways that we are still trying to completely understand. PolyMet's SDEIS attempts to model and predict how its mine pits and waste rock piles will effect the environment but they are woefully inadequate. They greatly underestimate the actual rate of groundwater base flow and therefore cannot possibly realistically predict the consequences to ecosystems downstream. This error could have drastic and irreversible consequences to water quality and wild rice beds. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lise Abazs Lise Abazs 5879 Nikolai Road Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Liv Bly

16039

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Liz Campbell

43331

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Liz Campbell 605 n 64th st seattle, WA 98103

Liz Nordling

21227

To: Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager Dear Ms Fay. I write in opposition to the proposed sulfide mine proposed by PolyMet in NE Minnesota. I believe that our water is our most precious resource in Minnesota and this mine would do irreparable harm to it. Please do not allow PolyMet or any other mining company to harm our environment by establishing a copper/nickel mine in the Superior National Forest. Thank you. Elizabeth M. Nordling 7477 115th St N White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Liz White

14406

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, As a born and raised Minnesotan (now residing in Florida, earning my PhD in Ecology), I want to say that I hope the potential long-term ramifications of this action are truly being taken into account. My entire family still resides in Minneapolis, and I speak on behalf of them. There is money to be made and some people will get jobs, but in the long run, what are the real costs and benefits. Clean water and natural lands are not something that can be replaced, and every loss needs to be viewed as cumulative (a thousand cuts). Clean water is something that we all absolutely need, and that everyone benefits from. Who ultimately will get the greatest benefit from this mining. It's not Minnesotans or our wildlife. Everything is connected, and as we continue to degrade the natural world, each tradeoff between exploitation and conservation becomes more important. Please consider the long term effects, and weigh these relatively short-term benefits against the permanent losses that will occur. Once something is gone, you can't get it back. Sincerely, Liz White 101 NE 9th St Gainesville, FL 32601-5526 (203) 691-8755

lizz

46924

We are writing to state our opposition to the PolyMet proposal. While we might all want to assume that Minnesota is water-rich and that our state has no issues with water-quality or quantity, that is simply not true. The threats to our water that are part and parcel of the PolyMet proposal are real. We ask that this proposal be denied and that further investigation be ordered. Respectfully, Curtis A. and Elizabeth Levang 4010 Bayside Road Maple Plain, Minnesota 55359 952/476-4123 clevang@aol-com

LK Woodruff

35700

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I am sick to death of everything being done for profits, while our sacred earth is being plundered into oblivion. The true COST is simply too great. So STOP IT NOW. Seriously consider these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. Why. Because it threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. ->There goes tourism. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have horrifically polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. ->Once that has been done - how do you FIX IT.. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, LONGTERM, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Not now. Not ever. Sincerely, LK Woodruff 2884 138th St W Rosemount, MN 55068-3465 (651) 295-0935

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lloyd Hansen

43248

Dear Mr Westlake, Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and MrJimenez:: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. It would thereby adversely affect the health of people, plants and animals in the area. I'll first address the duration of the threat from toxic waste with several (lengthy) quotes from scientific journals. The first is from www.geographical.co.uk, the website created to complement Geographical, the official magazine of the Royal Geographical Society: "Wadi Faynan, Jordan - An ancient copper-mining center around 50 kilometres south of the Dead Sea. Mining at the site started in the third millennium BC but expanded greatly under the Romans. The remains of the town, the mines themselves, agricultural terracing and a vast, 30-metre high, 200,000-cubic-metre slag heap still survives. The Roman Empire's industrial revolution continues to pose a threat today. Analysis of modern plants and animals in and around Wadi Faynan has revealed that the 2,000-year-old pollution is just as harmful in the 21st century as it was in the first. The growth of plants is stunted and their reproductive systems are severely damaged with very low seed production. Sheep grazing in the area had high concentrations of copper in their feces (up to 25 parts per million) as well as in their urine and milk." The second quote concerns the same site and comes from the international journal *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 2002: "toxicological implications of ancient copper mining and smelting in Wadi Faynan, southwestern Jordan: the pollution legacy of ancient metal extraction activities remains considerable (Gee et al., 1997; Maskall and Thornton, 1998). Pyatt and Grattan (2002) noted that traditional foods prepared by the Bedouin of the area may be contaminated with high concentrations of lead and copper; while Grattan et al. (2003a) have reported significant enhancements of heavy metals within the floor sediments of Bedouin tents pitched within a kilometre of Khirbet Faynan; copper concentrations reached 2849 mg/kg soil, with the highest values measured around the hearths where food is prepared. The exceptional enhancement around the cooking hearths probably resulted from the combustion of plants as fuel, which contain high levels of absorbed metals; copper in the stem of *Ephedra alta*, frequently burned in these fires, was measured at 603 mg/kg dried plant (Pyatt et al., 2000). Ingestion of plants containing metal burdens also appears to be contaminating the modern invertebrate food chain (Pyatt et al., 2002); the accumulation of metals by modern vertebrates is discussed in Pyatt et al. (1999), where modern goat skeletons were shown to contain lead and copper in excess of 100 µg/g bone. These studies suggest that in the present day several pathways operate by which organisms may accumulate body burdens of heavy metals emitted by ancient industrial activities (Pyatt and Grattan, 2001). These include the direct ingestion/inhalation of airborne metalliferous dusts; the ingestion of food contaminated during preparation by metal-rich dusts in the air, on the ground and via the release of absorbed metals during the combustion of plant material during cooking; the ingestion of food, both animal and plant derived, containing metals absorbed during growth (Leita et al., 1991; Ylaranta, 1996; Moustakas et al., 1997). It is clear that modern exposure to metals derived from ancient industrial activities is considerable. Analysis of buried palaeosols, sediments which have accumulated in archaeological features and mines and smelting waste suggest that during ancient times the region was highly polluted; copper and lead concentrations ranged as high as 11961 µg/g soil and 15205 µg/g soil, respectively (Pyatt et al., 2000). In the developed world, contaminant values at these levels

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lloyd Hansen

47784

Dear Mr Westlake, Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and MrJimenez:: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. It would thereby adversely affect the health of people, plants and animals in the area. I'll first address the duration of the threat from toxic waste with several (lengthy) quotes from scientific journals. The first is from www.geographical.co.uk, the website created to complement Geographical, the official magazine of the Royal Geographical Society: "Wadi Faynan, Jordan - An ancient copper-mining center around 50 kilometres south of the Dead Sea. Mining at the site started in the third millennium BC but expanded greatly under the Romans. The remains of the town, the mines themselves, agricultural terracing and a vast, 30-metre high, 200,000-cubic-metre slag heap still survives. The Roman Empire's industrial revolution continues to pose a threat today. Analysis of modern plants and animals in and around Wadi Faynan has revealed that the 2,000-year-old pollution is just as harmful in the 21st century as it was in the first. The growth of plants is stunted and their reproductive systems are severely damaged with very low seed production. Sheep grazing in the area had high concentrations of copper in their feces (up to 25 parts per million) as well as in their urine and milk." The second quote concerns the same site and comes from the international journal *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 2002: "toxicological implications of ancient copper mining and smelting in Wadi Faynan, southwestern Jordan: the pollution legacy of ancient metal extraction activities remains considerable (Gee et al., 1997; Maskall and Thornton, 1998). Pyatt and Grattan (2002) noted that traditional foods prepared by the Bedouin of the area may be contaminated with high concentrations of lead and copper; while Grattan et al. (2003a) have reported significant enhancements of heavy metals within the floor sediments of Bedouin tents pitched within a kilometre of Khirbet Faynan; copper concentrations reached 2849 mg/kg soil, with the highest values measured around the hearths where food is prepared. The exceptional enhancement around the cooking hearths probably resulted from the combustion of plants as fuel, which contain high levels of absorbed metals; copper in the stem of *Ephedra alta*, frequently burned in these fires, was measured at 603 mg/kg dried plant (Pyatt et al., 2000). Ingestion of plants containing metal burdens also appears to be contaminating the modern invertebrate food chain (Pyatt et al., 2002); the accumulation of metals by modern vertebrates is discussed in Pyatt et al. (1999), where modern goat skeletons were shown to contain lead and copper in excess of 100 µg/g bone. These studies suggest that in the present day several pathways operate by which organisms may accumulate body burdens of heavy metals emitted by ancient industrial activities (Pyatt and Grattan, 2001). These include the direct ingestion/inhalation of airborne metalliferous dusts; the ingestion of food contaminated during preparation by metal-rich dusts in the air, on the ground and via the release of absorbed metals during the combustion of plant material during cooking; the ingestion of food, both animal and plant derived, containing metals absorbed during growth (Leita et al., 1991; Ylaranta, 1996; Moustakas et al., 1997). It is clear that modern exposure to metals derived from ancient industrial activities is considerable. Analysis of buried palaeosols, sediments which have accumulated in archaeological features and mines and smelting waste suggest that during ancient times the region was highly polluted; copper and lead concentrations ranged as high as 11961 µg/g soil and 15205 µg/g soil, respectively (Pyatt et al., 2000). In the developed world, contaminant values at these levels

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lloyd Hoeft

18215

My name is Frank Ongaro and I'm giving my time to Lloyd Hoeft. Thank you, Frank. There are no simple solutions, only intelligent choices. My name is Lloyd Hoeft, L-L-O-Y-D, H-O-E-F-T, and I'm honored to have the opportunity to speak tonight as a Minnesotan in full support of PolyMet. I'm also speaking as someone who is part of the local mining industry as an employee of Cat. Caterpillar has a strong commitment to the mining industry and has a long history of developing environmentally-efficient equipment and solutions. In today's global economy, copper and nickel have become common elements in nearly everything we use, from cell phones, wind turbines to hybrid cars. The mining of these metals will help support key uses such as green technology, healthcare and manufacturing. The economic opportunities that copper-nickel mining brings is exactly what our state needs to both jobs and mine the minerals we use in our daily lives. Minnesota has some of the nation's strongest environmental laws and financial assurance regulations. Combining these strict standards with the lengthy and thorough environmental review process will ensure the copper-nickel mining will be done right. PolyMet's a resourceful project. The reuse of (inaudible) infrastructure greatly reduces the environmental impact. Many third-world countries mine the same minerals with little or no regard to the impact it has on the environment or its people. We are fortunate to have regulations in place and a company whose first concern is the environment and the citizens. The Polymet team is made up of Minnesotans with strong values and character who not only have faith in this project but also are members of the local community. They're the last people who would jeopardize environment, especially in their own backyard. Let's be good stewards of the natural resources we have. Many other countries and states wish for an opportunity to mine one of the largest copper deposits in the world. This project will employ 360 people, create 600 more spinoff jobs and over the next 20 years, generate 721 in wages and benefits, in addition, there will be \$10.3 billion in economic benefits to St. Louis County, as well as \$300 million in local and state tax revenue, and \$900 million in the federal tax revenue. That's a lot money that we can reinvest into our state. Let's use this opportunity to build a stronger sustainable industry that will allow future generations to grow and prosper in the Iron Range for generations to come. I've been to every hearing and continue to appreciate this project more and more each time. The support of the local community is admirable. There are local residents whose businesses are reliant on the clean water and they support this project. There's a lot of misinformation being thrown around, but look into the facts for yourself and you will find that most heated topics have already been addressed. We're all united here tonight because we care, so let's trust the professionals and unite the plan to mine these resources safely and responsibly. I want to conclude with a simple comment that CEO of PolyMet, John Cherry, said, "The debate isn't whether we should mine but how we mine." Thank you and have a good night.

Lloyd Kongsjord

36480

--- Forwarded message --- From: "Lloyd Kongsjord" Date: Mar 3, 2014 11:23 AM Subject: I Support Polymet To: Cc: > I work for and with the mndnr. I believe with their rules and regulations there is no reason not to permit this mine for northern Minnesota and polymet. Let's get this permitted and moving > Lloyd Kongsjord Po box 2 Talmoon MN 56637

36481

I work for and with the mndnr. I believe with their rules and regulations there is no reason not to permit this mine for northern Minnesota and polymet. Let's get this permitted and moving Lloyd Kongsjord

Lloyd Schallberg

47619

The gamble of maintaining a fresh water supply in Northeast Minnesota is too great to allow the mining of copper-nickel here. Purifying polluted water for hundreds of years is not part of a sustainable industry and does not make common sense. More effort should go to recycling, reusing copper and nickel and other metals that have already been refined and manufactured into products. Sincerely, Lloyd Schallberg 4901 Grand Ave #1004 Duluth, MN 55807

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lobbies Luther

42032

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Lobbies Luther Minneapolis, Minnesota

Lobsang Dhondup

39332

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Lobsang Dhondup 4820 Madison St NE Minneapolis, MN 55421-2332

Logan Olson

54349

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I don't believe that the NorthMet project is the right choice for Minnesota. While researching the project, I found that the pros were heavily outweighed by the cons. I found that the environmental impact and the impact on Minnesota's many sites of cultural importance could be drastic. I know that the mining project would create jobs and a potentially stronger economy for Minnesota, but what will we be left with after the twenty years? We'll be left with people who no longer have jobs, and one of the state's treasured natural habitats left nearly destroyed. Even the current land exchange offers wouldn't be able to make up for this loss of land and habitat for Minnesota's beloved wildlife. Not only could wildlife on land be affected, but also the wildlife of surrounding lakes, rivers, and streams. The waterways of this state are important to all of its citizens and we all want to ensure that they are kept safe from pollution and harmful chemicals that could create potentially deadly chemical reactions. There are more things that would be affected by this mining project than just the environment. There are also many sites of cultural importance to Minnesotans that could be at risk by the mining project. The three identified sites are The Sugarbush, Beaver Bay to Lake Vermilion Trail, and Mesabe Widjiu which is sacred to the Ojibwe people. Losing these lands would be a huge loss for the people of the area. Also, there are several historical sites in the area. We should try to protect these important sites instead of putting them at risk. The project would have many effects on air and water quality. The air quality would decrease which could cause problems for wildlife as well as humans. Also, mercury that rubs off when the ore comes into contact can pollute water, killing fish and vegetation. These are huge risks that I don't think Minnesota is ready to take. I hope you consider my thoughts and the thoughts of all Minnesotans and make the right decision. Sincerely, Logan Olson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Loi Kemp

44090

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. As a former member of the MPCA Board and an environmental consultant with 35 years of experience on water policy, I have been involved in a wide variety of development proposals and environmental reviews. I am convinced that this proposal is dangerous, and that the environmental review is seriously and legally deficient. In addition, as a citizen who treasures the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Superior National Forest, and our extended family's land and cabin on Burntside Lake near Ely, I have a personal stake in protecting the waters of this region. My concerns are myriad, but I will focus on two: water quality related health impacts, and the deficiencies in the SDEIS. Mercury and sulfate emissions are a major threat from this mine. Minnesota has been trying to rein in mercury for decades, placing significant restrictions on power plants and incinerators to limit added airborne mercury. Nevertheless, ten percent of infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood, according to the MN Department of Health. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Specifically impacted by the PolyMet project are surface waters already legally impaired due to mercury in fish. These include the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes. Opening this mine in this location would add a terrible mercury burden to the waters and future health of Minnesota's residents and the ecosystem. The threat of sulfide water pollution, the unique and nearly everlasting concern of acid drainage from metal mining and the waste rock it leaves behind, will multiply in its impacts on the region's waters, beginning with how it increases mercury in the food chain. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. We need to know what mercury concentration levels will result from seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. Yet the SDEIS fails to provide this critical information. A promise to "control" or "capture" is meaningless. We need precise information on untreated versus treated levels, and detailed scientific information on how the capture takes place, and where residues end up. The SDEIS does not fully assess human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. In addition to mercury in fish, manganese, lead and aluminum in water can affect the brain. Air emissions of asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates can be carcinogenic. Arsenic can cause cancer. The SDEIS does not analyze harm to human beings, particularly for vulnerable populations. The SDEIS omits analysis of risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS omits analysis of risks to groundwater affecting nearby private wells coming from the tailings basin. The SDEIS apparently halved the normal 70-year "lifetime" used for cancer analyses to 30 or 40 years, and I urge you to investigate and correct that assumption. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved gaps on human health impacts. My second major concern with the SDEIS is that it fails to carry out a full analysis of a range of alternatives. This is the heart and soul of the environmental review process. Significant alterations in activity or scope or mitigation should be fully disclosed and analyzed as to their impact on all aspects of the project. The "Do Nothing" alternative, to not build a mine at all, is to always be included and compared to the impacts of the proposal. That is how decision makers can make decisions on whether to permit an operation. Is the social and economic benefit large enough to justify an acceptable amount of environment harm. M

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Loi Kemp

44092

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. As a former member of the MPCA Board and an environmental consultant with 35 years of experience on water policy, I have been involved in a wide variety of development proposals and environmental reviews. I am convinced that this proposal is dangerous, and that the environmental review is seriously and legally deficient. In addition, as a citizen who treasures the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Superior National Forest, and our extended family's land and cabin on Burntside Lake near Ely, I have a personal stake in protecting the waters of this region. My concerns are myriad, but I will focus on two: water quality related health impacts, and the deficiencies in the SDEIS. Mercury and sulfate emissions are a major threat from this mine. Minnesota has been trying to rein in mercury for decades, placing significant restrictions on power plants and incinerators to limit added airborne mercury. Nevertheless, ten percent of infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood, according to the MN Department of Health. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Specifically impacted by the PolyMet project are surface waters already legally impaired due to mercury in fish. These include the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes. Opening this mine in this location would add a terrible mercury burden to the waters and future health of Minnesota's residents and the ecosystem. The threat of sulfide water pollution, the unique and nearly everlasting concern of acid drainage from metal mining and the waste rock it leaves behind, will multiply in its impacts on the region's waters, beginning with how it increases mercury in the food chain. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. We need to know what mercury concentration levels will result from seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. Yet the SDEIS fails to provide this critical information. A promise to "control" or "capture" is meaningless. We need precise information on untreated versus treated levels, and detailed scientific information on how the capture takes place, and where residues end up. The SDEIS does not fully assess human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. In addition to mercury in fish, manganese, lead and aluminum in water can affect the brain. Air emissions of asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates can be carcinogenic. Arsenic can cause cancer. The SDEIS does not analyze harm to human beings, particularly for vulnerable populations. The SDEIS omits analysis of risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS omits analysis of risks to groundwater affecting nearby private wells coming from the tailings basin. The SDEIS apparently halved the normal 70-year "lifetime" used for cancer analyses to 30 or 40 years, and I urge you to investigate and correct that assumption. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved gaps on human health impacts. My second major concern with the SDEIS is that it fails to carry out a full analysis of a range of alternatives. This is the heart and soul of the environmental review process. Significant alterations in activity or scope or mitigation should be fully disclosed and analyzed as to their impact on all aspects of the project. The "Do Nothing" alternative, to not build a mine at all, is to always be included and compared to the impacts of the proposal. That is how decision makers can make decisions on whether to permit an operation. Is the social and economic benefit large enough to justify an acceptable amount of environment harm. My prediction is that

Lois Braun

6191

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I find it astounding that a copper sulfide mine of the type proposed by PolyMet is even being considered in a part of the country dominated by wetlands. Copper sulfide mining has never been carried out safely in wet ecosystems. After its first Environmental Impact Statement received a failing grade, its current SDEIS is hardly better. Good paperwork cannot cover up a flawed plan. The SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. That is more than twice the age of our country. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River "would continue in perpetuity." Even if we could manage this seepage in the present, there is no way that any human being alive today can guarantee continued management that far in the future. Although I recognize the need for copper and other precious metals, especially because of their role in renewable energy technologies, the lake country of Northern Minnesota is not the place to mine for them. Arid areas of the Southwestern US would be far better. If not there, then we will simply have to learn to be more economical in our use of these substances, or find alternatives. They are simply not worth the perpetual pollution they would cause in northern Minnesota. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Lois Braun 1988 Brewster St #109 St Paul, MN 55108

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Braun

16126

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Braun

19212

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Lois Braun 1988 Brewster St #109 St Paul, MN 55108

Lois Gertz

39565

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Lois Gertz 8515 Haeg Cir Bloomington, MN 55431-1714 (612) 227-1720

Lois I Hamilton

54889

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Norrgard

16101

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders, Co: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am asking for an extension to the comment period on the Polymet Northmet SDEIS. March is fast approaching and I find that reading 2000 + pages - and trying to understand all that this project means to Minnesotans, it time consuming. I feel that the citizens of this state have a large stake in the outcome of this process and could use more time to do a thorough and comprehensive look at the documents Polymet has provided. This is a note I found on a "comments" section to a recent Daily Planet article: SUBMITTED BY PAT BRADY ON FEBRUARY 15, 2014 - 1:49PM. Thanks for the links from both of you above. The more I read, the more questions I have about these mining permits process on so many levels. And I am just an average citizen. Aren't our elected officials watching them like a hawk. This is more than an economic issue of 300+ jobs, it is about the future of our state. And a full discussion should be had ,not just a 60 day comment period of three town hall meetings. I agree wholeheartedly with the author. This project has far-reaching implications for the future of Minnesota, our arrowhead region, and I need to understand better the economics of a short term and very destructive extraction process compared to sustainable resource uses in perpetuity – uses that would not impact the health of the land, waters, wildlife and people of our state. Please extend the timeframe for Minnesotans to understand this project. We really need at least double the time that has been given so far. Sincerely Lois Norrgard 952-881-7282

43594

March 13, 2014 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-4025 RE: the PolyMet SDEIS for the Northmet Mining Project Dear Lisa Fay, Federal and State Agency Decision-makers, Comment additions: please include this “addendum” to my previous comments. I am insisting that the SDEIS address this problem. Lois Norrgard 10368 Columbus Circle Bloomington MN 55420 HYPERLINK "mailto:lnorrgard@lnmn10-com"lnorrgard@lnmn10-com COMMUNITY VOICES | It’s a whopper: PolyMet’s myth of 99-38% tailings seepage collection By HYPERLINK "http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/profiles/carla-arneson"Carla Arneson, HYPERLINK "http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/partners/community-voices"Community Voices March 12, 2014 HYPERLINK "http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/sites/tcdailyplanet-net/files/imagecache/HugeColorbox/14/12/fig_1_faulted_bedrock_and_surface_topography_-_northmet.jpg"http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/sites/tcdailyplanet-net/files/imagecache/NewArticlePic/14/12/fig_1_faulted_bedrock_and_surface_topography_-_northmet.jpg Map was prepared by Geologist J.D. Lehr In January, the Ely Timberjay broke the story that PolyMet’s Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) had a problem; its water flow modeling was flawed. Definitely a big problem when the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) seriously underestimated the amount of water available to transport pollutants. Perhaps a show-stopping problem; the DNR is not talking. The Tribes have been saying for years that water flow numbers were wrong. The DNR’s troubles have just begun. PolyMet’s SDEIS has yet another flaw. This flaw could prove to be fatal, ending PolyMet’s Project. Symbolically, the Ides of March is coming up. Critical miscalculations PolyMet’s SDEIS has sprung a leak. The projected seepage from PolyMet’s tailings basin and the Mine Site Category 1 waste rock stockpile has been grossly underestimated. “PolyMet does not propose to line the Tailings Basin, nor is the existing LTVSMC Tailings Basin lined.” (SDEIS, p. 5-161) Just reading that a proposed tailings basin of approximately 2,900 acres in size, or four-and-a-half square miles, would be situated, unlined, on top of an existing, leaking, unstable tailings basin, also unlined, screams BIG TROUBLE. As WaterLegacy’s attorney, Paula Maccabee, summed it up, “The SDEIS assumption of nearly perfect seepage collection is the critical foundation upon which all claims that PolyMet might comply with water quality standards downstream of the tailings piles rely. This assumption is unreasonable, unfounded, inconsistent with site conditions and inconsistent with the Modeling Work Plan methodology adopted by PolyMet” Mind-boggling; the SDEIS for a proposed sulfide mining project – in water-rich Minnesota – now has two flawed key components: water flowage and water seepage. The Co-Lead Agencies have not only made incorrect assumptions for base water flow, they have made incorrect assumptions for seepage of contaminated water (uncaptured and untreated). Simply put, they do not know how much surface and groundwater flows through the area; how fast, far, and where it flows; or how much contaminated water is escaping. Major underpinnings of the PolyMet Project knocked flying by the numbers. PolyMet’s house of cards has collapsed. The numbers The claim that 99-38 percent of total seepage from the tailings piles will be collected and treated is reflected in, “Table 5-2-2-36 NorthMet Project Proposed Action Tailings Basin Seepage (gpm) During Operations,” on page 5-159 of the PolyMet SDEIS. This table states that, under existing conditions, there is a total of 2,020 gallons per minute (gpm) of seepage through the north, west and northwest flow paths, 1,811 gpm in surface seepage and 209 gpm in groundwater seepage. This Table and accompanying narrative then predicts that during operations, total seepage in these flow paths will incr

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Norrgard

44178

March 13, 2014 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-4025 RE: the PolyMet SDEIS for the Northmet Mining Project Dear Lisa Fay, Federal and State Agency Decision-makers, I am a resident of Bloomington Minnesota, a citizen of Minnesota. I care deeply about the natural environment, birds and other wildlife and human communities of this state. I believe that the SDEIS has shown that this project should not move forward, there are many instances of missing, inadequate, and even false information contained within this document, even with that what is included has proven that this project is too great a risk to our waters, wildlife, air, environment and local communities to move forward and must be denied. 1) I urge that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) find the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the NorthMet Mining Project, incomplete and inadequate due to many shortcomings, detailed in following comments, and that it should be rejected; and 2) I urge the United States Forest Service (USFS) to reject the proposed land exchange as not in the public interest, with reasoning to follow in these comments; and 3) I urge the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to deny the Section 404 permit due to the unacceptable adverse impacts to thousands of acres of wetlands and inadequate replacement plans. Comments: I know much of what I include in my comments you've heard before, from the thousands of other very concerned citizens and those amazing non-profit organizations that have driven and passionate staff looking into this threat with great depth. I wonder and am incredulous that we even "need" to have to try to "convince" our state and federal agencies of the real threats and illogical direction that this and any following sulfide mining projects would be for our state, and all those people and states "down river" from us. You are deciding a future. Your legacy will be far-reaching, either a turn towards a more sane way of living with our natural world, or an irreversible pollution that will be impacting our waters and health "AT LEAST" 500 years into the future. Your legacy will be asking Minnesotans to commit future generations to a significant, persistent pollution risk – I say no. You will be remembered. I know that it might seem far-fetched, foreign thinking for us humans, or even "crazy" to say this, but we need a new future. Industry (and all of us thinking we are beholden to industry) needs to clean up its act. We no longer can accept the destruction of what is left of our natural world if we are to continue to live on a "livable" planet. We are stuck in a paradigm, but it is through our own negligence, possible laziness and lack of knowledge. Well, and the lack of Will from our elected and public leaders. You might think this is far too big of a scope to use for this one project - but it is not. We are now in a tipping point of over-consumption of resources that the 6th mass extinction (http://www.nytimes-com/2014/02/11/science/the-sixth-extinction-looks-at-human-impact-on-the-environment.html._r=0 or just google "The 6th Extinction") and climate change with its melting glaciers and rising water levels, catastrophic fires, droughts, and storms, and everything else that it entails, are really only just symptoms of - a far greater problem. We are using up the planet and cannot continue down this path. Projects, like this one, that bring far more costs, impacts, and destruction than they do value to us and future generations should be stopped. A new scope to use is using creativity and our human ingenuity to create good jobs that do not destroy the health of the people doing them. Period. Do not believe that we cannot do this – we can. And this project is a first step for the iron range and arrowhead region of Minnesota. Our Governor, Legislature, and public agen

Lois Peschel

54749

See attachment

Lois Quam

27456

Attn: Lisa Fay I believe that the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is not adequate to address the potential harm to our northern Minnesota watery environment, and I encourage you to reject it. Lois Quam 6421 James Ave S. Richfield, MN 55423

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Rosenthal

41831

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Schadewald

17363

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lois Schadewald

44190

Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In my view, the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. The proposed site is in a peat bog which is an irreplaceable wetland and I'm concerned about the loss of this wetland and the potential damage to the water surrounding it. I know that Polymet is mandated to address water pollution concerns, but practically speaking how can massive pollution possibly be avoided. You can write anything on paper and state that you have all sorts of contingency plans, but the day to day operations themselves are already toxic enough - how can it be environmentally responsible to extract and grind 1000 pounds of rock for every 3 to 4 pounds of mineral that will be eventually sold (by this company to the highest bidder; the transaction itself taking place from China because that is where they are exporting the enriched material to be smelted). I heard the above information firsthand at the public comment session held in St Paul from a representative for Polymet. I asked him what was the largest percentage of mineral they expected to find and he answered .3 to .4% and then explained it will take 1000 pounds of rock to obtain 3 to 4 pounds of mineral. He also explained that Polymet would enrich the percentage of mineral to around 30% here in Minnesota and then would send the resulting enriched mineral to China (he thought) for smelting because (in his words) the smelting operations in the US were already operating at maximum capacity. Also, how can Polymet be certain that they will be able to protect the environment in the event of another "500 year" flood like the one that just occurred in this area. That type of event is more and more prevalent in these times of changing climate and as far as I can see could only lead to disaster at this mining site. A wetland is about the only natural habitat that could effectively mitigate the damage done by a torrential rain event - and that is exactly what is being put up for destruction with this mining proposal. Also, the Polymet proposal to protect the surrounding water is to place their waste in plastic lined pits and then put barriers to groundwater seepage (if I understand right, this means clay) around it. How is this going to protect anything in the event of torrential rains. There was a disastrous coal ash spill in Tennessee in 2008 that ended up destroying countless miles of rivers and killing entire lakes and another coal ash spill in North Carolina last month. I know that I am mixing the concept of coal ash with mine tailings, but these tailings are going to contain high sulfur content and everything else that has been sequestered in the earth of this peat bog for the last 8,000 years or so. Peat is the precursor to coal, so I believe that the concern of a toxic spill similar to what happened in Tennessee and North Carolina is valid. I have read about the land exchange that would need to occur for this mining to begin, and also about the replacement of wetlands that would be required of Polymet. However, if these proposed replacement wetlands are peatbogs, it's my understanding that they are already protected under state and federal law and should not be acceptable as replacements. If they are not peatbogs, they should not be acceptable as replacements, because bogs like this require thousands of years to form. The idea that anyone could create or restore a peat bog on some other site is laughable. According to Elanne Palcich, writing in MINNPOST on April 29, 2013, "the loss of wetlands for the proposed PolyMet mine (1,400 affected acres) would be the largest single loss in the history of the Army Corps of Engineers." According to the DNR factsheet this wetland provides habitat for the Canada lynx and the northern long-eared bat. I didn't see a mention of the moose in this factsheet, but they will also lose habitat if this land exchange g

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lola S.

16112

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Loni Coppin

54723

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lonie Miesner

15891

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lonie Miesner 912 4th Street S.W. Apartment #11 Forest Lake, MN 55025

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lora Wichser

45467

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("PolyMet SDEIS") fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction of the

Lore Frye

42069

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Lore Frye Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Loree Kalliainen

42453

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please reject the proposal to allow sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. The proximity to both the Boundary Waters and to Lake Superior mean that the risk benefit ratio needs to lean heavily to benefit over risk. The benefits: a relatively small # of jobs for a few decades, maximum, benefit to the mining company's profit. The risks: contamination of 10% of the world's fresh water, long term risk and need for active management (for longer than the US has been a nation), damage to a heritage site. This will not help the residents in the region and has unacceptable risk of harm. Please use common sense and say "no". Sincerely, Dr Loree Kalliainen 7920 Hill Trl N Lake Elmo, MN 55042-9533 (651) 777-2300

Loren Espeland

16164

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Loren Eugene Sharp

54561

I don't trust the mining companies who are trying to further rape the mother earth, for monetary reasons. It sounds like the only thing is that the "mighty buck" prevails over sanity. I have used the BWCAW area for recreational reasons and do care about the area being preserved for our children and grand children and I don't want to leave a deadly legacy.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Loren Loberg

42008

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

lorenz steininger

42425

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr lorenz steininger waldstr. hohewart, None 86558

Loretta Holscher

16717

Thank for responding. Loretta Holscher Sent from my iPad On Feb 18, 2014, at 5:07 PM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lori Andresen

43511

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lori Andresen 3025 E Superior St Duluth, MN 55812

48487

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lori Andresen 3025 E Superior St Duluth, MN 55812

Lori Blauwet

48178

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lori Blauwet 607 Memorial Parkway SW Rochester, MN 55902

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lori Byrne

40965

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Lori Johnson

3573

I urge you to carefully consider any and all mining projects in Minnesota. Our water quality must not be jeopardized for a few mining jobs. The BWCA and Lake Superior are more important than the mining and the jobs it will bring. I am a home owner in the west Metro and in Ely, MN. I have a vested interest in the economy and future of both areas. This interest leads me to object to mining that has even a chance of harming our environment and water quality. Please preserve our environment for the future.. Delores Johnson 4331 Highland Road, Minnetonka, MN 55345 lori@sandlor-com 952-935-3961

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lori Johnson

6275

Regarding the PolyMet Mining Proposal As a home owner in both Ely and Minnetonka, I have evaluated the PolyMet proposed mining from both the Iron Range and Metropolitan prospective. From those positions I conclude that this mining would NOT be beneficial to Minnesota. I believe it would do more harm than good.. It would greatly benefit an international company, permanently scare the landscape, provide only a few jobs for a short time, and forever destroy Minnesota's water quality. There are just no proven and time tested methods to treat the amount of acid that needs to be processed over such a long period of time. Once the water quality is gone, no amount of money and "insurance" from PolyMet will bring it back. The few jobs that it would bring to the Ely area would be drastically over shadowed by the NEGATIVE impact the PolyMet Mining operation would have on Minnesota, Lake Superior, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and surrounding area lakes. Please do not jeopardize our water quality for a short 20-30 year gain. Once our water is polluted, it will never again be reclaimed. We will no longer be the "Land of Lakes" but only a range of polluted ponds. Please preserve and save our water quality at the highest level. Delores Johnson - HYPERLINK "mailto:lori@sandlor-com"lori@sandlor-com - 952-935-3961 4331 Highland Road, Minnetonka, MN 55345 9 West Harvey Street, Ely, MN 555731 Information from ESET Smart Security, version of virus signature database 9293 (20140115) The message was checked by ESET Smart Security. <http://www.eset-com>

Lori Olinger

45007

Lori Olinger 25 Deer Hills Drive North Oaks, MN 55127 651-490-0769 I would like to submit the following comments regarding the SDEIS for the PolyMet Mining Project: Wild Rice: A wild rice-sulfate study was recently released that could result in a change in the state's current level of 10 parts per million sulfate in waters that hold wild rice stands. I think the permit should not be issued to PolyMet until the decision is made regarding current limits and whether or not they should be updated. If a permit is given to PolyMet, it should include a provision that PolyMet would have to meet the current standards, even if they are changed by the PCA after the PolyMet permit is issued. I am also concerned that 10 taconite mines currently do not meet the current standard The DNR Wild Rice Fact sheet stated that PolyMet would monitor both groundwater and surface water. An organization other than PolyMet should also have responsibility for monitoring groundwater and surface water so that any problems be identified and mitigated as soon possible. If PolyMet does a good job monitoring, that is great but a separate group should also verify since so much is at stake with this project. There are many examples of pollution problems that were not identified early and resulted in significant pollution problems The Wild Rice Fact sheet also stated that the PolyMet project would be expected to increase concentrations in the Partridge River but only by .1 percent over existing levels. The current level in the Partridge River is currently above the required limit. PolyMet should not be allowed to contribute to the problem with the Partridge River even if it is expected to be a small amount. The tribe has sovereign authority, under the Clean Water Act, to protect its wild rice from mining pollution. This project should not move forward if there is going to be any negative impact on wild rice. Flambeau: When I asked a DNR official if there were examples of copper mines that have not caused pollution problems, he replied that Flambeau is one example of a successful sulfide mining operation. All of the articles that I have read regarding Flambeau are similar to these comments from the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. clip_image001 clip_image002 Here is another article from the Duluth News Tribune. clip_image003 When I hear that Flambeau is an example of a successful sulfide mining operation, I am very concerned that the DNR is not being realistic about the problems that can and will occur. Flambeau is a much smaller operation than PolyMet and was open for only 4 years. There are a lot of examples of sulfide mine operations that are now Superfund sites. \$80 million has been spent at the Butte – Silver Bow Creek site and work is not complete. At the Berkeley Pit in Butte , Montana, the mine was operated by Anaconda Copper and then by ARCO until it closed in 1982 and the water pumps shut down. Now the pit has become a tourist attraction as one of the largest Superfund sites in the country. The pit is a mile long and water level continues to rise and threatens the water table. Before approving the PolyMet permit, the DNR should take a field trip to Butte to see first-hand the result of copper mining. Talk to the residents of Butte. Ask about the long-term financial impact it has had. They certainly never expected anything like that to happen there. I would hate to have something similar happen in Minnesota. The PolyMet site is in a water rich part of the country that is subjected to freeze and thaw conditions. This will cause extreme challenges to be able to prevent pollution. What can go wrong, will go wrong. With so much at stake this project needs to ensure that every possibility is covered and the worst expected so that we can prevent the worst from actually happening. I am a concerned Minnesotan who wants to ensure that we don't overestimate the benefits of this project and underes

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lori Petree

41639

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Not just Minnesotans, but people from all over the country are very concerned with protecting clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. No mining company exists with sufficient funding to cover the astronomical costs that this cleanup will entail. Mining companies are likely to claim bankruptcy rather than ensure responsible ongoing reclamation. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to REJECT this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. My husband and children have canoed this area with their Boy Scout troop, and desperately would like to see it preserved for future generations. Sincerely, Mrs Lori Petree 8308 S Alsab Trl Evergreen, CO 80439-6311 (303) 674-7353

Lori Rosenthal

30769

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. And while Republicans believe that clean up responsibility is nothing to address it is of the utmost importance to have those discussions now rather than dump millions of dollars on to the tax payer. One crystal clear option to avoid all of this mess is to stop the project NOW. Not one job is worth the toxic environmental devastation that PolyMet and NorthMet will surely bring to our state. We depend on you to protect our waters and uphold the laws/regulations already in place to do so. Sincerely, Lori Rosenthal 3936 N Enchanted Dr NW Andover, MN 55304-2316

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lori Steckervetz

40060

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Loriann Wright Gumm

47032

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Loriann Wright Gumm 6451 w bell road apt 1112 glendale, AZ 85308

47033

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Loriann Wright Gumm 6451 w bell road apt 1112 glendale, AZ 85308

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lorie Badiyan

41741

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lorraine Blaszcak

40330

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Lorraine Blaszcak 20 Potash Road Oakland, NJ 07436 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lorraine Delehanty

40377

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Lorraine E Johnson

57239

Expect bankruptcy at end of PolyMet operations. It's what they do, put it on the people of the state to clean things up! Leave the precious metals in the earth. We don't need PolyMet!Lorraine E. Johnson2006 Adirondack StDuluth, MN 55811

Lorraine Norrgard

42661

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lorraine Redig

39242

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

LORRAINE Stofa

40635

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs LORRAINE Stofa 4464 Rue Elgin Pierrefonds, QC H9H 1V2 (514) 555-1212

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lorrie Ogren

43264

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Lorrie Ogren 300 w main c6 Northboro, MA 01532

Lory Fedo

18182

My name is Lory Fedo. Lory, L-O-R-Y. Fedo, F-E-D-O. I am the president of the Hibbing Area Chamber of Commerce. I was not paid to be here. And I live 30 miles south of the PolyMet mining site. I want to thank all the chambers that are here this evening. Shout out to the trades. Thank you for being here in support of this project. I grew up in a small mining town. All the mines closed when I was in grade school, and I saw my community dwindle to one-third of its population. City leaders struggled to bring in tourism and wood products jobs; but wages and investments of those businesses could not replace the mining and industry jobs. As we now know, it takes all types of businesses to build a healthy economy. Growing up there was hard and I have spent much of my life praying for the day we can safely mine while protecting our environment so that we can rebuild our communities. That day has come. Like many others here, I trust the science behind the SDEIS and many thousands of hours of research that have gone into it. I believe in our DNR and I trust my friends and neighbors who work in multiple government agencies and are a part of the SDEIS work team. Gosh I'm nervous. My personal message is more direct. The word "jobs" has become political jargon. A word that's on a candidate's brochure. It no longer has a face. I would like to talk about the faces behind the jobs that will be created and the faces of those who will benefit. Like the face of an ironworker who has been struggling and is collecting unemployment and trying to pay his heating bill. He does not want to move to the Dakotas and may not have to if PolyMet is a go. Or the face of a grandmother who lives alone because her children have moved to other parts of the country for work. Mine. If this job goes, her oldest grandchild hopes to move back home to get a job at the mine and help out. Or the face of children on the Iron Range who love where they live and want mom and dad to live here forever so they can fish, swim, and ski. Most of them will likely need to move out of the area for work without more jobs on the horizon. Or the thoughtful faces of scientists, geologists, and engineers who want to move their families here so they can work on this very exciting project. Or the face of a main-street clothier who fears he will need to close his store because of dwindling sales. The possibility of this project brings him hope. And finally, the hundreds of faces of people across the state of Minnesota who could be destined for poverty. With the jobs that this project could provide many would learn a trade, would work and feed their families, and contribute to a community. Sometimes we forget the faces in the midst of all the media hype and drama. I'm just asking that we remember them as we move forward and that we move on with this project so they can get to work. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lou Ferreri

4534

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager From: Louis Ferreri [HYPERLINK "x-apple-data-detectors://2"1245 Fairmount Ave](#) [HYPERLINK "x-apple-data-detectors://2"St Paul, MN 55105](#) What current jobs could be lost as a result of environmental changes. For instance, will tourism be disrupted by changes in land use and traffic in the region. What is the potential economic impact of a percentage decrease in tourism. What other livelihoods could decline as a result of changes in lands and waters. For instance, could fisheries decline. Could wild rice stands decrease. If so, to what extent. What is the estimated cost of building and maintaining the public infrastructure to support this project. For example, who builds roads and pays for maintenance. Who pays for public services to support workers and families moving to the area. What, if any, portion of this expense has PolyMet been asked to cover. If not, why not. What, if any, guarantee has PolyMet made to ensure that Minnesotans will be hired for mining work. Will they be union workers. What will be the wage differential between the highest paid executives and the lowest paid workers. Before granting any permits will the State of Minnesota make its own estimate of financial reassurance. And if so, will it be more in line with the Grand Portage Band of Ojibwe's estimate of \$90-5 billion set aside at the outset. If not, why not. Why would the State of Minnesota assume the risk of permitting a hard-rock mine when not a single one has ever operated without gross pollution. What is the specific cost/benefit analysis. Because PolyMet says water pollution will last at least 500 years and millions of gallons of polluted seepage will enter groundwater each year, the State of Minnesota will be accepting risks for at least seven generations of Minnesotans if it permits this mining operation. What is the specific cost/benefit analysis that justifies this long-term risk. PolyMet calls for at least 500 years of treatment of polluted water. Minnesota Rules require the site to be maintenance-free at closure. Does this mean PolyMet will be keeping the mine open for at least 500 years. What company—national or international—has been around for at least 500 years. How can financial assurance exist if a company no longer exists. What laws, international and national, might prevent PolyMet from going bankrupt, closing its doors, or otherwise failing to meet the terms of this agreement. Sent from my iPad

Louis Asher

15741

See attachment

18255

My name is Louis Asher, Vadnais Heights, Minnesota. What I want to say is that it is absolutely insanity to assume that we can trade a few hundred jobs over twenty years for an eternity of pollution, and that's what it is going to be. I worked at 3M for 39 years and there is a few things that I learned there as a statistician and researcher. And one of the biggest things that I learned was that you can't make up facts. You take the data and then you take the information and you create real facts. That's how a company stays in business and that's why 3M is such a great company. PolyMet is lying through their teeth and I'm just disgusted by the whole thing. Thank you very much for listening. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louis Asher

19878

Across the country, there is no example where a sulfide mine has been operated and closed without polluting surface or groundwater with acid mine drainage, sulfuric acid and/or toxic metals. The risk of pollution is greatest in a water-rich environment like Northern Minnesota, which contains watersheds for the Boundary Waters Wilderness, Lake Superior and the Mississippi River basin. The PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine is the first sulfide mine proposed in Minnesota. Pollution from this project would impact the Lake Superior watershed. Based on PolyMet's recent technical documents: •PolyMet's open-pit sulfide mine would impact as much as 8,000 acres of high quality wetlands. These wetlands ensure clean water and protect fishing in the St Louis River and Lake Superior. This would be the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. •The ore is very lean, so more than 99% of the rock that is dug out of PolyMet's open pit mine will end up as waste. •PolyMet's sulfide mine would create a permanent waste rock heap of 168,000,000 tons and dump 228,000,000 tons of tailings on top of a tailings basin that is already leaking and violating water quality standards. •Pollutants from PolyMet's waste rock heaps, mine pits and tailings dump are likely to seep, leak and propagate through fractures in rock. These pollutants include arsenic, lead, manganese and mercury, which harm human health, as well as sulfates and metals that are toxic to wild rice or aquatic species. •Pollutants at the PolyMet mine site and tailings dump would exceed water quality standards for 500 hundred years if not eternity. •PolyMet is suggesting that it will treat some of its mining pollution essentially forever – using untested technology. •Glencore, a global commodities giant with a record of environmental, financial, and human and worker rights violations, now owns about 34-9% of PolyMet and is likely to own more. In its merger with Xstrata, Glencore committed to provide copper concentrate to China for the next 8 years. Metals and profits would go abroad, leaving pollution for local communities. Benefits to the community. PolyMet claims it would hire a few hundred local residents at the mine. The mine is currently proposed to operate for 20 years. This will be followed by an eternity of pollution. Sincerely yours, Louis Asher 4525 Birch Ridge Road Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

Louis B Asher

42847

See attachment

57168

The history of sulfide mining is one of toxic environmental degradation. There is no evidence that sulfide mining can be done without great environmental damage – especially in a water-rich area such as NE Minnesota. Louis B. Asher 4525 Birch Ridge Rd Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

Louis Hilgemann

27340

Dear project manager, I have some serious concerns with with Polymet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. First, the SDEIS doesn't take into account the cumulative effects of all the sulfide ore mining proposals and expansions of mines in the area. This cumulative effect will have a much large impact than this one specific project, and needs to be addressed in the final EIS. Also, the model used for analyzing the impact on water quality is completely erroneous. This model doesn't use the actual hydrology of the area. it is based on a much lower water quantity than truly exists, and does not account for major rain events which are sure to continue into the future (recent Duluth flood). These issues need to be addressed in the final Polymet EIS statement. Sincerely, Louis Hilgemann 3006 Woodland St Ames, IA 50014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louis Hilgemann

27584

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Louis Hilgemann Louis Hilgemann 3006 Woodland St Ames, IA 50010

49516

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Louis Hilgemann Louis Hilgemann 3006 Woodland St Ames, IA 50010

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louis Hoerr

39228

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I think it important to inform you that the reason my wife and I moved here from Missouri is in fact due to the BWCAWA. We drove many hours, that first time 30 years ago to spend a week enjoying the unspoiled pristine wilderness. We decided after that trip to live in Mpls. She asked for and received a transfer by Ralsto Purina Corp. and here we are in 2014 with no plans of moving to any other place in no small part due to our state's historically unique strong environmental positions. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Louis Hoerr 5906 W 39th St St Louis Park, MN 55416-2840 (612) 710-2278

Louis Kirkbride

41782

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louis Lelchuk

18891

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Louis Lelchuk 3943 Bryant Ave S. Apt. 9 Minneapolis, MN 55409 6128248240

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louise Dahlgren

17208

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Louise Dahlgren 6201 Magda Drive Maple Grove, MN 55369

50474

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Louise Dahlgren 6201 Magda Drive Maple Grove, MN 55369

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Louise Waddick

16293

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Lowell Harp

32909

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely,
Lowell Harp 209 S 7th St Oregon, IL 61061-1701 (815) 732-3953

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lowell Johnson

39559

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Luann LaValley

15794

To Lisa Fay, I'm writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. First, I want to express my confidence in your agency to thoroughly evaluate the project and its ability to mitigate potential environmental impacts. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, I'd like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out – all the more reason to support it. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws – some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country. Minnesota is home to a world-class deposit of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium and gold. This is an economic opportunity right below our feet that will benefit the state's economy for future generations. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. This project would mean 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state needs. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts has been completed. Although I am from a neighboring state I do work in Minnesota and have been following this project. I see the value of adding these jobs into our region. Luann LaValley 1501 N 76th Street Superior, WI 54880

Luca Rossetto Casel

40402

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Luca Rossetto Casel via Torino, 286 – 10050 Sant'Antonino di Susa (Torino) Sant'Antonino di Susa, ot 10050 IT

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lucas Lundgren 43732

I have worked as a geologist for the past 4 years, and I was fortunate enough to start my career working for PolyMet. At the end of 2009 I graduated from UMD and was hired by PolyMet to work on a drilling program for the exploration of the ore body. The experience was invaluable to me. Since the completion of that project I have been on the road working from the mines in Nevada to the oil fields of North Dakota, all the while waiting for the chance to go back to work for PolyMet. There is no company in the world that will be held to such strict environmental standards. Let PolyMet be the model for the rest of the world. Let other students have the opportunity to actually get a job when they graduate, just as I did. Please grant this great company the permit to mine. Thank you, Lucas Lundgren

Lucas Runquist 54353

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager My name is Lucas Runquist. I am a student at Southwest Jr. High, Forest Lake, MN. I am writing this letter to you for a project we are doing in class. I will inform you on my opinion on the PolyMet Mining Inc. project. I hope you can find it useful! First off, I would like to clarify that this company has an excellent plan in place. It would benefit our state of Minnesota in several ways. It would be the first one in our state as well. This project could help our economy, and Northern Minnesota's water supply. However, many things would be affected in the process in the making of this project. If we went on through with this project, many natural resources, such as forests, lakes, etc. This would include the land that the Ojibwe people consider sacred. Also, the natural habitats of some species of animals, fish, insects, etc could be damaged. I am aware of the plans that could potentially minimize the effects of these risks. If the DNR is willing to go through with this idea, then I will support them. If they decide not to, I'm all for it! Either way could help shape the future of our beloved state. I hope you found my information useful! Thank you for your time! Sincerely, Lucas Runquist

Lucia Reid 44638

I sincerely hope this project will NOT be allowed. Our environment is being rapidly destroyed by projects similar to this. There are very, very few jobs created and possibly 200+ years of cleanup. EVERYONE who visits Minnesota as well as residents will be exposed to the contamination created. If passed, this will be a serious environmental disaster to land, water and wildlife (who are already in danger). Thank you, Lucia Reid Creativecrystal-com 73 South Palm Avenue #222 Sarasota, FL 34236 941-388-7770 FAX 941-388-7774

Lucinda West 57201

Water's precious, we shouldn't hurt it. That's all. There's many, many details in that, but that's the basis of it. Lucinda West 1507 Chelsea St. St. Paul, MN 55108

Lucy Duroche 42154

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lucy Duroche 3542 4th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-4511

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lucy Knoll

40805

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I send this to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. It is crucial that PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. The wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important water

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lucy Knoll

49934

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lucy Knoll 2580 Kenzie Terr. Minneapolis, MN 55418

Lucy Sedgwick

18366

My name is Lucy Sedgwick. I am giving my time to Howard Markus.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lucy Sedgwick

19529

So my name is Lucy Sedgwick, L-U-C-Y, S-E-D-G-W-I-C-K, and I recently moved to 1722 Princeton Avenue in St. Paul. And I would like to make a statement that this SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved. I'm speaking not only for myself, but also as a staff member of Audubon Minnesota, so I'm also speaking on behalf of our 12,000 members across the State. The reasons that I think it shouldn't be approved is it doesn't provide important information. A lot of the comments that I've heard earlier tonight are talking about how they believe in the science that's being put forward and they trust in the agencies that are putting this forward, and I definitely believe in science, and I definitely believe in the agencies that are doing this, but the proposal as it currently stands is not enough. For instance, PolyMet claims to have made minimized -- claims to have minimized destruction of wetlands in their mining plan. They basically say, "This is the best thing we've got." However, an underground mine would actually disturb far fewer acres to access the ore in the headwaters of the St. Louis River. So in my opinion, the ore should probably sit in the ground until the value rises sufficiently to allow less destructive mining techniques to access the reason PolyMet isn't saying, "Hey, we could go underground and do less damage to our environment" is because, for them, it doesn't make economic sense. Well, in that case, they've clearly not minimized the destruction. If they were actually going to do that, they would go after it in another direction. And this is actually in reference to Section 8, pages 7 through 8, Appendix B and Casco another area that I think is a problem, especially representing Audubon Minnesota, we care deeply about our birds. It's, in fact, in our mission statement. Our mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, focusing on birds, other wildlife and their habitats for the benefits of humanity and the earth's biological diversity. I mention our mission statement because we do have 12,000 members across the State, many of whom have been members for decades and who are literally all over the beautiful State of Minnesota. And right now, I do not think that this SDEIS is sufficient. I don't think that it fully protects and replaces loss of significant habitats and species. For instance, the entire 3,013-acre mine site had been classified by the Minnesota Biological Survey as of high biodiversity significance. So basically, there are two state-endangered, two state-threatened and seven state-special concern plant species that are actually found on the mine site. So six regional forester-sensitive species -- and what that basically means is they're a federal forest plant species of concern. So these are plants that have been identified by the federal government, by the state government to be in trouble -- are found on the mine site, the mine site that PolyMet proposes to completely destroy, and you can find this in SDEIS Section 4, pages 173 through 188. The SDEIS generally describes the impact as too small to be considered significant. Well, if the species were not significant, what the heck are they doing on all of those lists? They're important to people, they're important to our government, to our federal government, to our state government and to the people of Minnesota, and you can see this in Section SDEIS Section 5, pages 339 through 354. The last thing that I want to say, this is coming from me personally. I'm going to have my 25th birthday in a little under a week, and I noticed that a lot of people that were getting up and testifying today were quite a lot older than that. I have a lot of time -- fingers crossed -- left on this planet, and I intend to have kids, and I do not want to bring them into a world where they do not have access to clean drinking water and cannot go out and enjoy the species that I've been able to go out and enjoy through my childhood. So I urge all parties to reject this EIS as it stands. It is insufficient and should be rejected. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lucy Soderstrom

44629

Thank you for accepting my comments on the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. Although I do support a lot of the iron mining currently in Minnesota, copper mining has a much greater environmental impact, and due to the EIS' lapses in addressing serious concerns, I do not support the NorthMet mine. One of the biggest issues is the necessary ongoing treatment of contaminated water after the mine is closed. The model used by the SDEIS measured 200-500 years into the future with no decrease in contamination. Although PolyMet states that it will cover the costs for water treatment, it does not give any explanation as to how the treatment mechanisms will be maintained for hundreds of years. The EIS does not state how long the geomembrane covers and membranes will last, how they will be replaced and what replacement will cost. Neither does it state how long the equipment doing the treatment will last or how that will be replaced. There is no information as to how PolyMet will maintain the physical plant after operations. In general, it doesn't provide adequate information for the public, voters, and regulating agencies to evaluate whether PolyMet will be able to treat contaminated water as projected. In the 2013 Annual Report, Polymet stated it has no experience with mining or treating contaminated, thus the EIS should be required to inform the public in more detail as to how they will maintain water treatment for 500 or more years. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from liability. Furthermore, not all polluted water can be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Mitigation plans for these seepages must be accounted for. Because PolyMet has no mining experience or financial capacity to develop and maintain a copper mine, it is likely that control of their decisions and operations will fall to the established mining entities that will ultimately fund the operations. So why isn't Minnesota requiring that the controlling company to make the commitments needed for such a massive mining operation. Why Glencore Xstrata and other mining giants set up their quasi-affiliates as they do is fully understandable, but that doesn't mean the DNR cannot require clear accountability from named funding entities. It's irresponsible to do otherwise. Glencore Xstrata will be among the primary beneficiaries of permits granted and as such should be the applicant and be subject to legal recourse by the state of MN for any failures to comply with the permits or other violations of law. Not all potential consequences can be anticipated at this point, however, in these circumstances with technology and processes largely untested on this scale, considerably more contingency planning is warranted. For an entity with no mining experience, asking for the immense responsibility of protecting the water rich environment they seek to mine requires greater and more confident planning and demonstrated ability to address inevitable, unexpected breaches in the mitigation mechanisms outlined in the EIS. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseen

Luis Ortega

43987

I would just like to say that I am strongly opposed to the idea of establishing another mine in Minnesota, for a number of reasons. The short-term benefit to the few entities with economic interests in this issue should hold no weight over the right for Minnesotans to keep their environment sustainable and clean. If Polymet has any right to establish this mine, they should be obligated to establish a trust fund (handled by an independent third party and mediated by the state government) to assure that Polymet will act with the highest integrity in their part of stewardship for the environment. Regards, Luis Ortega University of St Thomas | Class of 2014 | Neuroscience Major w/Justice and Peace Studies Minor Hana - Vice President of Operations Maysha - Education Program Director; Research and Evaluation Chair Minneapolis Heart Institute Foundation - Clinical Research Intern Minnesota's Future Doctors Scholar Cell: (612)-382-8358 "The task of leadership is not to put greatness into humanity, but to elicit it, for the greatness is already there." ~John Buchan

Luke Borkenhagen

44688

This is a firm NO on PolyMet. Whatever the facts, whatever happens down the road, one thing is clear: The BWCAW is one of the most beautiful places in the world - and should be protected MORE, not LESS. Thank you. Luke Borkenhagen 2817 Pleasant Ave Minneapolis, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Luke Christenson

47295

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Please don't take a risk at permanently damaging our beautiful natural resoruces in Minnesota - it is an advantage we have in the state that will increase in value over time. It wil reamain a powerful tourism draw int he years ahead. It is why I am proud to be a Minnesota tax payer. All you have to do is travel around the world and look at remanents of the messes they have left behind. It is like the invasive species - once here no going back - but at a more massive and dangerous scale. I love our lakes - fishing and incredible beauty of the north woods - as a proud taxpayer I am counting on you to protect them for our next generations. Sincerely Luke Christenson Luke Christenson 12309 Fiona Ave N. White Bear Lake, MN 55110 651-260-4760

Luke Jacobs

38716

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Luke Jacobs 411 S. 9th St Bird Island, MN 55310 (218) 393-0276

Luke Johnson

18299

My name is Luke Johnson. I am from Minneapolis, Minnesota. My stance on this issue is pro jobs. I am a 26-year-old, unemployed, and I represent some of the 44 percent of young Americans between the age of 18 and 28 who are under employed. This includes any job that is not directly related or requires their degree or qualifications of study. 360 jobs is not an adequate amount for any project, for me to consider it beneficial for my age group. A small fraction of the 360 will be Minnesotan jobs. I recently worked in Nicaragua for four months on a fisheries project and a freshwater lake system. I am very familiar with the concept of exporting environmental externalities. However, I feel it is our responsibility to utilize the full effect of our Environmental Impact Statement to reciprocate for the externalities that we are exporting. And one of the full force aspects of the Environmental Impact Statement should be exercising 23 the full 180-day review process. I think those are two good points. Cool. Thanks.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Luke Johnson 39438

---Original Message--- From: luke.warrenjohnson@gmail-com [mailto:luke.warrenjohnson@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 9:30 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR)
Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: Before I am able to adequately assess the full potential of this proposed mining project, and the many others soon to follow if this project is approved, I and every other Minnesotan need to see an adequate environmental review. A) The DNR has not allowed sufficient time for third parties, other than those hired through Polymet and/or DNR, to model and measure the projected water quality impacts. A 200 year hydrologic model should be vetted by numerous experts from a number of different parties and interests. No other agency, person, or organization has had the time to check whether or not the 200 year model is accurate and sufficient. A 90 day public comment period is too short. The public, including other experts, need more time to fully process these proposed benefits and impacts. B) The GIS maps used in the 100 mile swamp are wrong. The shapefiles in the SDEIS used to delineate the supposed USGS 100 mile swamp are not correctly georeferenced nor do the UTM's of the waypoints match those any other literature on this 100 mile swamp area. Thus DNR should correct its swamp delineation in order to more precisely predict the potential swamp impacts. C) Minnesota is dramatically changing because of climate change and this project will contribute to the root of the problem: greenhouse gas emissions. D) At age 26, I am unemployed and living in my Mom's basement. I encourage new job growth. As a fish biologist and GIS technician I may be eligible to gain employment from this Polymet project, though very unlikely due to the small number of projected jobs created. The type of boom bust development this project embodies is part of the reason my generation suffers a 26% unemployment rate. I would rather pay more taxes now, on the little income I make, to fund sustainable economic development in Northeast Minnesota. This is a much better alternative than me, my children, grandchildren, or great children paying for the inevitable restoration and cleanup efforts that will someday be required. This project is not sustainable growth and will do more harm than good. Sincerely, Luke Johnson 253 Washburn Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55405

Luke Laaveg 6334

Dear Ms Fay, Look, this obviously isn't going to work. I can certainly see the immediate benefits of this plan. Since when, though, has Minnesota ever been one to act on immediate financial impulse by way of throwing the health of it's people, environment, and pride by the wayside. This is an awful decision. Please understand the depth of disaster this permit can create for centuries to come. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Luke Laaveg Luke Laaveg 612 16th St Apt 1 Des Moines, IA 50309

Luke Peterson 6076

A responsible approach to mining should be followed in the State of Minnesota. This approach balances responsibility to the environment we all enjoy and job creation and economic growth. I applaud the DNR for following this balanced approach and leaving emotional, political, and unsubstantiated rhetoric outside of the approval of the EIS. Congratulations on a leading the state in a collaborative process that will continue to move our State forward in responsible mining. The right results, the right way. Sincerely, Luke J. Peterson 12577 West Skyline Parkway Duluth, MN 55810 Luke J. Peterson Financial Analyst - ALLETE, Inc. E-mail: ljpeterson@allete-com Tel: (218) 355-3216

Lura and Daniel Anderson 54668

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lura Wilson

21029

Dear Lisa, I'm writing in hopes that the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine project gets denied. If this project goes through it will destroy this beautiful wilderness that we enjoy and need, including jobs. This area depends highly on tourism. My husband and I run a small lodging business and a Bed and Breakfast where people come from all over the world to enjoy. If Polymet is allowed to mine it will destroy our business and many others. Tourism in this area will last a life time where the mining project, if allowed, will only provide temporary jobs and potentially ruin the landscape FOREVER. I have heard the plans for clean up but that will cost our children and grandchild dearly and realistically there is no guarantee that the destruction caused by mining can be cleaned up. I personal believe we will lose the beauty for ever along with many jobs if this project comes to fruition. SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy thousands of acres of wetlands in the Superior National forest not to mention our drinking water, wildlife, including moose whose population is already at risk, birds, fish, and eventually even our big Lake Superior That is incredibly sad. PLEASE reject the PolyMet's Open Pit sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable negative impacts that will permanently destroy this beautiful area. Sincerely, Lura Wilson 6125 Highway 1 Silver Bay, Mn. 55614 218-353-0346 Lura Wilson

21033

Dear Doug, I'm writing in hopes that the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine project gets denied. If this project goes through it will destroy this beautiful wilderness that we enjoy and need, including jobs. This area depends highly on tourism. My husband and I run a small lodging business and a Bed and Breakfast where people come from all over the world to enjoy. If Polymet is allowed to mine it will destroy our business and many others. Tourism in this area will last a life time where the mining project, if allowed, will only provide temporary jobs and potentially ruin the landscape FOREVER. I have heard the plans for clean up but that will cost our children and grandchild dearly and realistically there is no guarantee that the destruction caused by mining can be cleaned up. I personal believe we will lose the beauty for ever along with many jobs if this project comes to fruition. SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy thousands of acres of wetlands in the Superior National forest not to mention our drinking water, wildlife, including moose whose population is already at risk, birds, fish, and eventually even our big Lake Superior That is incredibly sad. PLEASE reject the PolyMet's Open Pit sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable negative impacts that will permanently destroy this beautiful area. Sincerely, Lura Wilson 6125 Highway 1 Silver Bay, Mn. 55614 218 353-0346

49797

Dear Mr Tim I'm writing in hopes that the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine project gets denied. If this project goes through it will destroy this beautiful wilderness that we enjoy and need, including jobs. This area depends highly on tourism. My husband and I run a small lodging business and a Bed and Breakfast where people come from all over the world to enjoy. If Polymet is allowed to mine it will destroy our business and many others. Tourism in this area will last a life time where the mining project, if allowed, will only provide temporary jobs and potentially ruin the landscape FOREVER. I have heard the plans for clean up but that will cost our children and grandchild dearly and realistically there is no guarantee that the destruction caused by mining can be cleaned up. I personal believe we will lose the beauty for ever along with many jobs if this project comes to fruition. SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy thousands of acres of wetlands in the Superior National forest not to mention our drinking water, wildlife, including moose whose population is already at risk, birds, fish, and eventually even our big Lake Superior That is incredibly sad. PLEASE reject the PolyMet's Open Pit sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable negative impacts that will permanently destroy this beautiful area. Sincerely, Lura Wilson 6125 Highway 1 Silver Bay, Mn. 55614 Lura Wilson

Lydia Holsten

42152

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lydia Holsten 6400 Smithtown Rd Excelsior, MN 55331-8211 (952) 474-5780

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lydia Kulesov

15414

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lydia Morken

16630

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lydia Morken 2313 141ST LN NE ANDOVER, MN 55304

50018

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lydia Morken 2313 141ST LN NE ANDOVER, MN 55304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lydia Neus

54197

I will not write this letter with the message that I do not understand the reasons for which you chose to let the mining commence in the Boundary Waters. I get it, but the future possibilities of what may come from this new reality is both shocking and fear inducing. Though this may bring jobs to the area (for a time) and may increase the amount of metals, at what cost is this happening to my world? The Boundary Waters are an escape for many. A safe haven where the land is untouched by the damaging hand of man and where the beauty of nature is purely exposed. As a person unable to visit it is daunting that adults can make decisions like this that may begin a domino affect changing the lives of many, possibly my own, as well as those of my offspring. Think not only if solving an issue, think of how this may hurt the children of tomorrow. The beginning of this sulfuric mining will degrade not only the water supply, but also the tourism that the area often depends on. If this area is changed astronomically and the jobs produced may not last. There is not a long term solution, their "solution" will only lead to more problems. The water in the Boundary Waters is one of our state's purest watersheds and the world only has .024% of the total water supply that is easily drinkable. Are you really willing to risk the purity of this resource and necessity to human life? I only ask that you think of how this decision will change the lives of so many down the road. One day people will be wondering what in the world possessed you to make this decision. It will go down in history though for its hurt and not its aid.

Lyle Bradley

18168

Good evening. I was wrong when I came down here. I told the guys there would be a very small crowd tonight because of the cold weather. In Minnesota weather doesn't seem to bother us. I worked for the Smithsonian Institute several years ago when they came to Minnesota. And I remember one of the saying, "I can't believe it. You have more people out for this program than in Los Angeles." People in Minnesota are concerned about history and the environment. So I want to congratulate everyone that came tonight. I'm a half-lifer. I spent half of my life in Iowa and half of my life in Minnesota. Don't hold that against me. But in Iowa if you don't deal with agriculture, you don't get very far. In Minnesota we have such a tremendous diversity of jobs and so on that we cover the whole gamut. And that I think is a real congratulatory thing for Minnesota. Let's keep it up. Half of my half life I spent in the Marine Corps. And half of my life I spent teaching kids in high school. And I look at that past history that I've had and I feel that I spent part of my life protecting this country and part of my life protecting the future with good generations. And we have a lot of good scientists coming up. I've been involved with science all the way through my college and work schedule. And I've been very concerned because this particular project is going to load us with things that are not very good. Sulfide mining brings sulfuric acid. Have you ever tried swimming in sulfuric acid? Now not only sulfuric acid but also from sulfide mining we get a lot of other good ones, like a little mercury and a little so on. So this is something that is of great concern to me, because when I'm thinking about future generations -- I have five of my own kids plus the thousands of kids that I taught -- we should give them as good an environment as is possible to have; and we cannot do it when we are going to pollute our area with some of these very powerful chemicals. We have to take care of people's jobs. And I lived through the 1930's when we had the interesting job markets, the people standing in food lines, and so on. I know what that is about. But we can handle this thing. Jobs are short lived. Water is long lived.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lyle Brandt

39073

---Original Message--- From: Lbrandt@uspsioig-gov [mailto:Lbrandt@uspsioig-gov] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 8:02 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Lyle Brandt 5820 Amy Ln Maple Plain, MN 55359-9303

43217

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Lyle Brandt 5820 Amy Lane Maple Plain, MN 55359

Lyle Raustadt

12837

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, Be carefull with any waste. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr Lyle Raustadt 5250 Colfax Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55430-3573

Lyle Salmi

15241

To Whom it may Concern: This project is way too risky for the potential to pollute our cherished lakes and streams To consider trading 20 years of jobs for 500 years or more of pollution is not acceptable, nor does it make good sense. The so-called assurances from the DNR for the parent company to provide .what specifically are they. In most instances, the parent company pillages the resources, then leaves. Holding them responsible for long term cleanup is impossible, since after they make their profits, they will file for bankruptcy protection. So who then pays. Us the taxpayers, to clean up the mess, if it can even be restored. The companies go off in search of another area of the world to exploit. Enough is Enough. P.S. I own a cabin on Bear Island Lake that has been in my family since 1962- I do not wish to see this area become a corporate wasteland. Sincerely, Lyle J. Salmi 11 Lincoln Place Decatur IL 62522

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lyn Pegg

39071

---Original Message--- From: carolynpegg@yahoo-com [mailto:carolynpegg@yahoo-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 8:37 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Lyn Pegg 1335 Minnesota Ave Duluth, MN 55802-2425

Lyn Yount

46868

To whom it may concern, Please do not authorize PolyMet's draft mine plan. There is too much at stake to accept a plan that does not take into account, and will damage the health of Minnesotan citizens, will cause damage to already stressed Lynx and Moose populations as well as other wildlife, and will poison and destroy wetlands, forest and our water table. We don't want more air and water pollution, and even if PolyMet does manage to provide so called "safeguards" against large scale mercury or asbestos disasters, no mine is able to cause no pollution. Every water source, table, creek, lake, pond, and wetland in the area of the mine will be affected, with wide reaching effects to the aquifer. Whether from direct pollution and chemical runoff or spills, or poisoned by the chemicals in the air from the machines and mining extraction processes, Minnesota's water will be harmed, and the people, animals and plants that depend on it as well. PolyMet will make a great deal of money, share a comparatively small amount with their "new employees," and leave Minnesota scarred, dirty, with centuries of cleanup, especially water treatment, untold health issues, and with all the bills. We've seen this happen in the south, in the Smoky Mountains, in the west, in Canada and the northeast The mining companies take, and leave devastation behind, and the money leaves with the business. This is unacceptable. Please direct our new jobs, corporate business developments, and state monetary development programs toward renewable, sustainable, environmentally healthy, green businesses. Thank you, Lyn Yount CTS (Certified Technology Specialist) Technical Support/Customer Service Milestone AV Technologies HYPERLINK "mailto:lyn.yount@milestone-com"lyn.yount@milestone-com P +1-952-225-6879 http://www.milestone-com/ cid:image002-jpg@01CAABF1-05A83C20please consider our environmental responsibility before printing this email

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynda Dahl

41886

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Lynda Dahl White Bear Township, Minnesota

Lynda Fedeler

38129

Mar 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Lynda Fedeler 5977 Eagle Lake Rd Duluth, MN 55803-9744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynda Haemig

41660

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Lynda McDonnell

39771

Dear state evaluator, I am not a scientist, but I have read enough about the potential damage the PolyMet mine could do to Minnesota's water and wetland resources that I urge you not to approve this project and related ones that could follow. Sulfide mining releases acid and heavy metals that harm aquatic plants, fish and waterfowl. And there's a great risk that the damage and cost of clean-up could far exceed the value of several dozen jobs for 20 years. I recognize that northeastern Minnesota badly needs good jobs for its people and communities. But increased spending for high-speed internet service and other strategic investments seems far wiser and more productive than authorizing a mining project that could endanger our water, forests, animals and people. Sincerely, Lynda McDonnell 3916 Pleasant Av. S. Minneapolis, Mn. 55409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynda Pauling 40441

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a big concern. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. The PolyMet SDEIS is an inadequate assessment of human health impacts and the PolyMet sulfide mine and mine wastes proposal poses an unacceptable risk to the health of fetuses, infants, children and adults in Minnesota. Please reject both the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet mine. Very truly yours, Lynda Pauling 5812 Olene Ave N Oak Park Heights, MN 55082

Lynda Withbroe 43040

Lynda and George Withbroe 6943 Newbury Road Woodbury, MN 55125 March 9, 2014 Dear Ms. Fey, I am writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet mine's proposal / mine in one of our state's greatest natural resources, the BWCA. As fairly new residents of Minnesota, my husband and I have visited the BWCA. We have read and researched the dreadful consequences of permitting this company to damage our land and water. Only 360 jobs will be created while hundreds of years of damage will result. Sincerely, Lynda Withbroe

54776

See attachment

Lynden Gerdes 36800

Please find my comments to the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange attached. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Lynden Gerdes 10566 Hwy. 1 Isabella, MN 55607 Lisa Fay SDEIS Manager, MN DNR Email: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us CC: Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Email: Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil CC: Tim Dabney US Forest Service Email: TDabney@fs.fed.us CC: Ken Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 Email: westlake.kenneth@epa-gov Lynden Gerdes lbgerdes@frontier-com

40963

Dear Lisa et al., Please accept the attached comments on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Thank you, Lynden Gerdes lbgerdes@frontier-com Lynden B. Gerdes 10566 Highway 1 Isabella, MN 55607 CC: Douglas Bruner US Army Corps of Engineers Email: Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil CC: Deputy Forest Supervisor Richard Periman US Forest Service Email: rperiman@fs.fed.us CC: Ken Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 Email: westlake.kenneth@epa-gov

Lynette Peterson 54490

The long term health effects of allowing the mining proposed by Polymet are substantial. More research is needed as well as more answers. As a health care professional and a resident of Minnesota, I ask that another look be taken at the short and long term effects of PolyMet being allowed to mine in Minnesota.

Lynn Bishop 38803

Dear Readers: In addition to the jobs it will create and the boost to the overall economy, this project will demonstrate a cleaner way of mining nickel for mines all over the world to follow. Lynette Bishop 4945 Jamilee Dr Hermantown, MN 55811

Lynn Boggie 54694

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn C. Lang

39566

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

42460

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lynn C. Lang 1721 Polaris Ct Saint Cloud, MN 56303-1375 (320) 202-0341

42461

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Lynn C. Lang 1721 Polaris Ct Saint Cloud, MN 56303-1375 (320) 202-0341

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn Clark Pegg 42597

See attachment

Lynn Erkelenz 21783

Hi -This is Lynn with Midwest Radio in Hibbing - can someone contact me. 263-7531

Lynn Evenson 3524

Dear Folk, As a resident of Ely, please accept my comments of profound concern regarding PolyMet's most recent attempt at an Environmental Impact Statement. My father's apt observation, "Figures don't lie, but liars figure" continues to echo in my head. PolyMet plays fast and loose with established, verifiable facts, including the biggest drawback to their proposal: nowhere in the world, at no time, in no way, has acid mine drainage been successfully contained long term. It cannot be done; this has been proven beyond any doubt. PolyMet's constant attempts to distract us from this glaringly obvious hazard do nothing to enhance their credibility. I have long since dismissed their promises to do better this time as so much hot air. This type of mine waste cannot be contained. It is that simple and that black-and-white. The companies involved in sulfide mining know this; that's why they dissolve, go bankrupt (they say) or otherwise disappear when things look like they're about to go wrong. That way, they can never be held accountable (read, made to pay to clean up their mess) for the widely documented disasters they leave behind when they close their mines. Take the money and run, indeed. No, PolyMet is not to be trusted. Yes, we need jobs, but not these jobs, which may or may not even be offered to my friends and neighbors. If one mine is drilled, and its waste problems spring one leak, the Boundary Waters and our drinking water are ruined. This too-long-standing conflict is having an impact on Ely, as well. Hostility is common, an ugly fact of life in a small town. As bad if not worse, rumors abound in the outside world that we're an armed camp up here; that mines are already operating and fouling the Boundary Waters; and it's shrinking our tourist business. At the moment, that's what's keeping us alive, and it's beginning to wheeze and stumble thanks to bad, inaccurate publicity. I blame the mining companies for this state of affairs. A local organization sells yard signs saying, " We support mining and clean water. We can have both." All the evidence, all of it, says otherwise. Please stand with the EPA and force PolyMet to do the right thing: go away. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Ms Lynn Evenson 206 E. James St Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn Evenson

41670

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn Glesne

41701

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

lynn grano

11238

2014 February 6, 2014 Attention: Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 RE: Public / Written Comment re the PolyMet Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Dear Ms Fay, Please submit / include the herein comments to the public record regarding PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mining project and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("SDEIS"). If one wants to quickly grasp the inherent absurdity of the proposed project, all that's required is to ask a simple question, namely-'what financial assurance instruments in operation in the year 1514 still function today.' Answer, none. Take a little 500-year trip down history's memory lane: Columbus has only recently landed in San Salvador; Ferdinand Magellan is meandering the Pacific in his wooden boat for the Portuguese; King Henry VIII is dispatching wives while Thomas More is writing "Utopia"; Luther hasn't started the Reformation yet, and another 65 years must transpire before William Shakespeare could start writing sonnets. More to the point, neither the United States dollar, nor any other present currency, exists. There is no United States Treasury to issue bonds, or Munich Re, AIG, or Lloyds of London to provide surety, project insurance bonds, or any other type of 'financial assurance'. And yet the proposed PolyMet project assumes a level of "financial assurance" stability going forward over the next 500 years that has never existed in history, or for even much shorter durations of time. Need anyone be reminded, within just the past 5 years, one of the largest providers of such "financial assurances" products, the American International Group ("AIG"), only staved off bankrupt ruin and closure because the federal government bailed the corporation out in excess of \$100 billion dollars. But for that bailout, all the prior issued AIG insurance policies, surety bonds, and/or other financial instruments (the very same type that PolyMet will presumably rely upon to meet their 'financial assurance' obligation to the State) would likely be worthless. Given that the SDEIS concludes that it is possible that mechanical water treatment might well be needed "for the duration of 200 years at the mine site and 500 years at the plant site" what possible "financial assurance" as required by Minnesota State law could, in fact, actually provide real assurance that the environmental mess this project may well create will be effectively dealt with. The answer is obvious. No such extremely long-term financial assurance exists today. It has never existed in the past and it will never exist in the future. If one wants real life confirmation of the inherent ridiculous nature of PolyMet providing "financial assurance" that will indeed last until 2514, try getting your State Farm agent to write a car or homeowner's insurance policy for the period 2014 to 2514 or call your Senator and ask them why the US Treasury doesn't issue 500-year T-bills in addition to their 10 and 30 year government bonds. Their respective chuckling responses will tell you all you need to know about the ludicrous nature of extremely long-term financial instruments / assurances. Moreover, rather than address this issue, the SDEIS offers only a pathetic punt of the problem: The level of engineering design and planning required to calculate detailed financial assurance amounts is typically made available during the permitting process and was not available at the time this SDEIS was prepared. (SDEIS, at 3-2-2-4) How, pray tell, is an informed citizenry expected to reasonably evaluate the proposed project's potential impacts if they are not provided with any meaningful ability to assess how PolyMet might possibly cover potential liabilities arising over the course of some five hundred years in the future, apart from being offered some banal recitation within the SDEIS to PolyMet possibly c

Lynn Johnson

35392

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Lynn Johnson 200 Oak St SE Minneapolis, MN 55455-2009 (952) 906-0554

Lynn Moyer

13246

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Living along lake Erie I am very concerned with the constant assault on our valuable fresh water "Great Lakes", from farm runoff, factories, the asian carp threat, mercury levels in the fish, etc, etc How can we justify this mine., especially when we consider it should be protected, since it is a National forest . Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mrs Lynn Moyer 399 Riverside Dr Fremont, OH 43420-9495

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn Pykkonen

16068

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynn Shoemaker

40416

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Lynn Voss

6020

I just left public comment session in Duluth. Was disappointed that there was no one speaking that actually lived near Polymet/Hoyt Lakes. I live in Hoyt Lakes, I work in Aurora. I have full confidence in the DNR's ability to do the research and monitor, We are an area that needs mining. The jobs are necessary, our economy needs it, Too long have we seen our children leave our area because they can't find jobs. Too long have we bought other countries resources, and improved their economies. Now, is the time. Safe mining. My husband and I live 5 blks. From the Partridge River. We fish and boat there, We don't take our beautiful environment lightly. Our vote is YES. WE SUPPORT MINING. Larry and Lynn Voss Hoyt Lakes, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

LynnAnne Vesper

38806

Resending with contact information: LynnAnne Vesper 14038 Fall Lake Rd Ely, MN 55731 HYPERLINK "mailto:lavesper@gmail-com"lavesper@gmail-com I am submitting comments regarding the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the NorthMet project. I own land and reside year-round near Ely, Minnesota. I believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1- Economic Impacts 2- Land Exchange, wetland quality, and water pollution 3- Environmental impacts to be addressed at a later date 4- Financial assurance requires additional analysis My primary concern is in the area of economic impacts, mainly in the area of financial assurance. Polymet routinely cites figures indicating how much they have spent so far on the permitting process, as if this number should justify the issuance of a permit. The DNR and other agencies have a responsibility to see to it that issues are addressed during the planning phase; otherwise no permit should be issued, regardless of the amount Polymet has spent on analysis. Further, regarding the proposed land exchange, the Forest Supervisor bears the responsibility for determining if the proposed land exchange benefits the public. The Forest Supervisor must make the determination that the land exchange is for the express purpose of directly furthering the financial interests of private and foreign economic interests and is clearly NOT in the public interest The land exchange should not be permitted to proceed. Wetlands exchanged are not of the same quality as wetlands destroyed. I have a friend in Southern Minnesota who has created a wetland "bank" from some reclaimed farmland. These wetlands created for the purpose of the wetland crediting system are by far inferior to those created over many hundreds if not thousands of years by natural processes. The artificiality of the wetland crediting system must be taken into consideration when determining the quality and quantity of wetlands to be exchanged for wetlands permanently destroyed or disabled by mining processes. 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS

Alphabetical by sender's first name

LynnAnne Vesper

38810

I am submitting comments regarding the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the NorthMet project. I own land and reside year-round near Ely, Minnesota. I believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1- Economic Impacts 2- Land Exchange, wetland quality, and water pollution 3- Environmental impacts to be addressed at a later date 4- Financial assurance requires additional analysis My primary concern is in the area of economic impacts, mainly in the area of financial assurance. Polymet routinely cites figures indicating how much they have spent so far on the permitting process, as if this number should justify the issuance of a permit. The DNR and other agencies have a responsibility to see to it that issues are addressed during the planning phase; otherwise no permit should be issued, regardless of the amount Polymet has spent on analysis. Further, regarding the proposed land exchange, the Forest Supervisor bears the responsibility for determining if the proposed land exchange benefits the public. The Forest Supervisor must make the determination that the land exchange is for the express purpose of directly furthering the financial interests of private and foreign economic interests and is clearly NOT in the public interest. The land exchange should not be permitted to proceed. Wetlands exchanged are not of the same quality as wetlands destroyed. I have a friend in Southern Minnesota who has created a wetland "bank" from some reclaimed farmland. These wetlands created for the purpose of the wetland crediting system are by far inferior to those created over many hundreds if not thousands of years by natural processes. The artificiality of the wetland crediting system must be taken into consideration when determining the quality and quantity of wetlands to be exchanged for wetlands permanently destroyed or disabled by mining processes.

1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model u

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynne Christensen`

44216

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lynne Christensen` 221 River Ridge Circle Burnsville, MN 55337

44220

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Lynne Christensen` 221 River Ridge Circle Burnsville, MN 55337

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Lynne Lokken 42463

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Lynne Lokken 3900 Sunnyside Rd Apt 3 Edina, MN 55424-1264

Lynne Markus 54810

See attachment

M Argaret Mousley 16097

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

M Hagen

15959

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

M Negus

47383

I am a professional Fisheries Biologist and am opposed to further development of the Poly-met mine. I have read the EIS and find it does not go into the detail necessary to answer critical questions of sulfide run-off and potential long term effects on the aquatic environment (wild rice, invertebrate, fish and wildlife). In addition, any project that takes 500 years to abate its pollution is not something rational Minnesotan's want to pass on to their children and grand children. At the very least this company under the supervision of the MNDNR needs answer the critical and unanswered questions on sulfide mining and potential for sulfide runoff posed by the chemical and ecological experts (of which I am not one). They also need to expand on the contingency plans which are vague in the EIS, should an unforeseen event such as a train derailment, extreme precipitation event, or explosion occurs. In addition, details need to be shared with the public on what process and how much funding will be set aside to address the long term clean up after this main development occurs and the mine is no longer operating and the company has either been sold, dismantled or gone into bankruptcy. Remember this is an extraction industry and the natural resources the mine is based on will run out. I am tired of spending taxpayer money to clean up after businesses rape our land, pocket the monetary profits and then leave the area or dissolve as mentioned previously. A prime example is the massive amount of money being spent to clean up the pollution that took place by logging, timber and steel companies over 100 years ago in the St Louis River. Ironically the watershed the Poly-met mine will be developed in is the St Louis River/Lake Superior watershed and after spending millions, we plan to risk polluting this system yet again. Will we ever learn. Allowing the Poly-met mine with only the information provided in the EIS appears to be another example of short sighted gains vs long term detrimental consequences. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I hope you look out for future generations, not just the short term job gains that will only last 15-20 years at the moSt

Alphabetical by sender's first name

M.T. Mason

43081

To DNR of Minnesota, Relevant to the Polymet copper/nickel mining economic impact, new media information indicates there is no shortage of either mineral that requires urgent demand for mining in Minnesota: A Wall Street Journal 3/11/14 article reveals demand for copper in China is based on its warehousing for collateral in a shadow-banking system rather than for actual manufacturing. As well, Indonesia has recently banned export of nickel raw metal to China due to ecological and resource-nationalism reasons; shortened supply has not caused market havoc. Since this mineral market is unpredictable, without demand driving the mining schedule, Minnesota has leverage to demand upfront economic concessions from Polymet (rather than looking like the proverbial hayseed in an international mining conglomerate). A reasonable alternative would be For Minnesota to copy Indonesia and employ "resource-nationalism" by keeping the operation owned and operated by our own State. What is the advantage in using a foreign corporation such as Glencore Xstrata (with suspect ecological track record), where we would get all the pollution but none of the wealth. We should not trade the unpredictable economic viability of copper/nickel mining for our current tourism trade which is based on Minnesota's water-economy. Thank you for your stewardship, M.T. Mason

Mac Meade

39336

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am opposed to the Polymet mining operation for many reasons, all of which I am sure have been stated numerous times by others. So I am only going to list one here. This is not the last time we are going to have the opportunity to capitalize on this significant resource. The value of the metals will only continue to increase. There will be plenty of "suitors" willing to mine for as long as that resources is there. As protectors of all Minnesota resources, we should wait until we are as close to 100% sure as we can be that the operation will cause no environmental harm. Technology will catch up to this, and there will be cost-effective mining techniques that will provide proven safeguards. If we demand absolute proof, the value of the resource and potential for profit will drive the research and technology until absolute proof is achieved. Please do not take this gamble with such an amazing environmental treasure. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mac Meade 388 McCarrons Blvd S Saint Paul, MN 55113-6912 (651) 488-7958

48682

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am opposed to the Polymet mining operation for many reasons, all of which I am sure have been stated numerous times by others. So I am only going to list one here. This is not the last time we are going to have the opportunity to capitalize on this significant resource. The value of the metals will only continue to increase. There will be plenty of "suitors" willing to mine for as long as that resources is there. As protectors of all Minnesota resources, we should wait until we are as close to 100% sure as we can be that the operation will cause no environmental harm. Technology will catch up to this, and there will be cost-effective mining techniques that will provide proven safeguards. If we demand absolute proof, the value of the resource and potential for profit will drive the research and technology until absolute proof is achieved. Please do not take this gamble with such an amazing environmental treasure. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mac Meade 388 McCarrons Blvd S Saint Paul, MN 55113-6912 (651) 488-7958

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MacKenzie Dwyer

12733

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Maddy Greeley

54184

I really think you should do this to the boundrie waters. Your killing the fish because of the pollutes H2O with sulfuric acid (PH). Your taking away fishing and tourism when will make it lose money. This has been around and protected sense 1978. Your taking away to many beautiful things away! Your going to build this mine then get what you want in 200um years then leave a huge environmental problem.

Madeline Baird

21507

Water quality in MN is too important to take a risk. Environmentally Unsatisfactory (EU) indicates that our review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that the EPA believes the proposed action must not proceed. Why ask for a study to just ignore it. Does Polymet know more than an impartial organization whose interest is protecting the public. Madeline Baird 26175 160th Ave Way Welch, MN 55089

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Madeline Buck

39780

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Madeline Buck 6104 Wilryan Ave Edina, MN 55436-2647

Madeline Gardner

57982

This project will pollute our valuable water resources & cause hundreds of yrs of cleanup. The risk is not worth it. I enjoy the BWCA several times a yr & used to work as a wilderness guide there for teens. Pollution of the water would take this experience away. Its not worth the risk. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Madeline Seveland

9799

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Madeline Seveland 14418 Wildcrest Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Madeline Seveland

18600

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Madeline Seveland 14418 Wildcrest Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345

43378

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Madeline Seveland Wildcrest Minnetonka, MN 55345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Madeline Seveland

50676

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Madeline Seveland 14418 Wildcrest Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345

Madelyn

43104

The Boundary Waters of Minnesota is a treasured part of our state. Part of its value lies in the beauty of its untouched nature. I will not stand for the destruction of an environment that means so much to me, my family, and many other Minnesotans. This land has been the backdrop of countless family vacations and memories for me. Its degradation is not worth the benefits this project proposes.

47657

The Boundary Waters of Minnesota is a treasured part of our state. Part of its value lies in the beauty of its untouched nature. I will not stand for the destruction of an environment that means so much to me, my family, and many other Minnesotans. This land has been the backdrop of countless family vacations and memories for me. Its degradation is not worth the benefits this project proposes.

Madelyn Larsin

43069

The Boundary Waters of Minnesota is a treasured part of our state. Part of its value lies in the beauty of its untouched nature. I will not stand for the destruction of an environment that means so much to me, my family, and many other Minnesotans. This land has been the backdrop of countless family vacations and memories for me. Its degradation is not worth the benefits this project proposes. Sincerely, Madelyn Larsin On Thu, Mar 13, 2014 at 4:18 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Madi Malone 41627

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Madi Malone Maple Grove, Minnesota

Madison Kolbow 15240

Maggie Nelson 47988

Hello, My name is Margaret Nelson and I am a senior at Prior Lake High School. I think the mining so close to the boundary water is a bad idea because the amount of money that would need to go into clean up is unfathomable. If the estimated clean up and regulation could be 500 years, going back that far would be Columbus's time. Can you name a company that is still around from that time. Further more after inflation of 500 years, the money put aside would not be enough to cover the cost of the regulation and clean up for that period of time. Because of this, I fear our beloved boundary will be damaged and not restored to the current beauty. Thank you for reading my concerns, Margaret Nelson

Maggie Rozycki 45851

What can be more important than preserving clean water. This resource will soon be even more scarce than oil. In a [HYPERLINK "http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html"](http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html) Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) the PolyMet NorthMet project is predicted to contaminate this watershed for anywhere from 250 to 500 years. To knowingly pollute the Lake Superior Basin watershed, seems very short-sighted. Maggie Rozycki Sent from my iPad

Magree Melvyn 3632

"The proposal of any new law or regulation of commerce which comes from [those who live by profit or who profited from the BP spill], ought always to be listened to with great precaution, and ought never to be adopted till after having been long and carefully examined, not only with the most scrupulous, but with the most suspicious attention. It comes from an order of men, whose interest is never exactly the same with that of the public, who have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public, and who accordingly have, upon many occasions, both deceived and oppressed it." – Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, 1776 For more observations ignored by those who live by profit, see "The Invisible Adam Smith" <http://magree.blogspot-com/2012/10/the-invisible-adam-smith.html>. Melvyn D. Magree 1925 E 8th St Duluth MN 55812 - Mel You can find more of my thoughts at <http://magree.blogspot-com>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Magree Melvyn

15288

I submitted the following to the Reader Weekly of Duluth (HYPERLINK "http://duluthreader-com/articles/2014/02/06/2872_what_do_you_think_of_the_twins_who_had_twins"<http://duluthreader-com>) for the Feb. 13 issue and posted it on my blog as <http://magree.blogspot-com/2014/02/does-environmentally-friendly-copper.html>. Does "environmentally friendly copper mining" exist? I did a Google search on the phrase "environmentally friendly copper mining". I received a large variety of references, some of them enthusiastic about the process, some very skeptical of its "environmentally friendly" results. "In-Situ Recovery", Excelsior Mining <http://www.excelsiormining-com/index.php/in-situ-recovery> This process consists of drilling sets of holes to push an acidic solution down a central hole and then pulling it back up with four nearby holes. The acidic solution dissolves the minerals. This process requires fracturing and must be below the water table. It supposedly can be permitted in 18 months and built in a year. At the end, wells are flushed and then filled with cement. This article enthusiastically states, "The San Manuel copper mine, owned by BHP Billiton, was a successful operation" However, BHP Billiton admits, "The water quality of the future lake is expected to be affected by spent process solutions that remain in the former open pit mine as a result of in situ mining on the benches. . . . the pit lake pH is expected to approach 5-0, and dissolved metals will still be present in the water." <http://protectourwaterourfuture-com/index.php/2011/03/18/report-isl-operations-comparable-to-curis-project/> "Copper and Sustainability", Copper Development Association <http://www.copperinfo.co.uk/environment/sustainability.shtml> Mostly about the usefulness of copper. Small nod to recycling. "Copper Mining In A Cotton Field. The Florence In-Situ Mine" by John Kline, the environmental project manager at BHP Copper's Florence site <http://www.copper-org/environment/impact/casestudies/cottonfield.html> Reprinted from "On CU", January - March, 1997, Vol. 1, No. 2- "On CU" is the quarterly publication of BHP Copper, a business group of The Broken Hill Proprietary Corp., Ltd. This article is very positive about in-situ mining. For example, "Its hard to imagine putting a sulfuric acid solution into the ground, and protecting the environment. But the permitting process makes sure the environment is protected." On the other hand, we have "Proposed Florence In-Situ copper Mine a Bad Idea", Arizona Mining Reform Coalition, "Working to ensure mining is done responsibly to protect communities and the environment in Arizona." <http://www.azminingreform-org/content/proposed-florence-situ-copper-mine-bad-idea> In 2011, fourteen years after it was proposed, this mine still had opposition, including changing the zoning of a residential area and complaints that the mine will contaminate groundwater. See also "Underground acid mining threatens Florence communities", <http://www.azcentral-com/arizonarepublic/opinions/articles/2011/08/28/20110828florence-con29-html> Dan Steuter, conservation chair of the Grand Canyon Chapter of the Sierra Club, Arizona Republic, 2011-08-28- As of January 2014, the project had not been fully started. See "Florence Copper Project". HYPERLINK "<http://www.florencecopperproject-com/s/Home.asp> What was that about 18 months to obtain all necessary permits. The Saskatchewan Eco Network offers several steps to reduce the need of mined products and to minimize the impact of mining. <http://econet.ca/issues/mining/whatyoucando.html> "Is green mining possible." <http://www.greenlivingonline-com/article/green-mining-possible> Max Mallet, Green Living. The article is undated but the page copyright is 2014- He wrote that a "good mining company" "is actually a recycling company". He stated that mining companies have too much "secrecy in reporting toxic mining waste". "[T]he industry has a long way to go before it can even be considered remote

Mahyar Sorour

54542

Please stop sulfide mining in the Boundary Waters! As someone who has lived in Minnesota their entire life, and has been a frequent visitor to the BWCA, it pains me to see such a beautiful place destroyed by greed and pollution. Please help preserve this peaceful and captivating land of nature! Creating more jobs isn't worth destroying the land, please save it!

Mai Her

54187

I am writing you this letter in respond to debate about whether we should put a mining on the boundary [ILLEGIBLE] of the lake not not. I say that we shouldn't. Why? Well first, let's consider about our environment. If we put a mine there what will happen to the water and the wilderness in that area. The acid in the air will cause the lake water PH to drop and probably change their colors. Animals will died from drinking those polluted water. This will ruin the whole beauty of the wilderness. We've been protecting that place for 30 years and now we're just going to give that place up? Is the environment worth less than precious copper and metals? I don't believe so.

54188

I don't think sulfide mining is a good idea. Sulfide mining pollute H2O with sulfuric acid (PH). People fishing/tourism/\$ there. Since it was 1978 wilderness in MN. It affect lakes and rivers. People love that place so please don't do it in that place. Do it in some other place.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maija Schaefer

14071

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to express my serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota. I feel that the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) lacks vital information about long-term water treatment, and how this treatment will be funded. By the mining company's own admission, the mining operation would ooze toxins into the region's waterways for as long as 500 years. The mining site would require constant and expensive water treatment for that entire period. PolyMet's plan will directly destroy more than 900 acres of valuable wetland habitat, and an additional 10 square miles will likely be damaged by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. I urge you to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and ask the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Ms Maija Schaefer 2 Adobe Ct Novato, CA 94945-1314

Maja Black

45921

Greetings, My name is Maja Black, and I wish to respectfully participate in the discussion regarding the projected impact of the PolyMet mine in Northern Minnesota. I am a college student, currently attending Carleton College, in Northfield, Minnesota. I feel strongly about this issue, as it is both close to my heart and close to my home. As a native of the rural Midwest, I recognize that the promise of jobs and a boosted economy in this time sounds like the promise of a lifetime. When there isn't much to offer in one's town, the promise of new jobs is often the difference between sending your kids to college or not. Having a permanent job means the potential for health care coverage, and better lives for the ones you love. In a time when towns that came from a historic relationship with mining are now struggling financially, there is no way to easily say that you really need this help. A passionate argument for the preservation of the Boundary Waters might not resonate with you, as a more practical relationship with the land might not bring the same connection to the place for you as it does for the thousands of tourists that paddle through every year. PolyMet is promising 360 permanent jobs, as well as thousands more hours of temporary labor. Jobs mean money, and money means opportunities. Additionally, the materials to be extracted from the land are resources that we very much depend on in the modern world. I could not be typing this comment on my computer without the mined materials used to build the hardware. We cannot deny the importance of these materials in today's society. I recognize all of these are very persuasive reasons for building the mine. However, I beg that this step not be taken too hastily. There is no worse way to be steered wrong than to enthusiastically support something while only looking at the benefits, while ignoring the potential pitfalls. When the intention is right, but the action is wrong, who can we blame but ourselves for the mess that has appeared. To accurately examine the pitfalls, we need to look at the arguments both for and against the mine. At the bottom of each side of the argument, we can find the same priorities. Those who support the mining do so with the belief in the "vast economic benefits the project will bring," as cited from the Jobs for Minnesotans statement on their webpage. They also cite a survey that says most Minnesotans trust the DNR to avoid the environmental pitfalls implied by the Environmental Impact Statement. Trusting the DNR and the statements of the SDEIS means a trust in our society, a trust in those who are supposed to know how to interpret this information. That trust is not illfounded, it means that we live in a society that functions as it is supposed to. However, if we look back to the SDEIS, we can find beyond a reasonable doubt cause to postpone the mine. It is one thing to trust the DNR to identify the potential impacts of the mine, it is another thing to trust the DNR to interpret this information adequately, in a way that keeps us, as the residents and caretakers of this land, safe. On the other side of the argument, it seems overcautious to condemn the proposed mine on the basis of the past impacts of mining and environmental concerns. It is true that the technology has improved in recent times, and that there are benefits to having industrial labor providing jobs for the community. However, the concerns raised by the environmentalists have a legitimacy to them, and we cannot deny them just because we might not agree with the sentiments of those who voiced them. Dividing the discussion into distinct sides hinders us from discussing what is truly important. Those who are speaking in defense of the Boundary Waters are not only concerned about the aesthetic beauty of a wilderness area. If the toxic water projected to be treated for upwards of 500 years were to be released in an accident, it not only would destroy the Boundary Waters, but it would

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Malcolm McCutcheon

7682

I have several concerns that I wish to express concerning the Polymet mining proposal in northern Minnesota. 1- Even if Polymet meets all the DNR requirements for mining sulfide ore in MN, including a bond to cover 500 years of contamination management, will other companies also eager to mine be held to the same requirements. The more companies involved in mining the greater the chance of a contamination accident. 2- Drought is a serious problem in the world, including the USA. Chancing a long term contamination of Lake Superior, the largest fresh water source in the country for a 20 year mining project seems illogical. Because of its size and volume the Lake cannot cleanse itself of contamination the way shallower Great Lakes can. Please protect this precious resource. Malcolm McCutcheon. MD 3121 MN Ave Duluth MN 55802 218-393-2282

malcolm nazareth

40905

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Malerie Wirey

40379

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Malerie Wirey 13 Allison Ave Ellsworth, ME 04605 US

Maley Neil

38808

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Maley Neil 3218 35th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2116

Malia Burkhart

57948

Please lead the way in protecting our water and fragile environments. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Malik Holt

57998

[I am] originally from Illinois now in Minneapolis. I agree with these comments below and I've been following this development through water Legacy .org. Hard to believe this development. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mandy Marshall 42551

See attachment

Manel Dias 40281

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Manel Dias Mt.McKenzie Drive Calgary, AB T2Z3C CA

Mao Vang 54232

Dear Ms. Fay,Hello. My name is Mao Vang and I'm a sophomore at Humboldt High School. I'm writing to talk about the environmental Impact statement and the mining that PolyMet wants to start at the 100 mile swamp. I want to talk about this because the map that was done that shoes the drainage at the mining not affecting other lakes and streams in the marsh. From this view, people would mine in okay. But it actually not because the map is wrong which can fool more who don't know the natural lakes.The environmental Impact Statement also should that there are high levels of toxic in the water after the mining. That'll stay for about 500 years and will cost billions of dollars to clean up and which is impossible because when sulfuric acid gest into the water it can't be removed. So it'll just keep flowing down the streams and lakes. Which will kill off many species of plants and animals.The mining will destroy our resources that we have in Minnesota. It will also take away part of our waters at Minnesota. The drainage will forever permanently cause us to suffer if we live on the land of environment that won't support us. Taking away what could be affected by generations to come.Sincerely,Mao Vang734 Chippewa AveSt. Paul, MN 55107

Mao Vue 54233

Dear Ms. Fay,My name is Mao Vue. I am a student from Humboldt High School. The map in the environmental impact statement is wrong. PolyMet people drew maps of the one hundred mile swamp; their map compared with the U.S. National Atlas shows that the PolyMet has left out half of the swamp. They are immorally lying just to get jobs and it is affecting the BWCA in a very negative way. The BWCA is left unprotected from acid mine drainage. A place with water so pure like the BWCA being polluted would be very sad and I don't want that to happen because once it is polluted it'll be impossible to recover. In order to protect the BWCA I'll need your help. Possible solutions to fix this issue are: correct the maps that PolyMet has created, test the water in Langley Creek to make sure there's no pollution seeping through the swamp.Sincerely,Mao Vue1569 Hyde Ave SoCottage Grove, MN 55016

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marc Fink

18321

I am Marc Fink. I am with the Center for Biological Diversity. I live here in Duluth. The first thing I would like to add is, Minnesota law requires that mines leave an area maintenance free at the time of closure. The PolyMet Mine, however, mechanical water treatment would be needed for more than 200 years at the mine site and over 500 years at the plant site, which would be in violation of state law. Funding for mitigation under (inaudible) is critical for ensuring informed decision making. Unfortunately the EIS is completely silent as to how PolyMet would fund the hundreds of years of mitigation repair and maintenance for the hundreds of years of pollution control. I believe it is unfair to impose on our grandchildren and future generations the responsibility to fund and maintain the water treatment plants that are going to be required at this site. I think it's also illogical to think that there is not going to be more pollution problems for hundreds of years at this site. The Clean Water Act does not allow permits to be issued where a discharge can cause or contribute to water quality violations. The areas downstream of the proposed site are already in violation of water quality standards; and, therefore, no more pollution can be allowed. The Clean Water Act sets forth a pretty straightforward program where you first clean up existing pollution before you can allow further pollution. And up there there is already mercury and sulfate pollution. Under the National Environmental Policy Act agencies are required to look at the cumulative impacts of the projects. As we all know, there's a lot of mining projects up there that have already had significant impacts on the area and downstream into the St. Louis River Watershed. I believe the limited impact analysis under NEPA needs to include the St. Louis Watershed to encompass all this pollution. The National Environmental Policy Act Limited Impact Analysis for Moose completely does not mention the species whatsoever. That's a glaring defect in the analysis. Research shows moose are declining dramatically across the state and yet they are not even mentioned. I believe both the EIS and the 404 permit need to be rejected by the agencies, go back to the drawing board, and come up with a better analysis or reject the permit outright. Thank you.

Marc McLennan

57623

We need Polymet to get the mining industry back where it used to be. Marc J McLennan Branch Manager Border States Electric (BSE) 218-576-3766 – Direct mmclennan@borderstates-com HYPERLINK "<http://www.borderstateselectric-com/>"www.borderstateselectric-com Description: BSE_SCS_Horiz_TMandR_541and199

Marc Olson

52313

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Marc Olson PO Box 185 Barrett, MN 56531

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marc Schoen

14874

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Marci Hoff

47066

Lisa Fy, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 We are writing as residents of northeast Minnesota to express our significant concerns about the proposed PolyMet project. We believe that the PolyMet project could destroy or severely damage irreplaceable wetlands in the St Louis River watershed. We are very concerned that this project would be harmful to drinking water supplies and put human health at risk due to increased arsenic and other contaminants. The fish habitat, natural wild rice, and tribal resources are threatened by PolyMet. The pollution and need for pollution treatment are major concerns. We are aware of the fact that sulfide mines located in water-rich environments, like Minnesota, have polluted surface or groundwater with acid drainage and/or toxic metals. This makes us very fearful for future generations who will reside in northeast Minnesota. Therefore, we ask that the SDEIS be deemed inadequate and the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful. We ask that the exchange of Superior National Forest Land for the PolyMet project be rejected. We do not support allowing PolyMet a state permit to mine in Minnesota. Thank you for consideration of these significant concerns. Marcia Hoff and Paul Hoff 2122 Princeton Place Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcia Eiyneck

15380

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcia Jacobs

16753

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcia Jacobs

17107

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Marcia Jacobs 1520 Koester Ct. #56 Northfield, MN 55057

50376

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Marcia Jacobs 1520 Koester Ct. #56 Northfield, MN 55057

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcia Mitcheltree

40423

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Marcia Mitcheltree 415 Cogan House RD Trout Run, PA 17771 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcia Nermoe

15769

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Marco Good

42922

Marcus Imes

40098

Hello noble DNR representative, I have followed the Polymet story for the last couple years and still have concerns about the proposed project. I know the Iron range needs jobs, but this project will only provide jobs for around 20 years and will leave us with cleanup for centuries. Polymet has a decent plan for containing the acidic and heavy metal waste, but few things in life go perfectly to plan. That is my concern about the mitigation plan; if any little thing goes wrong, a lot of toxic water or slurry will be released into a nearly pristine watershed, which is irreversible. I believe the cleanup plan calls for 200-400 years of water treatment. I am extremely skeptical that everything will 'go to plan' over that period of time. Acts of god (the Duluth floods), unforeseen circumstances (cracks in the bedrock developing), or accidental oversights (circumstances like the ones that led to the 35w bridge collapse) are likely to create an environmental disaster in the next 200-400 years. Based on a reasonable expectation that something unforeseen and catastrophic will happen over the next 220+ years, I encourage the DNR to deny the permit, or get a very very substantial up front payment to ensure the future health of our environment (a larger payment than currently proposed). Thanks for listening, Marcus Imes

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marcy Leussler

42493

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Marcy Leussler 4456 5th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5124 (612) 824-3240

MARDI Ringquist

41699

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Maren Anderson

41275

to Whom It May Concern, I wholeheartedly oppose the PolyMet mining location. There are not enough jobs that will be created to validate the absolute destruction of our natural resources. Please, DNR. Protect our water, our land, our fish, birds and mammals. Make a stand for the environment. We NEED it. I am sick of our environment losing to corporate greed. If we keep this up, there won't be any pristine wilderness left. Thank you, Maren Anderson - Maren Anderson | Photo Stylist [HYPERLINK "http://www.marenandersonstylist-com"](http://www.marenandersonstylist-com) www.marenandersonstylist-com 612-237-8147

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maren Hinderlie 18153

My name is Maren Hinderlie. And you can see it's spelled "Hinderlie." And what I stand for -- so I've invited Larry Long -- I'm deferring to Larry Long to sing a song for us. LARRY LONG: I'm so honored to be here. Today we lost a very great American, Pete Seeger. And I stand before you in the spirit of Pete and I speak this in song. This is a song that I wrote for this gathering. (Sings a song).

Margarate A. Gillen 39916

DNR, I am highly against the proposal to allow PolyMet to operate mines in Minnesota. I have lived in the Twin Cities for 23 years and I love the beautiful lakes, trees, wildlife, and clean air. My family has camped in the Boundary Waters and experienced its beauty and peacefulness. We cannot afford to have this resource polluted by mining companies who lamely promote job growth but are really counting profits. I, and many others, are counting on you to represent the best interests of Minnesota families in the face pressure from these big companies and their slick staff. Please say NO to Polymet and preserve Minnesota's beauty for generations to come. Thank you, Molly Gillen

Margaret 18125

My name is Margaret (inaudible). I am a native of Aurora. I work for Minnesota Power as vice president of regulatory and legislative affairs. Minnesota Power strongly supports the PolyMet project and the SDEIS. (Inaudible) his job staples of middle class life, food closing, health care, college education. And because of mining strong schools and community and help us become educated, (inaudible) and able to stay in Northeastern Minnesota. Because of mining also blessed with endless opportunities to appreciate nature and recreate right out our front door. (Inaudible) while I grew up here I also lived in the metro area where the presence of quality jobs and the life that comes with them is a given the rest of the state doesn't have. Mining brings economic opportunity to places like the Arrowhead, Hoyt Lakes. The opportunities for a quality of life here that is too often only available in the largest cities. (Inaudible) tremendous opportunity to create high quality employment for people living a high quality of life here. (Inaudible) after the professional and public review of the PolyMet EIS through this process I am a confident state and federal agencies (inaudible) and confident because I know our agencies carry out regulatory responsibilities competently and thoroughly and with the highest integrity. (Inaudible) society clearly needs PolyMet (inaudible).

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret A. Redmond

39221

From: Margaret A. Redmond 1455 Rose Place, Roseville, MN 55113 March 10, 2014 Comments regarding PolyMet SDEIS Despite the huge economic and political pressures to develop a major Copper Nickel mining industry in Northeastern Minnesota, the flagship permit request by PolyMet—and the resulting SDEIS—are full of very troubling problems. These include issues which appear to be sloppy science, issues of modeling, and vital issues that are not addressed—or are addressed inadequately. The underlying science is supposed to be the basis for mitigation efforts for mining impacts and for contingency planning for a range of complicating (and foreseeable) situations that might arise. When the science, modeling, and serious degree of omitted factors is at the substandard level of this SDEIS report, a decision to allow mining to take place can become a very grim forecast for serious resultant environmental and/or health problems. Further analysis of several issues is essential to be able to avoid them or plan for realistic and effective solutions. Basing a major, environment-changing project on a foundation like this can be compared to house-building—those built on lousy foundations never quit causing problems and draining funds. They are not bargains. And they can be toxic to their residents. In addition, there are other issues which would indictate that ALL aspects of this second EIS and the proposed mitigation measures therein should be of absolute, stellar, impeccable quality. These are perhaps just as important as the science issues, and, are just as damaging to the increasingly marginal credibility of this SDEIS.

1- SOME SCIENCE ISSUES There are several issues in the SDEIS that leave me very concerned regarding its basic usefulness as a tool to even assess the CURRENT status of the areas to be mined and to be utilized for waste rock disposal and for treatment ponds. Those insufficiencies lead me to real disbelief about its valid use as a predictive instrument for future conditions once mining actually begins.

A. There are basic problems in the water modeling—in terms of assumptions and in terms of total failure to authenticate the model presented for the Partridge River.

B. The models handle the possibility of extreme weather events very poorly, and—in the brevity of their handling—very dismissively.

C. Although the DNR (in its other divisions, eg Forestry) does acknowledge the reality of climate change, this SDEIS and the models it is built on barely acknowledge any possible impacts. Clearly, there ARE some climate change impacts which would need advance contingency planning to avoid environmental contamination.

D. Previous mining in Minnesota—ie, taconite—has had to take measures to protect the population from harmful fibers released in mining and milling. Specifically, asbestiform minerals are found in some of the rock bodies. There is not much discussion of this potential hazard.

2- EXPANSION OF CONCERNS REGARDING SDEIS METHODS and CONTENT

A. Some basic problems in the water modeling:

(1). The Water Quality modeling for the mine area is NOT based on the actual MEASURED flows in the Partridge River. Flows measured by the DNR exist, but the model vastly understates (underestimates) the amount coming in as groundwater. This unexplained mismatch of data actual and data assumed casts doubt on other numbers used throughout the SDEIS.

(2). In addition to the mismatch in data sets, there has been a failure to collect the data which would be needed to validate a model in the real world. Often, to validate a model (that is, to check whether it has predictive value for the future), the researcher constructs the model, then runs it "backward" on data that's already been collected in past years. The model is "valid" if the model can actually "predict" the observations of the data in the past.

In the time between the first EIS in 2010 and this revised EIS of 2

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret and James Stevenson

39243

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Margaret Ann Nelson

47080

Lisa Fay and the DNR in general, Just a quick word to add my voice to those calling for a refusal to let PolyMet establish mining activity in the state of Minnesota. This is way too dangerous, with way too many unknowns, for our state to risk the future health of our lands for relatively short-term gain. Many more jobs would eventually be lost as we lose the wilderness we are so fortunate to be the stewards of. I am strongly opposed to this project and request the greatest caution going forward. The promise of jobs should not occult the eventual risks involved. Thank You, Margaret Ann Nelson PO Box 1196 Grand Marais, MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Beegle

9927

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Margaret Beegle 550 Varner Circle North Golden Valley, MN 55427

18698

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Margaret Beegle 550 Varner Circle North Golden Valley, MN 55427

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Beegle

50773

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Margaret Beegle 550 Varner Circle North Golden Valley, MN 55427

Margaret Bujold

42762

See attachment

Margaret Clemence

57955

Please protect the Boundary Waters--no sulfide mining! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Margaret Fait

43598

Environmental potential disaster and Ethically corrupt

Margaret Farr

42420

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Margaret Farr 1929 valhallar Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Haapoja 7767

As Rangers born and bred, my husband and I are very skeptical about the PolyMet project and its effect on the sensitive environment of northern Minnesota. It is our understanding that once the pollution has developed from a sulfide mining operation there has never been a successful way to get rid of the toxic waste. It is hard for us to believe that PolyMet will cover the cost of this clean up for 500 years or longer. What happens when this company disappears or goes bankrupt. Our precious northwoods and BWCA are too valuable to risk no matter how many jobs this company promises. When we see the water shortages in the southwest and California, we realize clean water is at a premium in many parts of the country. We don't want our pure water polluted. If the PolyMet process is safe, why can't they prove it by building a pilot plant that will show everyone they can safely mine these metals. Sincerely, Don and Margaret Haapoja 20043 County Road 70 Bovey, MN 55709 218-247-7830

Margaret Hayden 54913

See attachment

Margaret Hodnik 38514

Good Morning, Attached is a letter from: Margaret Hodnik 1811 Tyrol Street Duluth, MN 55811 Thank you, Patti Schuman Minnesota Power 30 W. Superior St Duluth, MN 55802 218-355-3344 pschuman@mnpower-com

Margaret Jewell 42539

See attachment

Margaret Jo Anderson 54885

See attachment

Margaret Kirtley-Sternberg 10380

I don't think this type of sulfide mining should be tried here until it has been successfully done somewhere without severe environmental damage. Given the track record of the mining industry, there is no reason to believe this mining will be accomplished without destroying water quality, even if the technology exists to do so. A several hundred year consistent clean-up is unrealistic.

40113

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Margaret Kirtley-Sternberg 320 E Buffalo St Duluth, MN 55811-2437 (218) 724-4328

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Merkow

16033

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Margaret Nelson

30186

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The Great Lakes are the source of drinking water for millions of Americans and Canadians. Allowing PolyMet Mining to pollute Lake Superior, the upper lake in the Great Lakes flow, would mean severe degradation of water quality, with consequent threats to human health all along the watershed. There are other concerns about this project's potential impact on our region, including: loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and permanent ruin of the land stripped for the open pit. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Margaret Nelson 2206 Green Bay Rd Evanston, IL 60201-3027 (847) 425-9412

Margaret O'Loughlin

3472

Dear DNR representative, I'm writing to express my opposition to the Poly Met Mining Project. The project seems like a terrible choice for the North Shore location for the following reasons: - the toxic and lasting effects of water pollution - the absence of long range planning for inevitable accidents and system failures - the tax burden Please don't be complicit in degrading yet another tract of wilderness in our state. Thank you, Margaret O'Loughlin 2721 39th Avenue S. Mpls. 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Sears

40980

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I do not live in Minnesota but I have relatives that do. I care deeply about the condition of waters in every single state that our birds use; whether they live in or are migrating through, Minnesota. I feel that this project is just going to be a slow death for all birds. Please do all you can to stop it before it can harm anything. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Margaret Sears 1648 Arbor Knoll Loop Trinity, FL 34655-7182 (727) 375-8795

margaret sorensen

11926

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margaret Thilmany

16104

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Margaret Wilcox Browning

54901

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marge Danielson

40827

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Margi Preus

41128

Dear Ms Fay and MN DNR; I want to express my concern and opposition to the proposed PolyMet mine. My concerns center on the documented concentration of sulfur in the holding ponds which is a result of the mining process, as reviewed in the EIS. The likely leaching of this highly toxic sulfur into the surrounding lakes and streams would severely damage the ecology of our area. Elevated sulfur levels would decimate fish populations and reduce or eliminate other aquatic species. These waterways would change from the clear pristine watershed we all know and value. And rely upon. The company has argued that all of this highly toxic water borne sulfur can be contained. Similar mines in other parts of the world and not situated in a massive fresh water basin have been unsuccessful in this regard. The EIS states a need to monitor and repair the holding ponds for at least 500 years. Clearly, no current corporation will likely be around 500 years from now. Even the posting of bonds or setting up trust accounts would be unlikely to stop the dispersing of this very toxic pollutant. I'm reminded of the radioactive water, currently stored in a variety of containers throughout the US. In the last 60 years (about 11% of the 500 year projection) those storage vessels have been seriously deteriorating. We had a short term need for electric power and now we have a 10,000 year pollutant to warehouse for the foreseeable future of mankind. I see little reason to think that mining precious metals in a pristine watershed that connects to our Great Lakes is a necessity. The short term financial gains and some employment aren't remotely sufficient to risk the inevitable pollution of our watershed. Once introduced into the watershed these pollutants will rapidly disperse, and we have no foreseeable technology to remove sulfur from billions of cubic feet of water. I would urge you to deny this application and spare our region our country and the planet from this very unwise mining activity. Sincerely, Arno Kahn

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margi Preus

42261

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Margi Preus 1747 Columbus Ave Duluth, MN 55803-2517 (218) 728-4780

54824

See attachment

Margie Ritter

9416

I am a life-long resident of Minnesota and much of my professional career was related to science and industry including environmental compliance. I have read the SDEIS for the proposed NorthMet Project and Land Exchange and want to complement you on the work done and the completeness of the project as outlined. This is a large important project for the region and it appears to me that most everything that one could imagine to look at and analyze has been done. I am in favor of this project because the State of Minnesota is one of the most stringent regulators in the nation and in the world. I believe that if we are to utilize precious metals in our everyday life and ask for greater technology and energy savings that use these metals, then we should also bear the cost of the mining that these metals will bring. To do anything less is hypocritical on the part of our society. We live on a world that is round and what happens in far-away lands does ultimately affect us. I believe that the EIS outlines that this project can be done safely .after all is a project that deals with inorganic agents which are easily removed by simple chemical means. Certainly, there will be unknowns, with a project of this size that is to be expected. However, I believe that with work on the part of the company and the regulators any problem can be solved with a good outcome. As I mother and perhaps one day, a grandmother, I am not afraid that this will ruin our land for future generations. Instead I see this as an opportunity to show the world that this substance can be safely mined, that it will be a world-class model for environmental compliance and will provide increased technological breakthroughs for the future generations. Thank you for your consideration. Margie Ritter 32 NW 4th Street Grand Rapids, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margit Johnson

21439

Dear Ms Fay, I am opposed to the proposed PolyMet metal mining project in northern Minnesota. I urge you to deny the permit needed to allow the proposed land swap and open pit sulfide mine. My reasons are numerous, and you have probably heard them from many other concerned Minnesotans. - The land exchange circumvents federal law that protects national forests and watersheds therein. - The impact of the mining operation on surface and ground waters, wildlife, air quality and sensitive habitats will be significant. PolyMet's proposal includes clean-up and monitoring for hundreds of years, which defies logic, financial responsibility and good stewardship. I understand that the DNR is scrutinizing only the environmental impact at this stage. But the huge costs and super-human time scale cannot be ignored, as they reflect the serious environmental consequences of mining in a water-rich environment. - While valuable metals are, indeed, among Minnesota's natural resources, their extraction must be weighed against other natural resources such as wetlands, groundwater, rivers, Lake Superior, the boreal forest and all the flora and fauna that supports, and the air quality throughout the area. A balance is in order here. Yes, we need more copper and other valuable metals. But Minnesota ranks quite low on a national scale of valuable metal reserves. Much larger copper mines elsewhere currently produce and will continue to produce much more product than this mine will ever yield in its 20-30 year life span. - Air emissions and water effluent from such a project would include sulfates and asbestos-like materials that will seep or stray far from the proposed project site and have long-lasting consequences. These byproducts will impact not only the flora and fauna of the entire area, but also the employees, their families and other residents and visitors to this precious part of our state. In short, the environmental review process has not fully or accurately addressed the impact of this proposal on the water, air, wildlife, land and other natural resources that you and all of us are responsible for now and into the future. I urge you to deny the permit. Sincerely, Margit Johnson 613 Union St Northfield MN 55057 Cc: Representative David Bly and Senator Kevin Dahle

Margot Monson

18208

Bjorn Monson, B-J-O-R-N, M-O-N-S-O-N, and I want to cede my time to my better half. MARGOT MONSON: Margot Monson, M-A-R-G-O-T, M-O-N-S-O-N. I have a master's degree in entomology with research experience in wetlands. As a biologist, I'm speaking to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and the Wetland Conservation Act which states that, "There shall be no net loss in quality, quantity or biological diversity in Minnesota's existing wetlands." The supplemental EIS states that in addition to a 912 wetland acres destroyed directly at the PolyMet NorthMet site, there will be an additional 7,000-some acres destroyed indirectly from the effects of air and water pollution. Mining has been revealed that indirect effects of mines on wetlands are real. For none of these aquatic resources exist in isolation. They are all interconnected, and they are what make watersheds strong and functional. At the very least, any wetland compensation should occur within the same watershed and include the St. Louis River watershed at the Lake Superior Basin. According to Chapter 5 in the Supplemental EIS, 68 percent of the wetland replacement areas are outside the Lake Superior Basin, 72 percent of the credits are off. The Supplemental EIS only commits to replacement of 26.9 acres out of the over 7,000 acres. These losses will mean that the very serious destruction of peatlands found in this ecosystem, and these take hundreds, thousands of years, sometimes, to develop. The land suggested for the replacement value is from old sod farms. Surely, not in any way equal in quality or biodiversity. In order for an agency to determine wetlands to use for replacement, they must have data that documents the biodiversity of these lands, and having done wetlands research, I know that Minnesota does not have any comprehensive inventories of such diversity anywhere in Minnesota aquatics has this, let alone in our nearly pristine BWCA in Lake Superior watersheds. Some have been done on a spiritual task list. My work, and along with my colleagues, studied caddisflies. Caddisflies are important in water quality, but these important inventories document just a fraction of the millions of organisms that live there and take years to complete. Furthermore, the Army Core admits it has no experience in requiring wetland compensation after a project is built to mitigate indirect loss of wetlands. As scientists, you must know that all wetlands are not created equal in function and biodiversity, and wetlands in Northern Minnesota are far different than those that we can find in other regions of the state. This wilderness is unique in the entire US. We have one BWCA and one Lake Superior. So, my question for you, as scientists responsible for making these decisions to ask, to the future of our variable wetlands, how can you in good conscience allow the destruction of thousands of wetlands knowing they are truly irreplaceable? If this kind of destruction is permitted, it will be not based on real science, but wishful thinking, and our descendants will suffer.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margot Monson

43060

Tim Dabney, Deputy Forest Supervisor U.S. Forest Service, Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Avenue Place Duluth, MN 55808
Dear Sir: March 9, 2014
I've written to you because we were originally advised that the U.S. Forest Service will weigh in on the decisions for permitting sulfide mining in MN, and the forests are ecologically integrated with the wetlands. I have lived in Minnesota all but three of my 68 years and do not own any land within the BWCA or Lake Superior watersheds. I have only visited there enjoying the as-pristine-as-we-have-in-MN wilderness, but my children and grandchildren have camped and hiked in this region and will be there again this summer. This part of our state is very special to us and visited by tourists from all over the U.S. and world, not only for its wild beauty but for the ecological health of the forests, wetlands, streams, rivers, and lakes. If the idea that perpetual treatment of water contaminated by the sulfuric acid produced by the mining processes may be necessary for centuries is not outrageous enough to stop you dead in your tracks and cause you to reject it, the very fact that the financial assurances will not be stated publicly until the permitting process begins is disingenuous and an insult to Minnesotans. The fact is that 80% of sulfide mining operations in the U.S. have closed with massive environmental degradation, all have left water pollution behind, and some filed for bankruptcy leaving taxpayers to foot the bill. For these reasons and that PolyMet has never operated a sulfide mine, is owned by foreign companies, and Glencore is a major investor with horrific environmental and financial track records in foreign countries, should be more than enough evidence for Minnesotans to reject this type of mining and this company at the outset. I am most disturbed by the inevitable loss of wetlands, so critical to the function of aquatic ecosystems. I studied in these amazing places as an aquatic biologist doing research in wetlands as a grad student in the UMN Dept of Entomology. I know that each wetland functions as it does because of its evolution over thousands of years involving millions of interactions between invertebrates, aquatic and terrestrial plants, and the particular soils, minerals, substrates, and water chemistries. This does not begin to adequately describe the immense complexity of an ecologically healthy wetland, and my professional experience working in them fuels my passion for these habitats so critically important in maintaining natural functions in these wild places. If sulfide mines are permitted in MN, this will mean the permanent destruction of thousands of acres of valuable and irreplaceable wetlands. These are not just any wetlands one casually drives by in the city or rural areas but places wild and undisturbed, primarily reached only by hiking, canoeing, portaging, and each unique in its watershed. The fact that the plan calls for the "replacement" of the destroyed wetlands with land far removed and in different counties, much apparently in previously drained and farmed land, is ludicrous from a scientific perspective. Even if the natural flowage eventually resumes, it will be hundreds of years before the hydrology is restored to its original function, nor will it be the same in quality and biodiversity as the destroyed wetlands once were. There may be a plan to increase the acreage of the "replaced" land to be greater than that destroyed, but increasing it does not justify it, because it is different land in a different habitat ecologically, and this is an insulting mollification. The Wetland Conservation Act, states that there be "no net loss in quantity, quality and biological diversity" for the land chosen to replace the destroyed wetlands. Where are the biological inventories of all the critical species of wetland plants, animals, fungi, etc. that would have to be used to determine equal biological diversity? There may be some for plant spe

54742

See attachment

54743

See attachment

54744

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Margret Fox 42061

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Margret Fox 3262 Wilder Rd Santa Rosa, CA 95407-7748 (707) 545-8961

Maria 54870

See attachment

Maria Antonescu 16228

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maria dels Angels Beltran

40374

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Maria dels Angels Beltran C/. de la Pineda, 32-34 Palau-solità i Plegamans, 08184 ES

Maria DOnofrio

15817

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Maria DOnofrio 9585 Pawnee Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maria DOnofrio

40387

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Maria E. May

45714

Dear DNR Committee for the Review of PolyMet Mining Project, Foreign mining interests and big money should not determine how we manage public land in Minnesota. There's no amount of compensation that would be enough for the kind of damage this kind of mining could cause. I know that many of you must share my conviction that the number of jobs temporarily created are not enough to justify ruining the watershed, one of our most vital and irreplaceable resources. The SDEIS report released to the public failed to report accurately on the inadequacy of collection pumps to catch all or most of surface and ground water waste,. The same report made no mention of the geologic fractures under the tailings basin itself. Many Minnesotans think that even this invitation for public commentary is a sham. What do you think. Please bear in mind that public works on this scale are now conducted in a climate of unprecedented transparency. Interest in what happens here is not about to go away, and it will take more than a few fudged reports to hide the potential for disastrous consequences for all Minnesotans. I urge you to turn PolyMet away. Please don't approve this project. Thank you, Maria May St Paul, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maria Freund

38376

Dear Governor Dayton and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: I am very concerned about the impact PolyMet's mining plans in northeastern Minnesota will have on environmental and socioeconomic resources and I urge you to reject the NorthMet project proposal in its current state. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement clearly identifies the effects the plan will have on water, bio resources, and socioeconomic resources. I am not in favor of a plan that would: · Elevate aluminum and lead levels in our water. · "Directly affect 912-5 acres of wetlands located within the NorthMet Project area, mostly within the Mine Site, as a result of activities such as filling, excavation, and installation of a containment system within the wetland boundary, and, therefore, these wetlands would be permanently lost" (ES37). · "Directly affect up to 1,741-1 acres of Minnesota Biological Survey Sites of High Biodiversity Significance, 698-2 acres of "imperiled" or "vulnerable" native plant communities, and 2 acres of "widespread and secure" native plant communities" (ES38). · [Impact bio life] "There are 11 state-listed plant species, all at the Mine Site; nine species would be directly affected and two would be indirectly affected by the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (ES38). · "Potentially affect aquatic physical habitat via changes in streamflow, affect riparian and aquatic connectivity via construction activities within the riparian zone, and affect water quality by increasing solute concentrations above Class 2B (aquatic life) standards" (ES38). · [Potentially impact/ Impact] "One federally listed wildlife species, the Canada lynx, may be affected by localized direct decrease and fragmentation of designated critical habitat Four additional state-listed species—including the gray wolf, eastern heather vole, wood turtle, and yellow rail—may be affected by the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (ES39). · [Impact] "The territory ceded by the Chippewa of Lake Superior to the United States in 1854- The Chippewa reserve rights to hunt, fish, and gather on lands in the 1854 Ceded Territory. Natural resources and the lands on which they are gathered are important to the Bands for a number of reasons, including their cultural, spiritual, and/or historic meanings, and will be considered under federal agency tribal trust responsibilities as outlined above and also as cultural resources under NEPA" (ES39). I recognize that implementing the proposed plan would create jobs and positively impact the greater Minnesota economy; however, I believe that PolyMet can produce a better project plan for this mining initiative, one that involves less environmental damage/risk, does not threaten our state's defining clean fresh water characteristic, and does not require 500 years of water treatment post-mining operations. Please reject the PolyMet proposal and ask NorthMet to revise their project plan with greater consideration for environmental and socioeconomic and cultural impact. Sincerely, Maria Freund 2313 Barton Ave NW Buffalo, MN 55313 This e-mail is intended only for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that the use of this information or dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete the original message. Thank you.

maria galbiati

40433

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, maria galbiati rembrandt 22 Milano, ot 20148 IT

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maria M. Pierz

45525

From: Maria M. Pierz, 331 Coolidge St Anoka, MN 55303 March12, 2014 To All Concerned, Once the big machines come into the Babbitt and Hoyt Lakes area, all bets are off. There are no guarantees that PolyMet's new technology and water treatment facilities will not have an adverse affect on the surrounding environment. I find myself in the category of the "No Action Alternative'. Two major problems with the copper/nickel mining is that seepage into the water table will have major consequences for the pristine wilderness; and the mining will impact three watersheds with wetlands and forests, potentially even the BWCAW. My point is that with all the scientific studies there is no positive evidence that the mining will not have a negative impact on the areas. Minnesota is known as the "land of sky blue water", an area that offers recreation and serenity to all who come to the northwoods. 90% of the area mined will only bring 10% of the copper, and the rest is sulfide and other dangerous minerals (ie mercury). The impact will endanger the aquatic plants, fish, vegetation, and wildlife. Over the years there can be a cummulative effect on the surrounding waters and habitats. Reclaiming the area will be impossible even over the 500 year plan. Even climate change cannot be predicated with 100% accuracy. By 2040, the 350 jobs that are gained in the short run will be gone for future generations. Money matters, but the focus should be on the long term and not be part of short term gains. The Superfund clean-up is in the billions of dollars. We cannot let profits rule our decisions. Water Quality is certainly an issue for continuation of legal rights to the Native Americans in the area especially concerning hunting, fishing and wild ricing, in accordance with the Treaty of 1854- Wild rice is a tender crop that can be washed away with the pollution of waters. Habitat loss will impact the wildlife. Certainly, the negative effects of the copper/nickel mining will damage a beautiful area for camping, canoeing in the BWCAW. Everyone loses in this proposition. Please protect our our wild and scenic places and preserve it for future generations. Maria M. Pierz 763-427-0332

maria thompson

39267

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms maria thompson 11152 164th St W Lakeville, MN 55044-8937 (952) 465-8836

Marian Gordin

13628

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, Please choose clean water and a healthy environment for all of us by denying PolyMet's proposal to mine sulfide ore at the headwaters of the St Louis River, which will damage the watershed all the way to Lake Superior. This operation will destroy wetlands directly and contaminate air, water, and soil over a large area. Think about the recent industrial "accidents" in West Virginia and North Carolina/Virginia. Don't let profits and greed override the health and standard of living for all Americans. Jobs are good, but NOT at any price. Please deny the Section 404 wetlands permit described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) being considered by the Corps of Engineers and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Birds, fish, forest and aquatic animals and plants, as well as children, grandparents, and communities will suffer incalculable short- and long-term problems if we (that is, our government agencies) continue to bow to corporate pressures for such projects. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Marian Gordin 1654 Rainier Falls Dr NE Atlanta, GA 30329-4108

Marian Puglisi

54145

The effects on human health haven't been adequately addressed in the PolyMet environmental review. It fails to define the human health oeffects of increased mercury emissions, exposure to asbesdos-like mineral fibers and arsenic. The World Health Organization lists 10 chemicals of major public health concern. Sulfide (copper) mining involves 5 of them including mercury, arsenic, lead, asbesdos, and air pollution. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marian Van Dellen 14580

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesota's greatest resource is pure water and unspoiled natural areas. Please do not allow mining to threaten that. We need clean water much more than we need minerals. Please say no to the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Marian Van Dellen 600 4th St SW Apt 306 Rochester, MN 55902-3245 (507) 282-4565

mariana morgan-sawyer 38903

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms mariana morgan-sawyer 1725 Graham Ave Apt 136 Saint Paul, MN 55116-3276

Maribeth Schulke 39369

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Maribeth Schulke 8481 Hiawatha Ave Eden Prairie, MN 55347-1549 (952) 949-2021

Marie A Braun 57275

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

Marie Beckner 35908

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. I and my husband have visited Lake Superior to see the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore and its beauty astounded us. I am so sad to hear that you are now taking steps that will risk and possibly spoil the natural beauty of this exotic and beautiful place. It is irreplaceable. Most people do not know of its existence. All of the surrounding regions were also beautiful and fragile so that I was thankful that they were relatively isolated. This is a part of our world that needs protection. The plant and animal life have adapted to the harsh winter climate over eons of time and we can undo it so easily and carelessly. Please take care to protect this wonderful place. Sincerely, Marie Beckner 2540 Chagrin Dr Willoughby Hills, OH 44094-9632 (440) 525-5077

Alphabetical by sender's first name

marie grenu

40381

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, marie grenu la bagottiere Breel, ot 61100 FR

Marie Leven

36145

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. What are you thinking. You would pollute wetlands and National Forests so a foreign company can make profits. Smells like some big money going under the table. Then what about Lake Superior, our Great Lakes are polluted enough as it is and there is a warning about eating any fish caught there already. A lot of us get our drinking water from the Great Lakes so what is your plan when we can no longer drink the water. It is long overdue to just say no. Sincerely, Marie Leven 321 Bellewood Dr Flushing, MI 48433-1879 (810) 659-4471

Marie-Dominique Ostrowski

43247

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Marie-Dominique Ostrowski 9054 S. Lakeshore Drive Tempe, AZ 85284

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilla MacGregor

15856

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Marilla MacGregor P.O. Box 226 Kasota, MN 56050

Marilyn Andersen

46203

Thank you for this opportunity for input. Please prevent further mining destruction in our North Woods and Waters, and do not the PolyMet SDEIS. The mining itself is totally unacceptable. Accidents always happen, despite precautions and our best analysis and fat bank accounts waiting to take care of damages. Those facts are incontrovertible, without need of analysis. In regard to issues in the SDIE, I do not approve of: open pit operations that permanently scar the earth and destroy our forests and habitat. acid run-off-which can't be assured for 500 years, no matter what price. habitat destruction for native plants and animals pollution, such as sulfates in our wetlands, which become toxic to plants and animals, and production of mercury methylate, which further poisons aquatic life further infringement of Indian rights on legally ceded territories, including hunting and ricing activities "streamlining" public processes such as hearings, etc to make it easier for wealthy corporations to pull off huge projects such as this without having to deal with public opinion. In our current system we let big money rule everything and destroy the earth that was our legacy. Whose pockets will benefit from this project. The copper will be gone, the jobs will be gone, and so will the earth, deeply impoverishing our citizens and the environment. Minnesota will get a pittance of the money that mining companies make. When China runs out of copper for its production, someone will discover another product, perhaps an artificial synthetic, that works just as well. Corporations have the wealth and resources to figure that out-let them do that now. Protect our birthright now, before it is destroyed. Thank you for the opportunity for input. Marilyn Andersen 651-777-6282 1717 McKnight Lane Maplewood, MN 55109

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilyn Berling

27169

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. We believe that you know only too well what is in this letter. We wonder why you would ever consider an open pit sulfide mine on National Forests Land. Doesn't this land belong to all of us. Aren't you the people who are responsible for protecting our interest? Allowing a multinational corporation access to make a profit on "our" forest land is not in our best interest as it seriously negatively affects the environment, particularly the wilderness areas and Lake Superior. Please do your job. Protect our interest, our national forests. If you need help to do this, call on those of us who write to you. You have our information and can reach us. Sincerely, Marilyn Berling 9114 Woodbridge Ct Indianapolis, IN 46260-1235 (317) 727-4768

Marilyn J Benson

54569

Please, let's not trade clean water in perpetuity for 300+ jobs—for 20 years! Leave the minerals in the ground so that we, our children and our great-grandchildren will have clean water. Let's recycle, re-use, and curtail our use of the metals.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilyn Magnuson

16163

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilyn Rahn

41712

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilyn Smith

40310

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Marilyn Smith 4449 Toro N. LV, NV 89031 US

Marilynn Smith

40457

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Marilyn Smith 1071 Candlelight Blvd D49 Brooksville, FL 34601 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marilynn Torkelson

42476

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Marilynn Torkelson 8956 Braxton Dr Eden Prairie, MN 55347-5344

Mario Velarde

40302

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mario Velarde 19860 NW 64th CT RD Miami Lakes, FL 33015 US

Marion Cartwright

41084

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, There are serious problems with PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. This region's copper-nickel is locked in a sulfide-containing matrix. Once exposed to oxygen and water, sulfides oxidize to produce sulfuric acid and release metals in soluble forms, including mercury, copper, iron and nickel. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. It could also wipe out wild-rice beds in the watershed. The trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mrs Marion Cartwright 205 N Sheridan Rd Lake Forest, IL 60045-2474 (847) 235-2803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marion Scott

40161

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Marion Scott 1691 Princeton Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1943 (651) 470-7923

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marit Witt

52573

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Marjorie Pitz

11328

I attended the St Paul open house, and reviewed the film, which was very helpful. Thank you. I don't believe that contractors have the skill to create a fully functioning sealed barrier beneath the storage pools of toxic waste-no matter what engineers might believe. For that reason, I oppose the PolyMet development, as the risk to water resources is too great. I hired contractors to create a pond system at IRRB's Ironworld USA, using a product we thought was fail-proof to line the bottoms of the ponds. It was fraught with so many unexpected problems, and leaked like a sieve. We had problems with: air temperatures being too low due to the short construction season (temps above 50 were required for the seam sealants) humidity being too high at the pond bottoms where soil was saturated (humidity made the curing process incomplete) water in the pond basins made them too mushy even after pumping out the water, so the basin was not compacted well wrinkles in the fabric created trapped areas that did not get sealed properly (it is impossible to avoid wrinkles) contractor was pushed to work outside the proper temperatures, due to the short season and impending deadlines contractors became high from working with toxic products, and their judgement suffered, leaving pin holes pin holes occurred in many places, but there were no more obvious leaks the ponds leaked so fast it caused damage to nearby buildings no one could trace where the water leaked to, as the mining dump material beneath the ponds allowed the water to escape deep below the surface immediately the contractor was pressed to re-do huge areas without reimbursement, and went bankrupt All in all, the concept of creating a sealed basin sounds appealing, but there will always be seams and wrinkles, improper applications, and weather struggles, and a perfect seal is not possible. Nor is a sealed basin's life span going to be long enough to deal with the toxin life above. Nature can erode any material we invent, with enough time. Marjorie Pitz Martin and Pitz Assoc., Inc. 1409 Willow St Minneapolis, MN 55403 651-778-9558

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marjorie Savage

18905

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I would like time to review and consider this plan, but the length of the document requires more than 90 days for the average citizen to read this complex plan. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place at a later date. As a Minnesota resident and a former landowner adjacent to the St Louis River, I have a strong and personal interest in sustaining water quality and preserving the natural environment along the river. I would like the time to properly review the document and provide educated comments. Sincerely yours, Marjorie Savage Marjorie Savage 6911 Booth Avenue Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076 612-709-8713

18906

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I would like time to review and consider this plan, but the length of the document requires more than 90 days for the average citizen to read this complex plan. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place at a later date. As a Minnesota resident and a former landowner adjacent to the St Louis River, I have a strong and personal interest in sustaining water quality and preserving the natural environment along the river. I would like the time to properly review the document and provide educated comments. Sincerely yours, Marjorie Savage Marjorie Savage 6911 Booth Avenue Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076 612-709-8713

Marjorie Simon

16262

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark 20826

Thank you for taking my comments: I do not believe that PolyMet is capitalized to the point that if groundwater contamination happened, they would be able to provide long term protection to the citizens of MN. If it's already too late to stop the project, any amount of money that is required to be set aside must be indexed for inflation, so \$100M determined to be sufficient today will grow as the costs for the eventual clean up grow. This amount must be revised on an annual basis with the State on MN holding the money in escrow. Fresh water is a valuable resource in and of itself, much more than nonferrous metals in MN. The risk of environmental damage is great, the likelihood that PolyMet will not be able to adequately address the issue is also great . . . just say NO to this mining project and continue to allow one of the world's great natural resources continue to be enjoyed by thousands of people each year. Mark Anderson 1620 N. 4th Street Mankato, MN 56001 (H) 507-345-1855 (c) 507-340-7677

Mark A. Kaprelian 47622

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Polymet Mining, Inc. NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange (the "Project") Dear Ms Fay: I write to call attention to certain material facts about the financial condition of Polymet Mining, Inc. (Polymet) which are not addressed in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) dated November 2013 and issued for public comment on December 6, 2013- The failure to give these facts adequate consideration in the SDEIS undermines its quality and usefulness to permitting authorities, other policymakers and the public. I strongly urge the Co-lead Agencies to address these facts before proceeding any further with the Project. In its financial statements and related disclosures filed with the United States Securities Exchange Commission, Polymet states: While we were incorporated in 1981, we have no history of producing minerals. We have not developed or operated any mines, and we have no operating history upon which an evaluation of our future success or failure can be made. We currently have no mining operations of any kind. Our ability to achieve and maintain profitable mining operations is dependent upon a number of factors, including our ability to successfully build and operate mines, processing plants and related infrastructure ourselves. We may not successfully establish mining operations or profitably produce metals at any of our properties. (Polymet Mining Corp. January 31, 2013, Form 20-F at 9 (filed April xx, 2013)). In other words, Polymet has no demonstrable capacity to establish or sustain a viable mining operation. Furthermore, Polymet's financial resources are, to put it charitably, extremely limited. Polymet has an accumulated deficit of \$88-4 million, it has no operating revenue (Id. At 9, 13, 34, 35) and its "only source of liquidity consists primarily of cash from project debt, other debt and equity financing" (Id. At 35). It states "we currently do not have a source of revenue" (Id. At 11), and "we do not know if we will ever generate revenue" (Id. At 8). In its most recent interim financial statements, PolyMet disclosed that it will need to renegotiate a convertible debenture held by a Swiss investor, Glencore AG, or raise sufficient funds to meet its current obligations and to fund planned development, capital expenditures and administration expenses for the next year. (Polymet Mining Corp. October 31, 2013, Condensed Interim Consolidated Financial Statements Note 1 at 1 (filed April 22-, 2013)). Significantly, Polymet's development of the NorthMet Project and the nearby Erie Plant is Polymet's only business (Id. At 13-16). In other words, unlike, say, British Petroleum, Exxon Mobil or General Electric, Polymet has scant capital and no other resources to absorb financial losses or other adverse contingencies relating to the NorthMet Project, such as a prolonged collapse in prices or a catastrophic environmental accident. Polymet acknowledges that if the prices of metals in our ore body decrease below a specified level, it may no longer be profitable to develop our North Met Project for those metals and we will cease operations. Polymet Mining Corp., January 31, 2013 Form 20-F at 7- And Polymet acknowledges, as it must, that its business is subject to various risks and hazards, including environmental hazards, that could result in damage to, or destruction of, mineral properties, production facilities, transportation facilities, or equipment. They could also result in personal injury or death, environmental damage, waste of resources or intermediate products, delays or interruption in mining, production or transportation activities, monetary losses and possible legal liability. The insurance we maintain against risks that are typical in our business may not provide adequate coverage. Insurance against

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark A. Snidarich

43842

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Minings proposed NorthMet project has been thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMets project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'm very familiar with, and have faith in, the proposed reverse osmosis water treatment technology and believe that if any further water treatment would become necessary that simple ozonation of discharged water in holding ponds would complete the process to comply with even the strictest water quality standards. The same ozonation techniques hold true for air quality. Fact: OZONE oxidizes and decomposes organic and inorganic contaminants at a higher rate than other reagents. Also, OZONE is used for eliminating heavy metals from the effluent produced by many types of industry such as mineral extraction plants. And over 4000 cities worldwide use ozone to treat their municipal water and/or sewage. There are ways to clean up air and water discharge simply and effectively from most industry if only implemented. These techniques would also benefit Wild Rice growth. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. We cannot let the sins of past copper mining keep us from moving forward into a new safe way of doing business. My hopes would be to keep PolyMets mined resources in the United States and working here to keep us the "greatest country in the world." Thank you. Mark A. Snidarich 3912 Peary Rd Eveleth, MN.

Mark Anderson

40638

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Mark Anderson 125 Century Trl Lino Lakes, MN 55014-7002 (651) 784-3205

45617

Mar 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The question here is whether clean water and sulfide mining can coexist The simple answer is no. The complicated answer is, "simply" no. Every sulfide mine ever operated has polluted the water around it. There will be pollution. This is acknowledged in the EIS. Polymet claims it can control the amount of contamination. It cannot, however, control nature for 500 years. The massive rain event of 2012 should teach us even greater respect for nature. Regulations can look good on paper, but they are no match for a force of nature. Also, they are no guarantee a catastrophe won't happen. They only provide for the cleanup, if possible. No amount of economic gain is worth the risk to perhaps Minnesota's greatest resource, clean water. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Anderson 4501 Cambridge St Duluth, MN 55804-2314 (218) 724-6375

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Anderson

48539

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The question here is whether clean water and sulfide mining can coexist The simple answer is no. The complicated answer is, "simply" no. Every sulfide mine ever operated has polluted the water around it. There will be pollution. This is acknowledged in the EIS. Polymet claims it can control the amount of contamination. It cannot, however, control nature for 500 years. The massive rain event of 2012 should teach us even greater respect for nature. Regulations can look good on paper, but they are no match for a force of nature. Also, they are no guarantee a catastrophe won't happen. They only provide for the cleanup, if possible. No amount of economic gain is worth the risk to perhaps Minnesota's greatest resource, clean water. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Anderson 4501 Cambridge St Duluth, MN 55804-2314 (218) 724-6375

Mark Arneson

44235

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I currently work in Central America building water projects and providing treatment for drinking water. I have seen so many ways that problems can derail a project's planned expectation. While the plan to capture water run-off and treat it by membrane filtration may work well on paper and may work fairly well in practice (although the track record for sulfate rock mining is poor, in my research I have not found one example that did not pollute beyond intended levels). However, it is a remarkable position to consider a which tech solution for this newly created environmental problem. It is as if Christopher Columbus put this in place in 1492 when he sailed the ocean blue, and we Minnesotans are dutifully maintaining and operating the equipment today for the relatively small and short lived gain for those Spaniards. A crazy notion to consider. Proposing the creation of a new environmental problem that demands treatment for so very long can not rely on a high tech solution. There are too many things to go wrong, both things thought of and those not yet imagined. There needs to be a proven, effective low tech solution that will clean up the fallout of this mining operation. I admit that this may be hard to do, but the mining operation and the created environmental problem do not need to happen. An extraordinary request to create an environmental problem for Minnesota to deal with into perpetuity requires an extraordinary demand - the mining and exposure of this acid producing rock is permitted only if it can be treated in a proven, low tech, fail safe manner without continual human input. The SDEIS needs to include this fail safe treatment option. Sincerely, Dr Mark Arneson 2101 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1273

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark B 47108

As a life long MN resident and frequent visitor to it's many recreational opportunities I am very much concerned with a possible Poly Met mining project. My greatest worries concern the long term harmful environment impacts that such mining will cause. These fears are due to the companies reported lack of experience in this type of mining and it's troublesome history of implementing adequate environment protections. Minnesota's north woods is truly unique and in my opinion worth immensely more than the mineral value or job creation that is purported to be produced. Now is not the time to move ahead with this project. These minerals aren't going anywhere. I'm suggesting waiting, hopefully until better pollution controls exist to ensure that these precious natural resources remain available for future generations. It is my desire that this project not presently be approved. Thank you. Mark Butala 10575 St Croix Tr. No. Stillwater, MN 55082

Mark Bakk 18210

My name is Mike Birkeland. I'll be giving my time to my friend and fellow Northern Minnesotan, Mark Bakk, who drove down here with me tonight. Thank you, Mike. My name is Mark Bakk, M-A-R-K, B-A-K-K. While I can't play guitar and I'm not an eagle scout, but I did just save a bunch of money on my car insurance. I'm here tonight representing the board of directors and the nearly 43,000 members of Lake Country Power, a rural electric distribution cooperative that serves eight counties in Northeastern Minnesota and most of the rural areas surrounding the project that we're talking about here. In 2010, our board took the position of supporting non-ferrous mining projects if they demonstrated appropriate environmental safeguards. We believe the PolyMet Supplemental EIS conforms to that standard. Our electric service territory doesn't include this project, so our cooperative and our members won't gain directly, financially, from approval of this project. But we support the science, the data and the outcomes. Lake Country Power also supports moving forward with the project because of the moral dilemmas that defy logic if we don't. Dilemma Number 1. Many in this room are supporters of renewable energy and the state's renewable energy mandate that requires 25 percent of Minnesota's energy be generated from renewable sources by 2025. This is a worthy goal, and like electric cooperatives, are well on our way to meeting this requirement. But there's a moral argument to consider because it's unjust to push this demand for renewable generation sources that drive up the price of electricity yet be against the extraction of the very minerals that go into what most of us in this room would call clean and green energy sources. Whether it's wind energy, solar energy or battery storage, it takes precious metals mined from the earth to capture renewable energy and make it work. If we're opposed to taking these resources out of the ground to meet renewable energy mandates and expand alternative options, is the outcome truly clean or green. Dilemma Number 2. It's contradictory to be for one form of environmental science that suits our ideals, yet opposed to the same science that doesn't. For example, climate scientists have tested and modeled data for years to validate predictions about the earth and our atmosphere. Some of the data's been adjusted, yet we continue to accept their findings as fact. The SDEIS uses the same methodology to predict outcomes for modeling data that has been tested, verified, and repeated, but in this case, to protect our environment. Science, if applied correctly, uses logic and recognized methodology to predict outcomes. Are we willing to accept and support the science in one case but not in the other just because one example aligns with our values and the other does not. Lastly, Dilemma Number 3. Is it morally acceptable to allow mining for precious metals elsewhere where we can't verify the environmental outcomes? How could we be more for the very products and technology that helped make the opposition to this project be so well heard, yet be against the most scrutinized venture of this type in the world. When we transfer this demand, it's like burying our heads in the sand. If you have a Smart Phone in your pocket right now --

Mark Baldwin 42147

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mark Baldwin 1801 Hague Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-7397 (651) 808-4350

Mark Bauerly 10752

I support the project 100%. I know that the mine be environmentally safe. It will have a huge positive economic impact on Minnesota and the US We need to mine our own minerals in the US for our balance of trade as well as our national security. Mark D Bauerly

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Berg

39747

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Berg 320 Blake Rd N Hopkins, MN 55343-3402

Mark Bouchard

38791

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mark Bouchard 3517 16th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-2305 (612) 366-2049

Mark Brice

37026

I am pro-mining, pro-environment and pro-BWCAW. I believe that Polymet will provide immense economic benefits to the state of MN, especially the iron range region. I've sought expert opinion from parties who have read the EIS. These parties are not directly involved in the project or with any of the environmental groups opposed to it. To my knowledge the plan for the mine is smart, safe, financially viable and extremely unlikely to cause material harm to the environment during or after operations. I am 30 years old and have enjoyed time in the Wilderness for the last 22 years over approximately 35 trips. I am grateful for the financial position my family has been in over these decades as it has allowed me to enjoy these trips. As a "Twin Cities" resident I am an environmental stakeholder in this project because I want to continue to enjoy time in the BWCAW. However, do not stand to substantially benefit from an enhanced economy in the iron range. While I know that if this project go forward, my continual enjoyment of the BWCAW is ensured. However, Twin Cities residents have no right to impose unnecessary environmental restrictions to this project. Doing so only prevents financial benefits to families living on the iron range. This project is a fair compromise for all stakeholders and should move forward. Thank you for consideration of my comment. Mark Brice 5025 12th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Bridge 16749

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mark Bridge 610 Gilbert Avenue South Park Rapids, MN 56470

Mark Brown 4785

Please see attachment

Mark C Wihriala 18319

My name is Mark Christopher Wihriala, W-I-H-R-I-A-L-A. I live at 710 12th Avenue, Two Harbors, Minnesota 55616. I am a fisherman, a canoeist and an outdoor enthusiast who loves Minnesota. I am here tonight because I'm concerned about the water quality of Minnesota's rivers, streams and lakes. I fish in these waters, I drink these waters, and I swim in these waters. I do not want them to be polluted, and I do not believe that the SDEIS is a sufficient cumulative analysis of water quality impact from PolyMet Mining. I am requesting that the State and Minnesota deny the wetlands destruction permit. The Section 404 permit should be denied because PolyMet's discharge would violate water quality standards, destroy animal and fish habitats and threaten natural resources for centuries to come.

42697

See attachment

42698

See attachment

42699

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Calabria

16065

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Mark Catron

39541

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As one who values our state's natural resources and wants them preserved for our grandchildren I strongly urge you as decision-makers to reject the ill-conceived PolyMet proposal to mine in the Arrowhead. This is a shockingly bad idea: combining the exposure and deposition of sulfide rock, in a wet environment, located in a fragile watershed, to cause leaching of acids for generations to come, hoping that technology will somehow prevail. When in all of recorded history has a piece of technology, no matter how well conceived, withstood 200 to 500 years of daily challenge. In fact, with one environmental disaster after another, we continually prove how arrogantly short-sighted man can be. Precious metal mining always pollutes. It is currently the single most toxic endeavor we engage in. And our "partner" in this boondoggle, for the next several hundred years, is to be Glencore, one of the world's most notorious polluters ever. Why would we think this would end well. Please don't sacrifice the priceless legacy of a pristine North Country for a few million in taxes and twenty years of jobs. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Catron 4731 Bouleau Rd Saint Paul, MN 55110-3371 (651) 483-1266

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Catron 48779

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As one who values our state's natural resources and wants them preserved for our grandchildren I strongly urge you as decision-makers to reject the ill-conceived PolyMet proposal to mine in the Arrowhead. This is a shockingly bad idea: combining the exposure and deposition of sulfide rock, in a wet environment, located in a fragile watershed, to cause leaching of acids for generations to come, hoping that technology will somehow prevail. When in all of recorded history has a piece of technology, no matter how well conceived, withstood 200 to 500 years of daily challenge. In fact, with one environmental disaster after another, we continually prove how arrogantly short-sighted man can be. Precious metal mining always pollutes. It is currently the single most toxic endeavor we engage in. And our "partner" in this boondoggle, for the next several hundred years, is to be Glencore, one of the world's most notorious polluters ever. Why would we think this would end well. Please don't sacrifice the priceless legacy of a pristine North Country for a few million in taxes and twenty years of jobs. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Catron 4731 Bouleau Rd Saint Paul, MN 55110-3371 (651) 483-1266

Mark D Dickinson 54758

See attachment

Mark D Jackson 42538

See attachment

Mark D. Dickinson 43046

March 10, 2014 Mr. Tim Dabney Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Avenue Place Duluth, MN 55808 Dear Mr. Dabney, I am opposed to the proposed PolyMet large scale copper-nickel sulfide mining operations near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt, Minnesota. Simply stated, I do not believe the "BENEFITS" outweigh the "COSTS". Mining companies engage in exploration and complete cost/benefit analyses of projects. Often they determine the costs are too great and do not justify a project- even though there are valuable raw materials. While there is copper/nickel, this is NOT the only valuable resource. As a citizen of Minnesota and user of the BWCA and other northern MN areas, I do not believe the "costs", to the environment and the tax payers for the 200 to 500 years after mine closure, are warranted. My objections to the project are summarized as: Short term benefits of relatively few jobs do not outweigh long term costs of pollutant monitoring and clean up. (Are we that optimistic to think a mining company will provide financial support for 200 to 500 years? That is not optimistic, it is "dumb"- no company is going to last that long nor provide the financial resources for that time period!) The copper-nickel is not needed, we can derive what is needed from recycling. The copper-nickel will not be used in MN, or the US, and therefore will not directly benefit MN. Mining companies have documented histories of pollution and significant impact to the land and environment. PolyMet has NO documented contingency plans for accidents/disasters. Again, from a "cost/benefit" perspective, this project does not make sense. I strongly urge you to reject the PolyMet proposal. Respectfully, Mark D. Dickinson 1674 Princeton Avenue St. Paul, MN 55105

Mark Domerchie 47462

Markdomerchie@tahoo-com Duluth MN 55803 Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark E. Vesley

43462

To the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: On page 569 of the SDEIS we find the following: “A Contingency Action Plan has been prepared as part of the Flotation Tailings Management Plan (PolyMet 2013m). The plan provides guidance to on-site personnel and emergency responders in the case of unplanned occurrences at the Tailings Basin. The plan defines 3- Level 3 is defined by either imminent failure of the Tailings Basin or a significant component thereof. The first actions in the event of any Level 3 condition are to check all persons who could potentially be affected are safe, initiate the appropriate chain of communications, and immediately undertake appropriate response actions.” What exactly does the phrase “appropriate response actions” mean. Why are the Flotation Tailings Management Plan’s disaster provisions not covered more fully in the SDEIS. This is grossly inadequate. As “100-“ and “500-year” floods begin to occur every few years in northern Minnesota, it is clear that extreme weather could cause failures in treatment systems that enable pollutant release from mine tailing pits far in excess of any rosy PolyMet projections. Will PolyMet, a mere shell company, be responsible for guarding against these inevitable events for the next 500 years. What financial assurance for disaster mitigation can PolyMet possibly provide that would cover such an immense period of time. What assurances has the DHR confirmed thus far to pay for mitigation of even the “normal” amount of acid and heavy-metal environmental damage in ensuing years that sulfide mining always produces. Until such time as proper financing for much more robust water safety measures can be guaranteed, permits for this project should be denied. Thank you. Mark E. Vesley 1598 Edmund Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55104-2234 [HYPERLINK "mailto:mvesley@minncle-org"mvesley@minncle-org](mailto:mvesley@minncle-org)

Mark Engebretson

47124

To: Minnesota DNR Human beings are bad at weighing the potential for a current gain against the potential for a future loss. This failing skews the analysis of environmental issues, all the way from overarching topics like climate change down to specific projects like mines. It is hard for us to compare effectively a clear near-term benefit (Jobs., usually), against a foggy long-term detriment, even, in the case of hard rock mining, with plenty of past examples of cases where the scales have been poorly calibrated. With this dynamic in mind, we urge the Department to go out of its way to lean on the scales in favor of future protection and recovery of the landscape that will hold this mine. There is a good Minnesota statute directing the Department to do that, and there is no requirement that the provisions and fundings for future protection and recovery leave room for a profit for the miner. These minerals are not going anywhere, and even if if extra-prudent and especially tough requirements discourage extraction now, there will certainly come a time when those requirements will fit a sensible and profitable mining outcome. We have tried to follow this mining proposal and the resultant environmental concerns, and are sorry that we have not seen a financial proposal for future protection and recovery from someone that we can refer to or endorse. We would rather our message be "please don't do that - do this" than "please worry about this somehow." But in this specific case that very lack of alternative proposals for the future seems to show how uncertain and underweighted the future is in the analysis so far. We hope that the Department can insist on a financial plan for future protection and recovery that escapes the usual human tendency to discount the future, and that sets an especially tough and thoughtful standard for this mine and the Twin Metals mine that will soon follow, and for other states as well. We thank the Department staff for its work on the huge task of dealing with this proposal. Mark and Carol Engebretson 153 Lakeview Ln. Wayzata, MN 55391

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Haider

18297

My name for the record is Mark Haider, M-A-R-K H-A-I-D-E-R. And the reason I'm commenting on this is I think it needs to be commented on because there are a lot of false premises that people are going on. Like PolyMet is a new company and they are bringing new things in. Well, actually, most of the people have been part of other things around the whole world. Just because they polluted around the whole world, they are going to come here and not pollute? Okay, I'm not believing that. The last thing they set up, and if you look and read the list of names that are involved in this PolyMet operation, they are the same people that set up the Eagle Mine in Michigan. Okay? To show what short-term commitment they have, they have already sold it, and it is not even up and operating yet. They sold it in January of 2013 and the plant isn't even up and operating yet, in Michigan. Okay? Their company is also involved along the Flambeau River in Wisconsin. They are reopening a mine over there so that they can get more minerals out of it. Okay? But because the mine was put in in 1980, pollution control standards, they only have to use the 1980 ones. Because if they had to do the same thing and apply now to get a permit, they couldn't get a permit. The mine over there is only 140 feet from the Flambeau River. Okay? Do these people really care about Minnesota or Wisconsin or Michigan? Or do they care about themselves? Okay. And there are a number of different corporations that they fall under; Rio Tinto (phonetic), PolyMet. And PolyMet had a previous name. Okay? They have already changed the name once in this thing in Minnesota. And they have a number of names. Okay? So, you know, can they be trusted? Well, if you look back to the last thing they did in Michigan, they sold it before it opened up. Okay? To me, when you are dealing with people like that, you know, who can deal with that? They can't be trusted. Okay? I said, you know, that's the first thing when I'm dealing with somebody, it is that I have to know that they can be trusted. Okay. Which we are talking 550 years here. You know, 500 years. How about one year? We are not even going to be sure that they are going to have it a year after it opens. Because they -- if you look at their past record, these people, the No. 1 guy for PolyMet, he worked on the Eagle Mine project in Michigan. Okay. He is working on this one. Okay. So, it is a corporation. So, they could sell it next week. They could sell it right after they got the approval. Okay. So, you know, you can't -- you can't trust them. Okay. It is, you know, that's all I got to say. Thanks.

28725

Mar 4, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Minnesota is second largest user of underground water reserves used in mining of all states because of iron ore mining and now we have already started to pump well water to neutralize the acid derived from iron ore mining. Why would the state of Minnesota assume the full risk of cleaning up Poly Met mine site: Poly Met or another business entity which could own the mine site in the future would surely walk away from the massive undetermined liabilities. Poly Met isn't even committed to start cleaning up the mine site until after the mine site would be closed. What water would Minnesota be cleaning up with a reverse osmosis plant proposed for the site; polluted well water or/and polluted surface water . An undermined amount of jobs for an undetermined amount of years We would be better off to building a water bottling plant to produce water to ship to California for 500 years. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Haider 3988 Woodview Dr Vadnais Heights, MN 55127-4115

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Haider

49522

Mar 4, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Minnesota is second largest user of underground water reserves used in mining of all states because of iron ore mining and now we have already started to pump well water to neutralize the acid derived from iron ore mining. Why would the state of Minnesota assume the full risk of cleaning up Poly Met mine site: Poly Met or another business entity which could own the mine site in the future would surely walk away from the massive undetermined liabilities. Poly Met isn't even committed to start cleaning up the mine site until after the mine site would be closed. What water would Minnesota be cleaning up with a reverse osmosis plant proposed for the site; polluted well water or/and polluted surface water . An undermined amount of jobs for an undetermined amount of years We would be better off to building a water bottling plant to produce water to ship to California for 500 years. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Haider 3988 Woodview Dr Vadnais Heights, MN 55127-4115

Mark Hall

42993

Please accept my comments on the Polymet project attached hereto. Mark Hall 380 St Peter Street Suite 740 St Paul, MN 55102

Mark Harris

22931

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Multinational corporation, PolyMet, is seeking permission for an open pit sulfide mine on National Forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. If approved the mine will pollute the largest of our Great Lakes, Lake Superior, threaten local clean water and wildlands, and endanger public health for generations to come. A decision in favor of PolyMet's proposal would open a floodgate for more sulfide mining in a large area near Lake Superior and surrounding the Boundary Waters Wilderness - considered by some as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. This is a dangerous proposal. Please protect the Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from dangerous sulfide mining pollution. Sincerely, Mark Harris 3855 Blair Mill Rd Apt 204d Horsham, PA 19044-2905

23737

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, PolyMet, a multinational corporation, is seeking permission for an open-pit sulfide mine on national forest lands near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior. If approved, the mine will pollute the largest of our Great Lakes, threaten clean water and wilderness areas, and endanger public health for generations to come. A decision in favor of PolyMet's proposal would open a floodgate for more sulfide mining in this region, considered by some as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the world. Please protect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Lake Superior from dangerous sulfide mining pollution. Thank you for your consideration on these matters. Sincerely, Mark Harris 3855 Blair Mill Rd Apt 204d Horsham, PA 19044-2905

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Haugland, M.D.

45856

Lisa Fay MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("PolyMet SDEIS") fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Assessment, under the direction of t

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Imsdahl

9640

Hello DNR My feelings about the proposed Polymet mine situation: First, unlike what some mine proponents speakers suggested last night, most of us "environmentalists" do not hate miners nor mines. I see it as their right to mine, but in this case, only under the condition that they have a 100% ironclad guarantee that no sulfuric acid can escape into the surrounding environment. During last night's meeting, the mining side of the debate constantly brought up the notion that they trust the process, that they trust the agencies involved do whatever is necessary to ensure that no disaster will occur, now or in the future. I sincerely believe that the miner's and Polymet are doing everything required to make this happen. No doubt, they don't want to pollute their "own backyards", nor see their plant shut down and jobs lost during the mining process. Regardless, history has proven that despite the best efforts of leading professionals, disasters happen. Case in point: 35W bridge collapse. Based on historical fact, their reasoning is flawed and their position is irresponsible. I have no faith in ANY proposed system that is required to monitor and safeguard the waste for 500+ years. A year of two maybe, but 500 years. Seriously. If indeed, that it what is required, that is ridiculous, and we all know it. Frankly, I'd like to know what incentives Polymet will have to maintain an abandoned mine 400 years after any person who benefitted from it or had anything to do with it is dead. I saw a sign last night that read "500 Years Ago, Martin Luther Was a Catholic". Sarcastic, but it makes another good point. I've read over and over that 100% of sulfur mining projects have polluted the surrounding environments. If I were on the panel of DNR personnel responsible for this decision, I would want to know what happens in a worst case scenario. What happens if some terrorist group comes into northern MN 200 years from now and bombs one of these containment facilities, for instance. Again, if what I've read is true, "100% failure rate", how in the world can this even be considered.. We're being asked to be guinea pigs. Please, do not let them mine until they have the technology to immediately, cleanly, and completely dispose of the waste products. That copper has been there for millions of years and is not going anyplace. Just wait. Be prudent. Be conservative. Be smart. We all know that copper is coming out of the ground sooner or later. It will only become more valuable as the years pass. This is your legacy. Sincerely, Mark Imsdah

10706

--Original Message-- From: Imsdahl's [mailto:mimsdahl@frontiernet-net] Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2014 8:59 AM To: *Info (DNR) Subject: Re: Proposed Mine A slight correction: my last name is spelled Imsdahl, with an "L" on the end On Jan 29, 2014, at 8:45 AM, Imsdahl's wrote: > Hello DNR >> My feelings about the proposed Polymet mine situation: >> First, unlike what some mine proponents speakers suggested last night, most of us "environmentalists" do not hate miners nor mines. I see it as their right to mine, but in this case, only under the condition that they have a 100% ironclad guarantee that no sulfuric acid can escape into the surrounding environment. >> During last night's meeting, the mining side of the debate constantly brought up the notion that they trust the process, that they trust the agencies involved do whatever is necessary to ensure that no disaster will occur, now or in the future. I sincerely believe that the miner's and Polymet are doing everything required to make this happen. No doubt, they don't want to pollute their "own backyards", nor see their plant shut down and jobs lost during the mining process. Regardless, history has proven that despite the best efforts of leading professionals, disasters happen. Case in point: 35W bridge collapse. Based on historical fact, their reasoning is flawed and their position is irresponsible. >> I have no faith in ANY proposed system that is required to monitor and safeguard the waste for 500+ years. A year of two maybe, but 500 years. Seriously. If indeed, that it what is required, that is ridiculous, and we all know it. Frankly, I'd like to know what incentives Polymet will have to maintain an abandoned mine 400 years after any person who benefitted from it or had anything to do with it is dead. I saw a sign last night that read "500 Years Ago, Martin Luther Was a Catholic". Sarcastic, but it makes another good point. >> I've read over and over that 100% of sulfur mining projects have polluted the surrounding environments. If I were on the panel of DNR personnel responsible for this decision, I would want to know what happens in a worst case scenario. What happens if some terrorist group comes into northern MN 200 years from now and bombs one of these containment facilities, for instance. Again, if what I've read is true, "100% failure rate", how in the world can this even be considered.. We're being asked to be guinea pigs. >> Please, do not let them mine until they have the technology to immediately, cleanly, and completely dispose of the waste products. That copper has been there for millions of years and is not going anyplace. Just wait. Be prudent. Be conservative. Be smart. We all know that copper is coming out of the ground sooner or later. It will only become more valuable as the years pass. This is your legacy. >> Sincerely, >> Mark Imsdah >>>>>>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Klausner

40269

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mark Klausner 3854 gateway dr Greenbelt, MD 20770 US

40426

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mark Klausner 3305 Gateway Dr Greenbelt, PA 19104 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Klugiewicz 40977

Mar 9, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Mark Klugiewicz 32905 Sunrise Dr Magnolia, TX 77354-2628 (281) 259-6555

Mark Larson 43023

Attached are my comments on the PolyMet project. Thank you very much. Mark Larson 556 Summit Avenue St Paul, MN 55102 Mobile 612-963-0111 Email [HYPERLINK "mailto:lars77@outlook-com"lars77@outlook-com](mailto:lars77@outlook-com)

Mark Lauderbaugh 9867

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mark Lauderbaugh 12501 Nicollet Ave Unit 414 Burnsville, MN 55337

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Lauderbaugh

18639

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mark Lauderbaugh 12501 Nicollet Ave Unit 414 Burnsville, MN 55337

42909

Lisa Fay please see attached Mark Lauderbaugh Trident Process Inc. 10800 Lyndale Ave So. Ste 381 Bloomington, MN 55420 952-881-7271 Phone 952-881-4219 Fax 612-270-0878 Cell Trident 2c logo

42989

I would like to add the additional comment on the Polymet EIS. The impact of sulfates which will be produced by the Polymet mine on wild rice have not yet been determined by the PCA (see attached). Until they are the Polymet EIS is invalid and needs more study. . Lisa Fay please see attached Mark Lauderbaugh Trident Process Inc. 10800 Lyndale Ave So. Ste 381 Bloomington, MN 55420 952-881-7271 Phone 952-881-4219 Fax 612-270-0878 Cell Trident 2c logo

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Lauderbaugh

50715

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mark Lauderbaugh 12501 Nicollet Ave Unit 414 Burnsville, MN 55337

Mark Lundberg

6625

To whom it may concern. I believe Polymet corporation's due diligence has been over and above. I believe their plans on keeping the mining and run-off areas environmentally safe are legitimate. Like the mines today, they are policed for possible harmful issues created by mining. There is no doubt that this is a good thing for our future. If the Polymet mining goes through, there should be aggressive measures created to police the air, water, and land issues. Measures that will shut down the mining operation, if there is evidence of any possible breaches in Polymet's assurances. I believe the State of Minnesota and the Polymet company will work together to make it work. I firmly believe that this opportunity should come to fruition. I could get into the jobs, the local and state taxes, the future of our children, Polymet's being a good custodian but this means nothing to me, if we are left with a bad environment to live in. I do believe Polymet is all in to providing safeguards to the environment. I also believe that Minnesota's checks and balances and Polymet's pro-activeness will make this venture work. I firmly believe in the Polymet plan, and hope for Northern Minnesota and it's people to grow with the mine. - Mark Lundberg Products Manager TerraMar Ingredients, LLC 4920 Queen Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55410 218-750-7945

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Luttinen

689

I wanted to note my opposition to the proposed copper-nickel mine in NE Minnesota based on the information from the SDEIS. 1) I don't believe there is adequate funding set aside to cover the 200 to 500 years of waste water cleaning, monitoring. This will eventually fall into the hands of the state when the cost overruns what is set aside and the mining companies have provided what they can afford to cover without going bankrupt. It looks like a planned superfund cleanup site is the result of this mine. 2) I was encouraged about the changes to the holding pond but realized they are only offering a partial solution. There isn't enough information about how it would hold up to huge rainfalls and sudden flooding conditions. Rains in Duluth last summer caused huge washouts, flooding, loss of property, etc that could not have been predicted/expected. There is no secondary capture in place and if a overflow or breach occurred, it would flow into the St Louis River watershed. 3) Not enough information on the reverse osmosis process to clean the water. The idea is great but it will require a huge amount of energy to run this type of system. Is this within the ability of the local power grid. Are they going to create electricity onsite to power this. Has this been tested on the scale that will allow them to profitably process the volume of ore that is planned. I know the jobs provided are a great boon to the range cities and this will also provide a great new resource for the state but we need to be able to do this where the mine can still profit and the environment is not tainted for the next couple of hundred years. Thanks for listening. Mark Alan Luttinen 40 Taylor Lane Grand Marais, MN 55604

Mark Lystig

18245

My name is Mark Lystig, L-Y-S-T-I-G. I live in Eagan, Minnesota. I have not recently been to the Range, but I lived in Virginia for two years, and I am familiar with the problems with employment, or lack thereof, on the range, but I think this is an opportunity that we can take a stand to protect a really unique environment and that if we don't do it now, we will not have the opportunity. It's not just a matter of there being minerals up there. There are minerals up there, true, but there are other aesthetic features of the area that do not occur anywhere else, and we need, as a community, as a country, as a world, to protect the earth, and this the time to do it. Thank you.

Mark Mansfield

40048

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Mark Mansfield 37 Madison St Geneva, NY 14456-2853 (315) 789-2829

Mark Matheny

18282

My name is Mark, M-A-R-K, Metheny, M-E-T-H-E-N-Y. I, Mark Metheny, resident of Minneapolis, Minnesota, Hennepin County, spend a fair amount of time on vacation in the Ely area and I would rather not have copper sulfide mining occurring within the watershed of this area that is proposed. That's good. REBECCA LYSTIG

Mark McGuire

5906

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. I believe that PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. Thank you, Mark McGuire 1610 Brookside Lane Waunakee, WI 53597 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark McKeehan

39534

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mark McKeehan 29827 Hardwood Road Chatfield, MN 55923

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Moehlenbrock

43025

Dear Lisa Fay or Whom it May Concern: Please accept my comments on the Northmet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. My comments are listed below and in the attached pdf document. Northmet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments Mark C. Moehlenbrock 630 Orchid Lane North Plymouth, MN 55447 To Whom it May Concern: My primary area of concern regarding this project is its potential long-term effects to water quality. The plan to mitigate detrimental effects to water quality appears to have several shortcomings. Long Term Water Treatment “Mechanical water treatment is part of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action for the duration of the simulations (200 years at the Mine Site, and 500 years at the Plant Site). The duration of the simulations was determined based on capturing the highest predicted concentrations of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action. It is uncertain how long the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be long term; actual treatment requirements would be based on measured, rather than modeled, NorthMet Project water quality performance, as determined through monitoring requirements. PolyMet would be held accountable for maintenance and monitoring required under any permit and would not be released until all conditions have been met.” (Page 5-7) “In this SDEIS, non-mechanical treatment systems are not described in detail because the NorthMet Project Proposed Action is based on mechanical treatment only. However, implementation of non-mechanical systems is considered a long-term goal for closure.” (Page 5-7) Comments: Minnesota laws governing mine permitting expressly forbid granting a permit to any project that requires perpetual water treatment. By Polymet’s own calculations, their waste water would require water treatment for at least 500 years; their models didn’t calculate what would happen after that. Surely this is in violation of Minnesota’s mine permitting laws. The SDEIS vaguely references non-mechanical treatment, but doesn’t explain what that treatment method might be or when it will be able to be employed. Polymet claims to be very concerned with post-reclamation water quality, but in 50 years, when there is no more money to be made, who is going to make them accountable. 500 years is longer than any of us can fathom, and the idea that Polymet will be on site for half a millennium, diligently maintaining their waste water treatment facility, is absurd Mercury in the Embarrass River “Several lakes downstream of the NorthMet Project area within the chain of lakes are on the 303(d) list for “mercury in fish tissue” impairment, including Sabin, Wynne, Embarrass, and Esquagama lakes” (Page 4-133) “The NorthMet Project Proposed Action is predicted to result in a net increase in mercury loadings to the Embarrass River of up to 0-6 grams per year (from 22-3 to 22-9 grams per year), about a 3 percent increase.” (Page 5-207) “Research suggests that total mercury concentrations in streams and methylmercury content in fish are roughly proportional within individual watersheds (USGS 2010), such that, for example, a 5 percent increase in total mercury in water would be expected to result in about a 5 percent increase in mercury content in fish within that watershed” (Page 5-21) Comments: Mercury loading in the Embarrass River is expected to increase. The Embarrass River watershed is already impaired by excess mercury in fish tissue. The SDEIS justifies this by saying that, because mercury loading to the Partridge River will decrease, the net effect is less mercury in the Saint Louis River. This is small comfort to people who live and recreate on the Embarrass River system. Because of the existing impairment for excess mercury in fish tissue, any project that anticipates adding further mercury to the Embarrass River should not be deemed acceptable. O

Mark Morrissey

747

Very concerned about endangering water table for generations to come. Come back with better technology in 50 years. This is reckless dangerous planning to go ahead with unproven technology. Mark Morrissey bemidji man Sent from my iPhone

Mark N. Lazar

14785

This project is a horrible idea. We are risking an environmental catastrophe that would destroy a wilderness treasure. There is no reason to trust PolyMet will continue to protect the BWCAW. Please don't allow this to happen. Mark Lazar 3500 Aldrich Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408 612-824-7936

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Pelham

1379

To Whom It May Concern My comments on the Polymet SEIS for public record are as follows: I have read several sections of the report and the lack of detail regarding financial assurance is troubling. It sounds like this information will not be given until the permitting phase, which is quite late in the game. The wastewater treatment may need to continue for hundreds of years, so the estimate of \$3-5-6 million annually is meaningless. How much will treatment cost in 100 years. 200 years. I cannot envision any scenario where Polymet could afford to set aside enough money to cover the cost of an open-ended treatment period. The document is remarkably vague about the length of time required for water treatment, so I must assume that no one knows with any certainty. My second concern is the complete lack of consideration for underground mining as an alternative. How many large, open pit mines do we want in the area. If we allow one, what right do we have to deny others. Taconite mining has already decimated part of the landscape in the area; must we now destroy the surface of more land. Underground mining may cost more, but without including it as an option, how will we know. I am not opposed to mineral extraction in NE Minnesota, but it must be done right, or not at all. The SEIS is based on the assumption that all will go according to plan. I don't see any room for errors, accidents, spills, etc, yet there will almost certainly be unplanned events during a project of this size and duration. The environmental risk seems much higher than the document admits to. I respectfully submit my opinion that the proposed project should not go forward in it's current design. The environmental risks are too high, the financial assurance is no more than wishful thinking at this point, and we should not set a precedent by allowing an open pit mine now, to be followed by an unknown number of other open pit projects. Thank you for considering my comments. Mark Pelham 400 Sigrid Drive, Buffalo MN 55313 mepelham@hotmail-com

Mark Peltan

40294

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mark Peltan 23334 Lakewood Clinton Township, MI 48035 US

Mark Perry

38595

Dear Sir/Madam, I am an environmental regulator and am familiar with the environmental review process. I believe that the environment review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure the PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. I believe that this project is environmentally sound and will benefit the state economically. Sincerely, Mark L Perry, WDC Natural Resources Specialist Bolton and Menk, Inc. Consulting Engineers and Surveyors 2638 Shadow Lane, Suite 200 Chaska, MN 55318 Office: 952-448-8838 ext. 2741 Fax: 952-448-8805 Cell: 612-756-3795 _____ This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud-com>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Phillips

18221

My name is a Dave Lislgar, and I yield my time to Mark Phillips. Good evening. My name is Mark Phillips, M-A-R-K, P-H-I-L-L-I-P-S. They list that I'm from Oakdale, Minnesota, that's where I currently reside, but I'm a native of Eveleth, Minnesota, and spent the first 55 years of my life on the Iron Range, and actually plan to return to that area in my retirement in just the not-too-distant future. Both my grandfathers were hard-rock miners in the Iron Range and most of my family and extended family made a living off iron-ore mining for their whole lives. I spent most of my career, about 30 years, in the field of economic development. The majority of that time, trying to encourage job growth in Northeastern Minnesota, and to quote somebody that was up here earlier, that's not an easy task. I was privileged to serve nearly two years in the Dayton Administration cabinet as the Commissioner of the Department of Employment and Economic Development. During that period, I served on the governor's sub-cabinet on mining and also on the Environmental Quality Board, the EQB. This engagement provided me with many unique opportunities to receive firsthand high-level briefings from most of the DNR and MPCA and other agencies, as well as from PolyMet, on the proposed project. During this period, I developed a deep respect and confidence in the environmental review process in Minnesota and in the agencies involved in these processes. I also observed that PolyMet has worked diligently to respond to both the State Federal agencies to ensure a project meets all of Minnesota's and federal environmental standards. I was also comforted that PolyMet was proposing to use proven technology to remove any contaminants before returning collected and processed water to the environment. I also appreciated that PolyMet was willing to meet the state's somewhat arbitrary wild rice standards. Based on these and other firsthand obligations, I support the PolyMet project. I believe the agencies, both state and federal, should find the SDEIS adequate and move forward with permitting. Let's bring these needed jobs back to the Iron Range, as well as protect the environment we all love. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Mark R Brown

3163

I have been following the progress that PolyMet Mining has made in anticipation of operation. I am impressed and confident that the preparations and precautions proposed by PolyMet through processes like reverse osmosis will protect the environment today and well into the future. Minnesota's Iron Range, my home has had continuous mining activity since this country was settled. Then as now the quality of life, the environment and the natural beauty of Northern Minnesota has been cherished and protected by the mines, their workers and those in the community that work and support this critical industry. This will not change with PolyMet Mining. I am confident that PolyMet's mining operation as outlined in the SDEIS will have minimal if any long term adverse effect on the water, air or land. I believe that PolyMet will provide real living wage jobs for residents of the area, support education, local charities and initiatives, youth activities and opportunities all the while safely and responsibly mining important metals that are essential to the local and global economy. I am in support of this project. With Kind Regards, Mark R. Brown 742 Ridgewood Road Duluth, MN 55804 218-591-9093 Mark R. Brown Morgan Stanley Wealth Management Associate Vice President Financial Advisor Portfolio Manager 11 East Superior Street Suite 580 Duluth, MN 55802 218-720-0144 [HYPERLINK "mailto:mark.r.brown@morganstanley-com"](mailto:mark.r.brown@morganstanley-com) <http://www.morganstanleyfa-com/mark.r.brown/> <http://www.morganstanleyfa-com/mark.r.brown/videobrochure.htm> Important Notice to Recipients: Please do not use e-mail to request, authorize or effect the purchase or sale of any security or commodity. Unfortunately, we cannot execute such instructions provided in e-mail. Thank you. The sender of this e-mail is an employee of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC ("Morgan Stanley"). If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Erroneous transmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: <http://www.morganstanley-com/disclaimers/mssbemail.html>. If you cannot access this link, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By messaging with Morgan Stanley you consent to the foregoing.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark R Brown

57361

I have been following the progress that PolyMet Mining has made in anticipation of operation. I am impressed and confident that the preparations and precautions proposed by PolyMet through processes like reverse osmosis will protect the environment today and well into the future. Minnesota's Iron Range, my home has had continuous mining activity since this country was settled. Then as now the quality of life, the environment and the natural beauty of Northern Minnesota has been cherished and protected by the mines, their workers and those in the community that work and support this critical industry. This will not change with PolyMet Mining. I am confident that PolyMet's mining operation as outlined in the SDEIS will have minimal if any long term adverse effect on the water, air or land. I believe that PolyMet will provide real living wage jobs for residents of the area, support education, local charities and initiatives, youth activities and opportunities all the while safely and responsibly mining important metals that are essential to the local; and global economy. I am in support of this project. With Kind Regards, Mark R. Brown 742 Ridgewood Road Duluth, MN 55804 218-591-9093 Mark R. Brown Morgan Stanley Wealth Management Associate Vice President Financial Advisor Portfolio Manager 11 East Superior Street Suite 580 Duluth, MN 55802 218-720-0144 HYPERLINK "mailto:mark.r.brown@morganstanley-com"mark.r.brown@morganstanley-com www.morganstanleyfa-com/mark.r.brown/ http://www.morganstanleyfa-com/mark.r.brown/videobrochure.htm Important Notice to Recipients: Please do not use e-mail to request, authorize or effect the purchase or sale of any security or commodity. Unfortunately, we cannot execute such instructions provided in e-mail. Thank you. The sender of this e-mail is an employee of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC ("Morgan Stanley"). If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Erroneous transmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: <http://www.morganstanley-com/disclaimers/mssbemail.html>. If you cannot access this link, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By messaging with Morgan Stanley you consent to the foregoing.

Mark Raulston

33238

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I spent one of the best weeks of my life canoeing in the Boundary Waters and Quetico-Superior, and have done other outdoors activities along Lake Superior between Duluth and Thunder Bay: canoeing, rock climbing, biking and swimming in Lake Superior. Though I wouldn't really recommend that unless you like ice baths. I now live on another of the Great Lakes in Chicago. I greatly appreciate the ecological, economic, and recreational value of the lakes. Even from a strictly business perspective, when you put a proper value on these services that the lakes provide, keeping sulfide mining is the right thing to do. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Mark Raulston 2543 N Bernard St Chicago, IL 60647-1201

Mark Rieder

11341

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Lisa, Please note my opposition to the Poly Met mine. The short term economic benefits do not outweigh the long term environmental cost I have recently seen claims from Poly Met that the economic benefit surpasses that of the Mayo/DMC project. I do not dispute those figures, but I do know that in Mayo's 150 year history it has not been a polluter of the environment, and will be in business long after Poly met runs out of things to mine. Please express my opposition to those who will decide on the value of this mine to the citizens of Minnesota. Respectfully, Mark Rieder 1069 Golfers Ct SE Rochester, MN 55904

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Roalson 57340

Mark Roalson, R-O-A-L-S-O-N. My main concern is the existing Dunka Pit, D-U-N-K-A. It is near PolyMet lands, but it is owned by Cliffs Natural Resources. It is a pit that had sulfuric rock, copper-nickel ore in it in the 1960s. They dug it up in the sixties and it wasn't iron, like they thought it was, it was copper-nickel ore. So it has been sitting around the pit, on the outside, and it has been bermed and diked, and there is a water treatment plant there, but it still leaks sulfuric acid, sulfates and heavy metals. And Cleveland -- or Cliffs Natural Resources has been fined at least once for letting this seep into the watershed that goes into Birch Lake. The MPCA and the DNR are responsible for making Cliffs Natural Resources clean this up, but they haven't done so. It still keeps leaking. So my main concern is if the regulating agencies, like the MPCA and the Minnesota DNR cannot make Cliffs Natural Resources clean this up before PolyMet, how are they going to regulate PolyMet, that is going to be a lot bigger operation? I don't know if I made that clear. Let's see what else I have on here. Another thing that concerns me about the PolyMet mine is that there doesn't appear to be any emergency plans in case of catastrophic events, like heavy rainfall, heavy winds that might damage or cause leaking in tailings ponds or in any treatment plants. In case there is heavy rains or heavy winds, they need to have emergency plans in place to prevent leaking or spillage. Also, on the PolyMet mine lands, there is going to be large containers of chemicals stored, like sulfuric acid and other chemicals to process the mine ore. And these things need to be bermed and contained, and there needs to be emergency plans in case some of those break, from whatever cause it might be. That's pretty much it. Oh, can I add one more thing? Minnesota has a law on the books stating that when you sink a hole in the ground, like exploratory drilling, to take ore samples out in the form of a core, that these exploratory holes have to be grouted, cemented from the bottom to the top to prevent cross aquifer contamination. But the Minnesota Department of Health has issued a waiver to the exploratory drilling companies that they don't have to grout these holes for ten years. So, one of my concerns is if they are giving waivers now and making exceptions, what other exceptions are they going to make in the mining process if things don't go according to plan? Alright. That should do it. Thank you.

57408

DNR: One factor that I couldn't find addressed in the latest PolyMet SDEIS is the issue of mitigating the results of natural disasters. While dealing with the acid water, heavy metals, waste rock and other concerns are listed, none take into account of what emergency efforts would take effect if there was a major flood. While the area to be mined is not located on a flood plain, neither is Duluth, MN. Only last year there was record summer rainfall in a short period of time and there was flooding to the extent never before recorded in Duluth's history. Whole paved streets were opened up and washed out. Sewers were overwhelmed. Cars floated away. A child was sucked into a sewer and miraculously came out an opening many blocks away, still alive, fortunately. I even experienced this in Brimson, MN, near the Iron Range where country roads were completely flooded and reamed out overnight to bedrock during the same time as the Duluth flooding. I am sure if you check the records at the MPCA, you will find that an already existing stockpile of copper-nickel ore stored within a berm (set aside by the former LTV mine on what is now Polymet) has several times had acid drainage wash over its walls and into tributaries going north to Birch Lake. Plankton, insects, and small fish life were the casualties. While earthquakes and tornadoes are very unlikely to happen in the northland, they are possibilities. Flooding, however, should definitely be considered in the emergency plans to contain waste and untreated water of all types. Thank you. Sincerely, Mark S. Roalson 218-225-8897 900 Dorchester Drive Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750

Mark S Jensen 54521

PolyMet has not proven that they can contain or dispose of the waste rock and other materials associated with the mining process.

Mark S Roalson 42805

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark S. Roalson

19100

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Mark S. Roalson 900 Dorchester Drive Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750 Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750 218 255 8897

Mark Saastad

39575

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mark Saastad 12272 Jack Pine Trl Eden Prairie, MN 55347-4631 (952) 828-5054

Mark Sanstead

18301

I am Mark Sanstead, fourth generation of Swedish immigrants to Minnesota. I'm proud of our state in terms of its legacy, amendments, and how our citizens would be taxed to protect our natural resources. As we look at mining ahead in the Minnesota future, I think we are at an important decision point. We are kind of weighing our heritage of natural resources, the water, the air, versus a short-term perspective of 300 jobs for a 20-year period by a company looking to start their very first mining operation. I hope that we can take a long-term view of our heritage and our resources, in terms of our quality of life in Minnesota, and be wise stewards of these resources. That's it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Sanstead 43317

I am very concerned about denigrating our water resources for decades ahead for the short term benefit of mining. I fear the costs will far out way the benefits to our state and our natural resources . I see few examples of successful copper mine reclamation. Please make sure we will not be paying a cost for generations. Let's not damage our Minnesota legacy. Mark Santead Phd Director Mental Health Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation

Mark Schoenecker 19957

Forgot to put a mailing address on my email so here it is Mark Schoenecker 18802 Brown's Lake Road Richmond Minnesota 56368 Sent from my iPad

19958

I am for the mining so jobs can be created I think we have more than enough protections in place to protect the environment. Get more people working in this state to help take the burden of high taxes off the rest of us working people. You democrats promised to lower property taxes which seem's to have gone out the window another broken promise. I am hoping the mining takes place and that a bunch of government regulation's does not put a stop to another opportunity to move this state forwaRdWe need more private sector job's people need to work in this state it only makes sense to go through with letting them mine in northern Minnesota.I think every one cares about protecting the environment and it can be done if we put our minds to it.Mining and protecting the environment could work if you get the rite people making the decision's.If this fall's through God help us all I may have to leave this state I am getting sick and tired of paying higher than usual taxes in a state that can't seem to move forward in other places than just the twin cities area. May God Bless us all bye for now thanks Mark Sent from my iPad

Mark Skelton 18078

Good evening. I'm Mark Skelton. I'm the Mayor of Hoyt Lakes and I'd like to begin by thanking the co-lead agencies, and all the agencies that have gotten us to this point, today, after nine years of hard work. I can't stand before you today and speak on the expertise of mining precious metals, but I am glad I live in a state and a country that have the experts to do what they've done to get us to this point, today. I do feel that I have some expertise to talk about the socioeconomics of this project, and I can start with the town about five miles from here called White Lakes that was a town of the '50s, new technology in mining, and how they closed that plant in 2001. In 2001, they closed that plant. But what I'm here to talk about is not our city. I'm here to talk about the socioeconomic impact of this statement. They talked about us as a region. Nine communities, three counties. They talk about us as a region, which they should, and as a region, did you know that we have 23,000 less citizens than we had in 1980? We have lost 10 percent of our population in this region. Ten percent. When our state sports 30-percent increase in population. Thirty percent increase versus a 10 percent. It's time to move forward. The socioeconomic impacts. Imagine. It is my hope -- it is my hope that the powers to be will look at this and will weigh, proportionately, the socioeconomic impacts to the science of this project. It is so important to us. Imagine, if you will. Imagine, if you will, two million man hours of construction, \$82 million of new federal, state and local taxes, \$232 million of direct wages, and so forth. \$330-plus million a year in direct output or the value of the metals coming out of the ground. That doesn't count the indirect -- the \$99 million in indirect wages, or the \$182 million in indirect output. It's time to do this project right, it's time to do this project now, and it's time to do this project here. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Skelton

18152

My name is Rory Lentsch. I represent the Local 512 Union Ironworkers Program. (Inaudible) apprenticeship program best program in the nation. I yield my time to Mark Skelton. Hi. My name is Mark Skelton. I'm the mayor of Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. Skelton is S-K-E-L-T-O-N. I understand that this project a risk. I took a risk crossing that highway out there in the roads a little while ago. I have to tell you that as far as a risk goes the consequences of taking that risk I believe is a risk we have to take. We have nine years of science. We have nine years of technology. We've got nine years of work from all these people. And we have regulatory agencies that are going to keep an eye on making sure this project is done. We cannot take the risk. We can say we're not going to do it. Yep. We're all going to use our phones. We're all going to use our computers. We're all going to use the medical technology. It's a risk that I believe has to be taken. I also have heard that Hoyt Lakes or the Iron Range needs to diversify their economy. They have to think outside the box and diversify their economy. I understand that people don't live there making a comment like that. If you live there, I think you've been living with your head in a box. Because the fact is we have been trying to diversify our economy for years, for decades. We have an agency called the Iron Range Resource Rehabilitation Board that has worked tirelessly for years. We have economic development people that we pay from small-town budgets to diversify our economy. We even built industrial parks. And my industrial park in my community has every amenity that you can possibly think of. And we have a marketing team that is awesome. But, you know what? The old analogy, "build it and they will come," we built it, nobody came. I will give you a little comparison. A little comparison of what is going on on The Range. My wife and I came down to the Excel Energy Center a few weeks ago and went to the Wild game. It was awesome. They announced that there were 20,000 fans. That is 20,000 more people than we have living in the cities of Virginia, Gilbert, Biwabik, Aurora, Hoyt Lakes, Babbitt, Tower, and Ely combined. This is a project that is about diversifying our economy. It's about stabilizing the economy. It's a project we need to do. Thank you.

Mark Snyder

58067

I'm very concerned about the loss of wetlands that would resort from the PolyMet mine as well as the risk this places on nearby water resources. Wisconsin has a moratorium on sulfide mining due to its track record. How can we be sure PolyMet will do better? Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Mark Sorenson

40654

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Are you guys nuts. There is very little in this mine proposal that even warrants discussion, let alone consideration. "Water, water everywhere, and not a drop to drink." I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Mark Sorenson 2987 W Owasso Blvd Saint Paul, MN 55113-2160

Mark Stratman

38955

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mark Stratman 110 Lakeview Ave Excelsior, MN 55331-9540

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Sutich

18358

Hello. My name is Mark Sutich. S-U-T-I-C-H. I'm a third-generation Iron Range bulldog. I've been involved in the mining industry off and on for 50 some years since I was a little kid. Got involved in some projects. I'm currently on site. I have -- my company leases property adjoining the PolyMet sites. We do quite a few project. I came prepared to talk to everybody tonight, but as I listened to everybody talk and bring up points, they're valid points; however, I think a lot of them might be selfish. You know, we want jobs on the Iron Range. Of course we do. We want to protect our water. We want to protect our forests. I don't think there's anybody in this building that wants to see environmental issues. I started at a mining company in '73. I watched many, many environmental issues come up and be addressed. These companies are responsible. Just like the regulatory organizations that are scrutinizing every move they make. They are going to be under a microscope. One of the things that my company does -- I've been involved with mining and mining people from all over the world. I recently talked to a gentleman who was a mining consultant worldwide. I met him -- I've known him for years. I met him at the Northern Green Expo at the Minneapolis Convention Center. He brought a point up to me. And I've heard it before. The world looks at the Mesabi Iron Range in Minnesota, the mining world, looks at it as the mecca of mining. The Australian mining -- there is nobody big technology other than Minnesota mining. South America relies on Minnesota mining. We are technically advanced in mining. When we look at this project, I have 300 jobs for 20 years, that's not true. It could be thousands of jobs for centuries. There are standards being set here. And in the true fashion of Minnesota, we're setting 14 the mining standards. We're setting cutting-edge technology that is going to pass through the world. We look at environmental issues. Let's bring these issues to South America. Let's bring them to China. I hear somebody say foreign countries are polluting our air. We're the people that have the capabilities of doing this. And, you know, we look at our whole situation, 60 years ago taconite was a dream; but it was our technology that developed that kind of mining. It's done all over the world today by our standards. We set those standards. We developed them. And we can do the same with this. And this is very important. And I think Minnesota needs to keep setting the standards in mining for the rest of the world to follow.

Mark Thurlo

41856

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mark Thurlo 1135 Loma Linda Ave Mound, MN 55364-9759

Mark Trainor

19973

I am a resident of Minnesota for the past 54 years..born here 1959 and never left I spend my summers and have a cabin in Ely MN I am 100% against this mining I am 100% sure the approval will go through no matter what we say or how many say it Why. Because there is 1 trillion dollars worth of Cu/Ni in the ground Mark Trainor 10540 Raven Loop Foley, MN. 56329 783 Kawishiwi Trail Ely, MN mgtrainor@gmail-com

Mark Trumper

45775

Dear DNR folks, One of the most important places in my life is the BWCA. It is a place of majestic beauty and clean clear waters. The polymet project is too close to this wilderness. It is too risky. The amount of time to treat the water is unreasonable, costly and unproven. The science has been called junk science by experts in environmental science. Importantly as well, the big promise, getting some to buy into this project, is the prospect of jobs in an economically depressed area. This is a short sighted advantage. The jobs are few and short lived. This is a bad project. When you decide if this goes through or not, the question is: is it the right thing to do. That's easy. No. It is wrong because the benefits are minimal and the long term costs are too high. It is risky and unproven. The foundation of the environmental protections are built on junk science. Don't approve Polymet. It is morally and economically wrong. Mark Trumper Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mark voorhees

38872

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Ask a question of Polymet "how many mines have been mined/on-going with the Polymet name". What is their track record. Sincerely, Mr mark voorhees 7660 Heritage Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55346-4426 (952) 949-0276

Mark Walters

42044

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mark Walters Hibbing, Minnesota

Mark Weis

3385

With the PolyMet proposal that says we might be treating this water for up to 500 years, is 20 years of mining really worth it. There has never been a successful mine of this type that the mining company has not filed for bankruptcy prior to the mine being successfully closed. Why doesn't the State of Minnesota do what Wisconsin has done and put a ban on this type of mining until a mine can be run for at least ten years and then shut down for at least ten years with no problems. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not allow this mine to open. We are only going to get one chance to do this right. Thank you, Mark Weis

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Wihriala

9585

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. In closing , I ask you to take a personal interest in protecting us from corporate interest in the short term and provide us long lasting water quality that we all can live with. Sincerely yours, Mark C Wihriala 710 12 ave Two Harbors Mn 55616 Mark Wihriala 710 12th Avenue North Duluth, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Wihriala

18498

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. In closing , I ask you to take a personal interest in protecting us from corporate interest in the short term and provide us long lasting water quality that we all can live with. Sincerely yours, Mark C Wihriala 710 12 ave Two Harbors Mn 55616 Mark Wihriala 710 12th Avenue North Duluth, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mark Wihriala

50582

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. In closing, I ask you to take a personal interest in protecting us from corporate interest in the short term and provide us long lasting water quality that we all can live with.

Sincerely yours, Mark C Wihriala 710 12 ave Two Harbors Mn 55616 Mark Wihriala 710 12th Avenue North Duluth, MN 55616

Mark Wihviala

19519

My name is Mark Wihviala. I'm a Finlander like most of you out here. So I'm an outdoorsman, a fisher, canoeist. I love Minnesota. I've been here all my life. But I am here tonight because I am concerned about the water quality of Minnesota's rivers, streams, and lakes. I fish these waters. I drink these waters. And I swim these waters. I do not want them to be polluted. But I do not believe that the SDEIS is a sufficient, cumulative assessment of the water quality impact from PolyMet Mining. I am requesting the state and Minnesota to deny the wetlands destruction permit, Section 404 Permit to be denied since PolyMet's discharge would violate water quality standards, destroy animal and fish habitat, and threaten national resources for centuries to come. Thank you.

Markus (Blom) Dandy

57255

75% of people oppose this process around the Grand Canyon area...Lake Superior and the BWCA are at least as important to Minnesotans (& humans as well as other animals – that require clean water to live) Short term employment is nothing compared to the long term loss(es).

marla kennedy

38902

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs marla kennedy 2259 Summit Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1002 (651) 645-3303

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marlene Lorraine Johnson 57220

I am totally against any of the proposed mining projects. It will damage the environment and not worth it. Stop it please!Marlene Lorraine Johnson1903 Old N. Shore RdDuluth, MN 55804

Marlene Voita 18234

Marlene Voita. I am a Sierra Club board member concerned about the environment and that for 300 jobs to have environmental effect for 300 to 500 years when we won't be here and the company won't be here and how long will the company last? Twenty years at most? I really think that this has to be rethought, especially with the state-of-the-art now where PolyMet has never had a facility like this before, and none of the plants that currently exist can show that they have no environmental effect. In fact, they have grave environmental effect on the land and water resources. Very concerned that this project would go forward, and I have experience working with environmental impact statements for the Pollution Control Agency, formerly, and I just don't think that it's appropriate to trade our future for 300 jobs and ruination of our land by the Boundary Waters or in the northern part of the state. The next project will be closer to the Boundary Waters. I know this is a different watershed but to ruin a watershed over a project like this. That's all I have to say. And we have a cabin in the Silver Bay area, so we're concerned about watershed.

Marlene Warkoczewski 43107

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Marlene Warkoczewski 126 Union Road Coatesville, PA 19320

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marlin Maas

41672

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Marsha Bezold

24784

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am writing this to urge you NOT to allow this mining in the Arrowhead and Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This beautiful area should be preserved for our grandchildren and great grandchildren and beyond. Did you know that the Boundary Waters area is one of 3 national high adventure camping trips that Boy Scouts can partake in. Let me tell you it is the experience of a lifetime. Please protect these areas for US, the taxpayers and the everyday people of this country to enjoy. Don't give away our God given wilderness to those who would exploit it for their own profit and leave the mess for the American people to clean up. Please do the right thing and protect this land. Sincerely, Marsha Bezold 100 Lantern Trl Midway, KY 40347-9030

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Baxter

19819

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martha Baxter 3709 Grand Way 218 St Louis Park, MN 55416

49556

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martha Baxter 3709 Grand Way 218 St Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Brummitt 18298

Martha Brummitt. At age 24, and as a graduate with a Bachelor's degree in geology, I understand the benefits of exploration mining. However, when I entered the poor job economy a few years ago, I thought about the far future and the state of the planet and what's important to me, exploring our natural environment. Instead of taking a job in geology with a high salary, I decided to explore. I chose to pursue an environmental education, using my geology background, the study of earth, to educate people. Using wilderness travel as an avenue for educating others, I earn a living by leading youth in the Boundary Waters, teaching watershed education and exposing people to the pristine resources we have left. If this goes negatively, it could negatively affect my job security. Let's not pollute it. Let's recycle what we have already stripped. On behalf of my generation, do not allow the PolyMet project to get passed. Because it will negatively impact the Boundary Water Canoe Area and our planet. Thanks.

Martha Cleveland 38449

The pollution concerns are monumental. The proposed solutions are ludicrous. This whole idea is a travesty. vote NO. Martha Cleveland Minnetonka MN

Martha Henrickson 54859

See attachment

54863

See attachment

54879

See attachment

Martha Krikava 17012

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martha Krikava 9696 101st St N 9696 101st St N Grant, MN 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Krikava

50287

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Martha Krikava 9696 101st St N 9696 101st St N Grant, MN 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Langer

16063

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Martha M Bjornson

57147

Please do not let this mining happen. We must preserve our water, our wildlife and our wilderness. Martha M. Bjornson 327 Wildwood Drive Duluth, MN 55811

Martha M Ritter

57270

The historical record (real data) show that no sulfide mining has been done without destroying associated ground and surface waters for unknown 100's of years hence. The proposed mines will be viable for +/- 20 years. Why would we sacrifice our land, fresh waters (eventually including Lake Superior) for 100's (at least 500 years) with no proof (data) indicating this can be done without system pollution? Where is the proof that initiating companies can and will afford and carry out appropriate remediation and how do the people who live here (along with other life forms that are to be protected under EPA dictates) do for potable H2O in the meantime over our future 100's of years? Martha M. Ritter 3750 Huckleberry Lane Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Morse

43721

1172 Parkwood Lane Stillwater, MN 55082 March 13, 2014 To the staff at the Minnesota DNR, US Army Corp of Engineers, and the US Forest Service: Thank you for your hard work in preparing the SDEIS for the proposed NorthMet/PolyMet Mining Project and for this opportunity to provide input. I am opposed to the proposed NorthMet/PolyMet mine in northern Minnesota. The statistical model which was used to determine the mine's environmental impact is flawed in that it does not take into account the worst case scenario but only outcomes with the greatest probabilities. Consequently, the SDEIS underestimates the potential human, environmental, and remediation costs. Recent environmental disasters demonstrate that we need to consider the impact of the worst possible outcomes, such as the "not-in-a-thousand-years" seepage of pollutants into Athabasca River and groundwater from tailings ponds in Alberta, Canada (The Canadian Press, February 20, 2014), and the discharge of toxic chemicals into the Elk River in West Virginia in January 2014 (causing the governor to order the National Guard to truck bottled water to residents and restaurants for drinking and bathing). The probable scenarios in the NorthMet/PolyMet SDEIS do not account for less frequent but certainly occurring real events, such as Duluth's recent 500-year flood which could cause an overflow of the tailings ponds. The tailings ponds and mining and mitigation plans in the NorthMet/PolyMet proposal do not adequately protect the public or the environment against the effects of such infrequent but certainly occurring events. Research shows that risks and costs are often underestimated. According to an article in the Canadian Press ("Federal study confirms oilsands ponds leaking," February 20, 2014), "Industry has acknowledged that seepage can occur and previous studies using models have estimated it at 6-5 million litres a day from a single pond." According to an article in the New York Times ("Alberta's Tar Sands, the Dead Duck Trial," March 1, 2014), "RiskMetrics, a financial research firm, recently put out a report indicating that tailings ponds represent an unknown liability for investors because producers have tended to underestimate remediation costs." Please do not trade short-term gains for long-term costs. Thank you. Sincerely, Martha Morse (Ely/Burntside Lake property owner)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Roberts

43118

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Ms Lisa Fay: I am providing comments regarding the proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Reframing Minnesota's Priorities to Recognize and Support the Vital Role of Biodiversity, Wild Lands and Eco-systems in Maintaining Human Security and Health The people of Minnesota need to re-frame how they view economic development and how they balance economic growth with environmental protection priorities for the state. With the very real threat of climate change and human population pressures on our natural resources, it is past time for us to move to a much more sophisticated world view of how we protect and maintain the quality and health of our natural ecosystems and wild lands. We need to recognize that not only our economic well-being and sustainability, but also human survival, depends on protecting and restoring the natural environment and the biological systems that create and maintain life. Minnesota is part of a global ecosystem and climate, and we will not exist as a species without this ecosystem remaining in balance. PolyMet's Financial Assurance and Reclamation Plan Are a Shell Game (Con Job) PolyMet Mining cannot guarantee the protection of northern Minnesota's environment, bio-diversity, water quality and the health of people and animals exposed to the inevitable resulting toxic pollution from mining. The proposed mine will ultimately destroy a significant amount of wetland and forest habitat in the middle of northern Minnesota, in the Superior National Forest, and Minnesota tax payers will end up covering the cost of the LONG TERM environmental damage incurred. Minnesota needs to move away from accommodating multi-international extraction industry financial interests and sacrificing the natural environment, public health, well-being and long term economic interest of Minnesotans. There is no level of "financial assurance" that PolyMet can give Minnesota that will assure the ongoing LONG TERM protection of northern Minnesota's wetlands, Superior Forest land, surface water and ground water quality, and the protection of threatened wildlife that depend on these natural habitats. Humans exposed to mining ground water pollutants face serious long-term health risks, and we have already seen (and should have learned from) the increased Mesothelioma Cancer risk for miners exposed to toxic air quality in mining work sites in northern Minnesota. Multi-international mining corporations are notorious for leaving environmental messes and toxic waste behind, after they have used up natural resources and moved on. The state of Minnesota is kidding itself (and is highly irresponsible) if it thinks it will have any legal standing to hold a multi-international mining company accountable for continuing to pay for and implement pollution mitigation after they are done extracting a projected 533 million tons of ore and waste rock over a 20-year period. It is ridiculous to think PolyMet would be responsible for what realistically would require hundreds of years, if not longer, of polluted water treatment to "assure" that watershed streams (Saint Louis River, Lake Superior, and other tributaries) and ground water are not contaminated. In addition, the proposed plan for water treatment of surface waters does not address the very high risk of polluting ground water, especially when you consider what the plan is for "reclamation." The DNR's description of PolyMet supposedly "reclaiming" its buried waste by covering it with a plastic membrane, filling up the mining pits with back water and then topping them off with a "reclaimed wetland" is science fiction. This is a ground water disaster waiting to happen. The state can't seriously claim that Minnesota will have any realistic legal standing to hold Po

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Vest

16882

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martha Vest 63 Fairview Avenue S. St Paul, MN 55105

43460

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Martha Vest 63 Fairview Avenue S. St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martha Vest

50196

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martha Vest 63 Fairview Avenue S. St Paul, MN 55105

Martin and Teresa Theobald

44682

PolyMet has not shown that they can protect the environment adequately. They continually try to cloud the topic of environmental protection with talks of new jobs. That is irrelevant. When the mines are long gone, tourism will be the industry that keeps Ely and other small range towns alive. I will not support sulfide mining in MN until the techniques have proven safe in other states. Martin Theobald

Martin Anderson

57931

Keep our waters clean!! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnuinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Aletemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martin Cooney

45167

Dear Ms Fay- My name is Martin Cooney. I live at 2912 Cherokee Place in Golden Valley, Minnesota. My zip code is 55422- I am a 35-year resident of Minnesota. I moved here in my early 20's because I wanted to raise a family and pursue a career in a state that valued and protected its natural resources and provided me and my family with a place to paddle and camp in the wilderness and the state's rivers, lakes and forests. I also wanted to settle here because I felt that the government would represent the interests of the people of this state would be represented with firmness and strength against the concentrated financial and political power of large corporations which, in too many cases, overwhelm the divided voices of individuals and community groups that don't have the money or the expertise to muster slick, expensive publicity campaigns or to pay local well-connected lawyers. Polymet is proposing to create jobs in Minnesota for a maximum of twenty years, at beSt When Polymet is gone, by their own admission, they will have left an environmental mess that will cost millions to clean up. There is no mention of where the clean-up money will come from. The technology that Polymet claims will insulate Minnesota's waters for the inevitable pollution produced by their mining venture is experimental and unproven. Most of the money coming out of the earth will have gone to Switzerland and parts unknown after passing through Canada. The water that has been poisoned by Polymet will have to be filtered for two hundred years - or more. The local economy will be more or less where it is now, suffering once again from unemployment because of the departure of a short-term mining venture. Only this time it will be Polymet that played out the mines. But what will be different from the down-sizing of the iron ore mining operations will be the risk that the State's most vulnerable waters will be polluted beyond recovery, the State's recreation and tourist industry crippled, and the local communities hurting once again from boom and bust mining. Require a very conservative level of financial assurance escrowed up-front I am writing to urge you to deny a permit to Polymet, a corporation that is owned by who-knows-what other mining interests that have insulated themselves from financial risk of this mining venture, unless Polymet's investors produce an amount of money equal to the the present value of the conservatively estimated costs of decommissioning the mine once Polymet is done with it. This amount must be conservatively estimated by impartial financial advisors retained by the State, and not by Polymet or its affiliated, associated, hired, or otherwise related or interested parties. This financial assurance amount must be put under the control of the state, invested in US Treasury bonds and completely insulated from any and all risks. I understand that the laws of the State of Minnesota require that Polymet or any comparable venture fully insulate Minnesota's tax-payers from the costs of cleaning up Polymet's mess once the venture has exhausted the mineral deposits, dividended the profits of the mining venture to their shareholders, and run out of cash. The only way to do this is to require that Polymet escrow the full amount of the financial assurance up front, before the operation begins. If, as Polymet maintains, there are "billions of dollars" of minerals on the Range, there can be little risk of recouping the carrying cost of the financial assurance. They are committed to spend the principal in decommissioning the mine and cleaning the environment for God-knows-how long after they've left. If there is a risk of recouping the carrying costs, then it should be Polymet that bears that risk and not Minnesota's taxpayers. Experimental and innovative techniques to control pollution The abundance of Minnesota's waters: rivers, lakes, streams, and groundwater, make it especially vulnerable to the kind of mining proposed by Pol

martin dahlke

21517

Feb 22, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. And while I'd rather not see the mine built in my backyard at all I wouldn't be able to oppose it if there was a clear case the our public institutions will be left holding the bag of pollution when the corporate interests are done collecting profits. Sincerely, martin dahlke 813 12th St Hudson, WI 54016-1803 (715) 690-1090

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martin Dietl

36727

Dear Sir/Madam: I write to please encourage you to deny Polymet a permit to mine in Northern Minnesota. The BWCA is far too precious a resource to risk to a company and an industry that has a long history of polluting and ruining the environment. Thank you for your consideration, Martin Dietl 3309 47th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Martin Makinen

9309

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martin Makinen 12125 Kenyon Ct. NE Street 2 Blaine, MN 55449

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martin Makinen

18420

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martin Makinen 12125 Kenyon Ct. NE Street 2 Blaine, MN 55449

50539

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Martin Makinen 12125 Kenyon Ct. NE Street 2 Blaine, MN 55449

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Martin Rigney 45420

To Whom It May Concern: First of all, I understand that name and legal mailing address are required for my comments to be valid. Martin P. Rigney, Phd 1027 Sherren Street W Roseville, MN 55113 I am writing to comment on PolyMet's request for a permit to discharge mining runoff into a wetland called the One Hundred Mile Swamp. By way of context, I am a transplanted Minnesotan born in Iowa who has, at various times in the last 58 years, called Iowa, Georgia, Illinois, Germany, Switzerland and Minnesota home. From my perspective, the single most remarkable feature of Minnesota as a place to call home is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. When I have been in state I have been at least an annual visitor to the BWCA and look forward all year to my birthday trip to the BWCA. I am a chemist by training and an RandD executive at a major Minnesota company with significant business in the mining industry. I am neither anti-mining nor what I would call an avowed environmentalist Each year I watch the Forest Service video encouraging me to "leave no trace" and take pride in always leaving a campsite in better repair than I find it. Having reviewed the pertinent facts, I am not convinced that PolyMet is being held to the same standard as an individual visitor to the BWCA despite the obviously potential for more significant and long term damage from their mining operation. I have been following the PolyMet controversy as reported in the mainstream media without forming an opinion one way or another but rather viewing it as the classic debate between local economic benefit and inevitable – and fiercely debated – environmental impact. I have recently dug a bit deeper and my position is a simple one – the burden should be – but has not been - placed on PolyMet to prove not that there will be no impact but that the future impact has been carefully and completely modeled in a scientifically rigorous manner such that a decision is made with a full understanding of the balance between positive economic impact and measurable but well understood negative environmental impact. In this regard, I am guided by the adage drilled into me in graduate school – theory guides but experiment decides. Given the value of this natural wonder I can imagine no justifiable reason not to require specific testing to confirm that water discharged from the mine site does not and indeed cannot enter the BWCA and I see no indication of this plan in the SDEIS. I admit that I have not read the SDEIP statement word for word but visual and electronic searches have failed to locate any data in the document to confirm that the mine site is geologically and hydrologically isolated from the Rainy Lake/BWCA watershed. I am sure you are aware of the concern about the accuracy of the maps contained within the SDEIS as referenced to the National Atlas and this only further compels that an experimental study of mine drainage be conducted. Before permitting can move forward, I encourage that experimental data are generated that are a more reliable predictor of the impact of the mine on the BWCA than the at best incomplete and at worst intentionally misleading information currently contained in the SDEIS. Best regards, Martin Rigney CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain proprietary and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Martin Running 18325

My name is Martin Running. I live in Duluth. I want to thank Army Corps of Engineers and the DNR to let us have this public input here. I wasn't planning on speaking tonight, but I was looking at all the stickers on everybody and I was noticing several of these people had "clean water" stickers on. These are the same people I saw at a previous meeting that were against a cell tower that was going to be put up outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. They didn't want to be able to see the tower (inaudible). This is a tremendous opportunity for the state of Minnesota and local people. I don't think we should let this go. And I don't think that we should have that much land tied up just so a few people can paddle canoes around. Thank you.

Martin Sterner 42806

See attachment

Martin von Euw 43030

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marty Kauls 42086

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Marty Kauls St Paul, Minnesota

Marty Seifert 42676

See attachment

marv schuety 45557

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on Alces Americanus, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described and should not be built anywhere that would impact any wildlife in the state of minnesota or any other state . the wildlife has sufferd greatly just from home builders ,not to mention other businesses that are built in wildlife areas . the declining moose population should speak for itself in this matter without any input from the public ,unless your goul is to make the moose and other animals extinct in minnesota .i know the pollititions dont care because they get paid under the table to make this and other projects go thru no matter what the publics vote says they lie cheat and steal from us tax payers for there own gain .i think that the public should be in on all the helping decide where and what happens with our country wildlife or not .i vote to protect the land from being robbed of the minerals and destroying the moose and other wildlife popultion in this or any other area im strongly against the mining of any thing in the area describe here . Sincerely, Mr marv schuety 6817 Barrows Ave Brainerd, MN 56401-1776

Mary Alice Harvey 42760

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Amundson

44204

Mar 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I also have other concerns about pollution. Once land, water, air and wildlife are destroyed, they never are completely be pristine any more and the dangers from the pollution go on for a long, long time. Also, corporations promise to clean up the messes that they create and often it is done partially or not at all because they don't have the knowledge to do the job correctly; sometimes there is no good way to clean up the problem created. Sometimes tax payers bear the cost of whatever cleanup must be done. Also, there is the issue of health related problems from pollution which can be permanent and sometimes fatal. None of the benefits from this mining can ever offset the detriments to health or pollution of the environment, locally or globally, and the effects on wildlife. Our planet is already in serious trouble from pollution; we do not need to contribute to it with more pollution. We need to be caretakers of this precious land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Amundson 10012 Drew Ave S Bloomington, MN 55431-2728

48500

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I also have other concerns about pollution. Once land, water, air and wildlife are destroyed, they never are completely be pristine any more and the dangers from the pollution go on for a long, long time. Also, corporations promise to clean up the messes that they create and often it is done partially or not at all because they don't have the knowledge to do the job correctly; sometimes there is no good way to clean up the problem created. Sometimes tax payers bear the cost of whatever cleanup must be done. Also, there is the issue of health related problems from pollution which can be permanent and sometimes fatal. None of the benefits from this mining can ever offset the detriments to health or pollution of the environment, locally or globally, and the effects on wildlife. Our planet is already in serious trouble from pollution; we do not need to contribute to it with more pollution. We need to be caretakers of this precious land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Amundson 10012 Drew Ave S Bloomington, MN 55431-2728

Mary Anderson

43860

I am opposed to PolyMet's proposed open pit mine in Northern MN, due to my concerns for the negative impact that it would have on the environment. I strongly oppose this project. Mary Anderson,15124 Lynn Terrace, Minnetonka, MN 55345 Thank you, - Mary Anderson

Mary Ann Lundquist

38699

Northern Minnesota is an irreplaceable gem with its pristine lakes, forests, and wetlands. Though a few hundred jobs for up to twenty years would be important in the short term it makes no sense to risk the disastrous pollution for up to 500 years. I cannot get over the admitted fact that there has NEVER been a copper nickel sulfide mine that has not leaked. We need to protect our land and water. I strongly urge our law makers to look at developing jobs in the clean energy area. It is sad that the new battery plant that will manufacture batteries for the Tesla car will be in Arizona. The plant alone will employ over 1,000 people. In Connecticut, Fuel Cell Energy Power is building hydrogen power plants to generate electricity and heat to power homes and industry. We need long lasting jobs here in Minnesota in industries that are forward looking and do not destroy our land and water. Mary Ann Lundquist

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MARY ANN RANDALL

42090

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, MARY ANN RANDALL North Oaks, Minnesota

Mary Arps Thompson

10037

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Again PolyMet has prepared an SDEIS with flawed data and inaccurate information. If they can't get this right, how will they protect the most precious resource we have, our water. Mary Arps Thompson 1370 White Lake Dr 1370 White Lake Dr Duluth, MN 55803

18786

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Again PolyMet has prepared an SDEIS with flawed data and inaccurate information. If they can't get this right, how will they protect the most precious resource we have, our water. Mary Arps Thompson 1370 White Lake Dr 1370 White Lake Dr Duluth, MN 55803

45143

Mar 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please have the courage to say NO to sulfide ore mining. Who do you believe. An industry with a terrible, costly, environmental record. They always say "It will be different this time, we have NEW technology." But do we want to be the experiment, risking our precious waters. Managing the state's natural resources does not mean they have to be taken. Sometimes the best management is leaving resources where they are. Especially when removing them means damaging an even more valuable resource, our clean water. When we can't drink the water, it is too late. Economics what will be the cost of cleanup and who will pay. A shell corporation with no real assets. And why do we want another industry to lead us down the road of boom and bust again. Please have the courage to say NO to sulfide ore mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Mary Arps Thompson 1370 White Lake Dr Duluth, MN 55803-9712

48522

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please have the courage to say NO to sulfide ore mining. Who do you believe. An industry with a terrible, costly, environmental record. They always say "It will be different this time, we have NEW technology." But do we want to be the experiment, risking our precious waters. Managing the state's natural resources does not mean they have to be taken. Sometimes the best management is leaving resources where they are. Especially when removing them means damaging an even more valuable resource, our clean water. When we can't drink the water, it is too late. Economics what will be the cost of cleanup and who will pay. A shell corporation with no real assets. And why do we want another industry to lead us down the road of boom and bust again. Please have the courage to say NO to sulfide ore mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Mary Arps Thompson 1370 White Lake Dr Duluth, MN 55803-9712

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Arps Thompson 50859

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Again PolyMet has prepared an SDEIS with flawed data and inaccurate information. If they can't get this right, how will they protect the most precious resource we have, our water. Mary Arps Thompson 1370 White Lake Dr 1370 White Lake Dr Duluth, MN 55803

Mary Becker 52296

I have reviewed the EIS ,and would like this project to go forward. The regulating agencies need to base their decision on science and facts. I feel I am a very strong environmentalist and I am all for clean water. The citizens of Minnesota have to trust in our government regulating agencies to do a good job of overseeing, monitoring, and regulating. We can only look at all the industries in Minnesota that do a of good job of minimizing their impact on the environment to see that this mine could do the same. My hope would be that the "not in my backyard" mentality rules over facts and good science. Vernon Becker 39679 592 ave Eden Valley MN 55329 320-282-5227

Mary Bjorngjeld 30266

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please protect our fresh water in BWCA and Lake Superior. This mining that is proposed is a dirty deal that threatens the health of watersheds and eco-systems for miles around the proposed site. Just say NO it is not worth the threat to natural resources(including wildlife) and public health. Say NO to big business. Say NO to pollution. Say NO to sulfide mining in MN. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest and we do not want it . Sincerely, Mary Bjorngjeld 1201 Pearson Pkwy Brooklyn Park, MN 55444-1757 (763) 566-8255

Mary Boranian 54850

See attachment

Mary Boyd-Brent 38881

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Mary Boyd-Brent 2233 Scudder St Saint Paul, MN 55108-1919

Mary C Kaeter 54760

See attachment

Mary Campbell 52225

My husband and I are totally opposed to the mining. While there may be some positives in terms of jobs for a few people, the long term effects are likely to be devastating. Please do not allow this mine to go forwaRd Stuart and Mary Campbell 7125 Boyd Avenue Eden Prairie, MN 565346 612-877-0966

Mary Carlson 54116

I do not support copper mining in Minnesota. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Cunningham

44305

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit I disagree with the way the current (Supplemental) Draft EIS disregards the concerns of the Fond du Lac and Grand Portage Tribal Governments, the 1854 Treaty Authority, and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission. Furthermore, the PolyMet review process used incorrect maps in the environmental impact statement that give the impression that mine waste is geographically isolated from the BWCA watershed when it is not. The maps used include incorrect outlines of the One Hundred Mile Swamp which is downhill from the mine site and will collect acid and heavy metal laced run off from the mine. I believe the environmental impact statement is inadequate, and I ask you to suspend any decision about the Draft EIS until these problems have been corrected. Sincerely, Mary Cunningham 1764 Lindig St Falcon Heights, MN 55113

Mary Davis

16724

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Davis 6674 Boyd Avenue Eden Prairie, MN 55346

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Davis

50088

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Mary Davis 6674 Boyd Avenue Eden Prairie, MN 55346

Mary Dickson

44537

Dear Sirs: I am voicing my opposition to the Poly Met operation. I do not think it is well thought out and think we should wait until the operation is safer. They cannot guarantee that they will be around for the next 500 years. Our water, our wildlife is our most valuable resource and we cannot put it in further danger. I cannot believe you are even considering this operation. Mary Dickson

Mary Disch

18266

My name is Mary Disch, D-I-S-C-H. I have some concerns about the Mining Project. At this point I am not in favor because my concern primarily is pollution affecting the watershed for Lake Superior and especially the wild rice area in that sense. And I'm concerned about whether the assurance will be enough to clean up, because the pollution is inevitable. That I'm not sure how the amount is determined and whether that will be a sufficient amount, given that the project is only 20 years, but the pollution may occur for quite a bit after that, and will. I think that's probably the environmental effects. I'm concerned whether PolyMet is -- I know it is a new company, but it is funded by other companies' money, and what their track record has been. My concern, too, is that opening this area to copper sulfide mining might open it up to more of that, and what the cumulative effects might be, and my concerns of the cumulative effects on the people that live nearby and the water quality of the Hoyt Lakes, which I think is pretty close. I would just like to see more concern and overseeing what -- my question is when PolyMet says they are going to do this, how often does that happen? And is there a way of assuring that that happens? What they say -- I know in reality what people say and then nature has its own ways of eroding things, and who oversees that, I'm not quite sure that I have gotten that question answered, as to who monitors and how well is the monitoring done in order to provide that we have clean water, especially how it is affecting Lake Superior and affecting the wild rice in the area. And my concern, too, that wild rice, when I talk to people, it moves around, so it is not like you can say this specific area has wild rice. So it is essential that the area has clean water so that wild rice can move to where it needs to move. And I heard that the mercury is more up, and fish, with the higher sulfate levels, and so that's part of my concern, whether those levels will be safe enough for fish. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Dosch

19508

My name is Mary Dosch, address 5523 London Road, Duluth, Minnesota 55804, D-O-S-C-H. So these are my PolyMet NorthMet comments regarding moose. Like most Minnesotans, I'm proud of our outstanding natural heritage including our iconic moose populations. However, the PolyMet SDEIS acknowledges that overall moose population in Minnesota declined 35 percent from 2012 to 2013, and now moose are a state species of concern. The PolyMet project would harm moose due to habitat fragmentation and loss. The key habitat types considered moose habitat include mature forest, grassland and brushland and aquatic environment. A total of 2,775.2 acres of these habitat types would be directly affected by the NorthMet Project -- by the NorthMet Project proposed action, and thus, would affect individual moose in the vicinity through habitat loss and fragmentation. Moose are important to the Indian bands under treaties and for subsistence. The SDEIS says that impacts on moose will be discussed in the Cultural Resources Section 5.2.9. However, neither that Cultural Resources Section nor the Cumulative Impact Section mention one word about moose. The PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate in that it needs to be redone to study cultural effects of loss of moose habitat at the PolyMet mine site and the cumulative adverse impact on moose. I'm sure we all want moose in Minnesota to survive so that our descendants will not have to learn that moose have gone the way of the passenger pigeon.

37853

Greetings: I am opposed to the proposed PolyMet mine for many reasons, including the fact that I'm an animal lover who wants to know that our precious wildlife will be here for future generations. For example, moose are already in substantial decline and the habitat loss that would inevitably occur if PolyMet were to mine would expedite further losses for our priceless moose population. In addition, many species of birds whose homes would be in harm's way, eg, birds in the St Louis River Estuary like Common Loons, Hooded Mergansers and Belted Kingfishers, need to be considered when weighing the pros and cons of this proposed mining project. Given the potential for great harm to wildlife, including moose, birds and fish, due to loss of habitat and/or pollution of habitat, I respectfully ask that ALTERNATIVES to the open pit mine, specifically an UNDERGROUND MINE, be studied. Since PolyMet has acknowledged that an underground mine could access copper and nickel, and since an underground mine would be far less destructive to the habitats of wildlife species in impacted areas, I further ask that PolyMet's SDEIS be rejected as INADEQUATE since it did not adequately address the possibility of an underground mine. Sincerely, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road Duluth, MN 55804 - "The eyes of the future are looking back at us and they are praying for us to see beyond our own time." - By Terry Tempest Williams

37857

Greetings: Among the numerous concerns I have about the proposed PolyMet project and its SDEIS and the Section 404 Permit is the impact that it would have on wetlands. Also, two areas that are downstream from the proposed PolyMet mine that would be adversely impacted by it are the Sax-Zim Bog and the St Louis River with its priceless estuary. PolyMet's plan for an open pit mine would directly destroy more than 900 acres of wetlands and could indirectly destroy more than 7,351 additional acres of wetlands in the Partridge and Embarrass River watersheds due to pollution and changes in hydrology. The proposed wetland mitigation only covers the 912-5 acres of direct wetland impacts. Therefore, the more than ten miles of additional wetlands projected to be "indirectly" impacted by water drawdowns and toxic materials will likely be permanently harmed as the bogs and coniferous swamps in harm's way are extremely difficult to restore. Thus the SDEIS, by not addressing the impacts on these "indirectly" impacted wetlands, is INADEQUATE in that respect. Also, where pollution from the mine pits, mine wastes and tailings piles seeps up from surface ground water flow to wetlands, it is virtually certain that PolyMet's discharge would violate water quality standards. Furthermore, PolyMet's excavation and thus changing hydrology in wetlands would increase mercury loading to wetlands and streams and increase mercury bioaccumulation in fish, thus putting human health at risk. Given the harmful outcomes discussed above, I respectfully ask that you a) REJECT PolyMet's SDEIS as INADEQUATE and the PolyMet project as ENVIRONMENTALLY HARMFUL; b) DENY the wetlands destruction permit (Section 404 permit); and c) DENY PolyMet a state permit to mine. Sincerely, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road Duluth, MN 55804 - "The eyes of the future are looking back at us and they are praying for us to see beyond our own time." - By Terry Tempest Williams

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Dosch 37864

Greetings: I am extremely concerned about what will occur if PolyMet is given permission to mine for copper and nickel in the priceless region between the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior. Given that PolyMet's own mine plan admits that millions of gallons of polluted water will seep off site, uncaptured and untreated, and that this will continue for hundreds of years, I have to ask how we can even consider giving PolyMet the green light. PolyMet's water pollution from the permanent mine's waste rock pile would need treatment for at least 200 years and pollution from the tailings piles would require treatment for at least 500 years and the pollution seeping out of the mine pits would continue in perpetuity = FOREVER. In other words, by giving PolyMet the go-ahead, we would be getting 20 years worth of mining jobs (SHORT-TERM GAIN) while incurring at least 500 years of pollution and perpetual water treatment (LONG-TERM LOSS). Furthermore, perpetual water treatment is not maintenance free. Currently the region that would be impacted by the PolyMet mine is a haven for tourists, fishermen, and outdoor enthusiasts like me, people who appreciate our beautiful region and who value its environmental integrity, its unique attributes, and its ability to restore their spirits on an increasingly polluted and beleaguered planet. By giving PolyMet the green light and thus setting a precedent for numerous other mining companies to follow suit, the seeds of our own destruction as a place of retreat and purity and sanity will be sown. I therefore respectfully ask that you REJECT the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful and I ask that you DENY PolyMet a state permit to mine given that in addition to the at least 200 and 500 years of pollution that PolyMet admits, their assumptions about the percentage of seepage collection at the tailings basin is unsubstantiated and thus the SDEIS must be rejected as INADEQUATE. Furthermore, the SDEIS should be rejected as it gives no detailed information as to how 500 years of water treatment will be paid for. Sincerely, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road Duluth, MN 55804 - "The eyes of the future are looking back at us and they are praying for us to see beyond our own time." - By Terry Tempest Williams

mary durando 41719

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr mary durando 523 Chesterville Rd Landenberg, PA 19350-1575

Mary E Stoick 54836

See attachment

Mary E. Dosch 10336

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am alarmed at PolyMet's SDEIS as it's essentially an experiment which, if allowed to proceed, would be a disaster waiting to happen and would put Minnesota's clean water at risk forever. The SDEIS doesn't provide even the most basic information to support its predictions. How much polluted wastewater would be going back and forth through nine miles of pipes. What is the total volume of wastewater in tailings and processing residue. Just how polluted is the wastewater in waste rock piles, pits, sump ponds, the tailings basin and the hydrometallic waste dump. Without this basic information, we can't estimate what would happen if PolyMet's almost perfect assumptions - not based on anything in the real world - don't come true. The SDEIS admits that it is an experiment. On page after page it says that in the event that modeling shows violations of water quality, PolyMet will "adaptively manage" the problem. BP "adaptively managed" that oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico with catastrophic results to the Gulf's ecosystem. This SDEIS is completely inadequate. The SDEIS must reveal wastewater volumes and pollutant levels at every step. Also, the SDEIS must have facilities from day one to meet standards. Once pollution is in groundwater it is TOO LATE to fix. I therefore ask that the PolyMet SDEIS be rejected as woefully inadequate and the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful due to the experimental nature of their proposed plan. Therefore I also ask that PolyMet not be granted a state permit to mine at this time given that their proposed "adaptive management" of any violations of water quality would put our priceless watersheds at risk of permanent contamination. Access to clean water should be the birthright of all - humans and non-humans alike. We have no right to jeopardize that birthright. Sincerely, Mary Elizabeth Dosch 5523 London Road Duluth, MN 55804 Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road 4365 Kingston Road Duluth, MN 55804 218 269 4632

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary E. Dosch

19001

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road 4365 Kingston Road Duluth, MN 55804 218 269 4632

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary E. Dosch

37903

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road 4365 Kingston Road Duluth, MN 55804

49110

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary E. Dosch 5523 London Road 4365 Kingston Road Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Ellen Kremposky

22900

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Also, Lake Superior retains water for about 200 years. Any mining waste inputs would last for centuries. Also, as shown by the severe drought in California, fresh water for agriculture, human and wildlife usage is imperiled. The largest fresh water lake in the world should be protected at our own society's peril. Just say no to this mine. Also, tourism is a big source of income and should be protected not damaged by mining operations. Sincerely, Mary Ellen Kremposky 419 N Gainsborough Ave Royal Oak, MI 48067-4220 (248) 565-8100

Mary Elling

39897

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Engen

39362

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Mary Engen 3136 38th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2143 (612) 721-7181

Mary Everest

44551

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: The PolyMet mine would violate the 1854 Treaty between the United States and Minnesota Ojibwe bands. This treaty guarantees the right to hunt, fish, and gather in the location of the proposed mine. However, the proposed mine would destroy wetlands and habitat for animals and plants fundamental to Ojibwe life. In addition to habitat destruction and removal, the proposed mine would generate unacceptable levels of mercury and sulfuric acid contamination in the watershed, subsequently turning food into poison. The treaty is a legally binding agreement between the United States and a sovereign nation. In short, it is your duty to protect this land. The land must remain intact, including the animals and plants that the Ojibwe hunt, fish, and gather. The PolyMet mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands MUST be rejected in order to comply with federal law and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. The SDEIS is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to provide a cumulative analysis of impacts to clean water, plants and mammals that are significant to tribes and protected under treaties, throughout the tribal Ceded Territories in the Lake Superior Basin. In summary, please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the proposed PolyMet mine and Land Exchange as destructive to the public interest and harmful to tribal rights, clean water, vital habitats and the health of future generations. Sincerely Mary Everest 4015 STANDISH AVENUE MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55407

Mary Faulkner

39793

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mary Faulkner 4921 Girard Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Gallet

42507

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Gallet 100 Elizabeth St Duluth, MN 55803

mary garbutt

19920

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary garbutt

47051

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

47052

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary garbutt

47053

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

47055

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary garbutt

49565

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, mary garbutt 12310 49th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55442

Mary Gover

40969

I understand (from the program on MPR) that large piles of tailings remain from past PolyMet mining, and that the effluent from these tailings fails to meet MN water standards. Accordingly, I urge the DNR to require that PolyMet clean up the existing tailings before it is allowed to generate any more. The SDEIS for this project is inadequate. It fails to give appropriate weight to the fact that every copper/nickel sulfide mine located in a watery environment has resulted in contamination of surface and/or ground water. We should not subject Minnesota's waters to a known source of contamination. Thank you for your attention. Mary Gover 6711 Lake Shore Dr S, Apt 1007, Richfield, MN 55423

Mary Grandmason

54791

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Green

40382

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mary Green 628 N. 18th Avenue Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary hagen

41748

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Haltvick

47379

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to express my concern about the proposed PolyMet project in northeastern Minnesota. I am originally from the area and still own property there so it is an issue which greatly worries me. In addition, members of my family live in the Embarrass River watershed. I believe that PolyMet's plan for sulfide mining does not sufficiently address its potential to do irreversible damage to the environment and the health of the people who live and work in the communities that would be affected. My first concern refers to the permitting required by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The wetlands proposed for destruction are priceless and form part of a broader biotic system. The 913 acres to be destroyed and the additional over 7000 acres at risk of being degraded by subsequent air and water pollution from the mining operations represent an unprecedented loss of wetlands for Minnesota. On paper the plan to replace these precious wetlands might look like a fair "exchange" if one is just counting acreage and size, but what is lost is an aquatic ecosystem of rivers, creeks, streams, ponds, swamps, land and vegetation that provide habitat for wildlife and maintain the quality of the watershed. Can the lands offered in the land exchange proposal really compensate for a lost ecosystem, especially if those lands are outside the affected watershed. The SDEIS does not factor the real value of the lost ecosystem into its calculations. Land has value but so do nature and natural processes. The science of economics rarely makes this kind of calculation. The SDEIS has not made it either. But it does not mean that such value does not exist. It just hasn't been calculated. I ask that you deny any permit to destroy or degrade the wetlands since we really do not know the value of what we are being asked to give up. In addition, I ask that you reject the Land Exchange Proposed Action. Also of concern are the opportunities for pollution that the proposed mining site offers. This area is rich in water but unfortunately many of the bodies of water in the area are already identified by the MPCA as "impaired waters" due to elevated levels of mercury. This, therefore, is a proposal to mine in an already compromised area that mining will put at further risk. The water quality models used by PolyMet are guesses and assumptions about how mining might affect the water, but they are unsubstantiated and without evidence. The historical record, on the other hand, shows that sulfide mining in a water-rich environment has historically resulted in surface and ground water pollution with toxins that are harmful to human life. In short, no one on the planet has been able to do this type of mining without degrading water quality. I don't believe the SDEIS sufficiently addresses the risks of this kind of mining in a water-rich environment. What happens if and when the water is polluted, a very distinct possibility since the proposal is for unlined storage of waste rock. Then what. I urge you to not recommend a permit to mine for PolyMet. Our waters are precious. What I have written is sincere and reflect my best attempt to understand the proposal. Please give it your closest attention. Thank you. Mary Haltvick 713 Heather Drive Shoreview, MN 55126

Mary Halvorson

44630

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. I am concerned about the long range affects this proposal will have on our environment for future generations. I am not at all convinced in plans for clean up and oversight. This is an endeavor fraught with too many problems Please reject this proposal and choose health for our entire ecosystem Sincerely, Ms Mary Halvorson 324 Harvard St SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-2920

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Heise

46594

Dear Lisa Fay, I have serious concerns and doubt that adequate funding will be available to address any accidents or incidents that occur during mine operations and especially after the mine closes. Secured funding also needs to be available for the lengthy water treatment process after mine closure. How is the funding guaranteed to be there even hundreds of years after mine operations cease. It is important to have all of the necessary funds readily available throughout the entire water treatment period of 500+ years so that clean-up costs do not become a burden on Minnesotan residents. How is inflation and any unforeseen complications of treatment being calculated into Polymet's closure costs. How can a person predict the value of the dollar that far in the future. In addition, I also believe the SDEIS is inadequate in the following areas: It does not adequately look at reducing impacts to wetlands by considering underground mining vs. open pit mining. Economic feasibility is not supposed to be the primary factor for alternative methods in an EIS. What evidence is there that the proposed treatment of contaminated water by reverse osmosis actually works on projects of this scale. The water treatment process is not specific enough. What are the plans for the toxic sludge generated by reverse osmosis. How is the reverse osmosis system guaranteed to keep up with the quantity and continuous supply of contaminated water. The proposed wetland reclamation and regeneration would not equal the high quality wetlands that the mine will destroy. What are the effects on human health, especially in the unborn and very young, of exposure to the pollutants emitted into the air and water, especially as these pollutants accumulate to higher levels. What insurance is there against underground drinking water contamination and what procedures will be followed to clean up any contamination that occurs. As abundant clean water becomes more scarce world-wide and thus more valuable, this resource should be weighted higher for impact considerations the farther the timeline of impacts goes into the future. For example, clean water is likely to be more economically and environmentally valuable 100 years from now than it is today, therefore, any long term negative impacts done now should be assessed as more harmful than is currently considered. What are the health risks to employees who are exposed to sulfide mining conditions. What is the potential for soil contamination away from the mine site and what health risks are present for people who come into contact with this soil, especially for those growing their own food. The Superior National Forest is a national asset and the proposed land exchange is not adequate compensation for US citizens. How will the survival and reintroduction of rare species found in the disturbed wetlands be assured after mine closure. Thank you for addressing these concerns, Mary Heise 2105 E. Superior St Apt 3 Duluth MN, 55812

Mary Helen Stephens

10764

I cannot find the original site when I made the comments, but I don't recall giving my address. I am interested in receiving updates on the program of stopping them. My email address will be on this page to you Mary Helen Stephens. _____ From: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us To: maryhelenstephens@hotmail-com Subject: RE: Reject PolyMet's NorthMet Mining Proposal Date: Fri, 24 Jan 2014 18:39:29 +0000 Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Helen Stephens

38874

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Since we know that water continues to flow downstream forever till it reaches oceans, how can we protect those, especially children who live downstream from this proposed mine from the Mercury that will follow the waterways out of Minn. There must be some way to collect the chemical before it leaves the mine site, forever, not in a land based ground storage pit. DNR has a big job ahead of them. So many protections to human health, wildlife protections, environmental health protections, taxpayer protections, CleanWater Act Protections, Wild rice protections, etc Don't think a few jobs are worth it. Stop the PolyMet mine before it causes damage to Minnesota. Listen to independent, unbiased science. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

38936

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The DNR needs to give absolute assurance to Minnesota taxpayers that they will not be responsible for any problems in the future with the PolyMet SDEIS Mine. Without that given, the plan for the mine should not be allowed. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Helen Stephens

38940

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I am an Alaskan resident but still revisit Minnesota at least once a year. I am concerned about the water studies necessary for your DNR to approve this mine. Water studies science can lead to different results. We have found that they are inaccurate in our proposed Pebble Mine up here in Alaska. We have found erroneous water science being pushed through our DEC to accept for the mine proposal. I want your DNR to be very careful with the science "proving" how this mine will be able to protect your northern waters with GUARANTEED assurance before moving forward There is a lot at stake here - water carrying pollutants into the Boundary Waters to Lake Superior is not to be allowed at any possibility. Clean-ups are always impossible. Water carries everything along the routes, leaving deposits everywhere. I know you are aware of this, but the extractive folks are good only at extraction. They really do not have any, so far, capability of recovering product pollutants once lost into water. No way at all. It is common knowledge that Exxon recovered only about 1/10th of the 11,2 million gallons of crude oil they released into Prince William Sound. The rest is still showing up every year. Lake Superior doesn't just belong to Minnesota - it is a National Treasure. It needs to be protected for ALL of us - FOREVER. THANK YOU FOR LETTING A CARING ALASKAN EXPRESS HER CONCERNS. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Helen Stephens

39011

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I certainly do not assume to be at all informed about the Glencore Company's Management history, but I see the name Tony Hayward listed as one sitting at the head of it. I only know him through the press at the time of the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico a few years back. I was totally not impressed with his skills at being a spokesman for BP nor of his ability to react under pressure. I recall his putting his loss of not being able to do what he wanted instead of taking care of his job ahead of taking care of the mess his company caused. I certainly do not have any confidence he would be any better if any accidents would occur in the beautiful Northern Minnesota country I remember enjoying. . The extractive industries - coal, gas, oil, mining - are pretty good at means of getting the desired substances out of the ground but have NO capability of doing anything when an accident occurs. We had our Exxon Valdez Oil Spill in Alaska-(I live in Valdez), the BP=Horizon disaster in off shore of our South's waters, the coal ash disruptions into the rivers of our country, storage tanks of chemicals leaking into waters used for human consumption. In no case were the companies able to recover the contaminating products. They really never include that aspect of contingency planning. But accidents happen because of poor planning and in every situation and people's health suffers, the environment suffers and they always say "We are sorry". Until we see GUARANTEES that NONE of the above WILL HAPPEN, I cannot see allowing this mine plan moving forwaRd Thank you Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

39132

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on Alces Americanus, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I would look more favorably toward the project of the proposed PolyMet if I could see a plan which considers the wildlife of Northern Minnesota. So far I do not see a reasonable plan to offer protection to the Moose population in Northern Minnesota. The moose are finally increasing their numbers up there and that is one issue I would like to see considered in their plans. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Helen Stephens

39133

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. I live in Alaska but return to MN to visit my sister and her family every year. We have our problems with the proposed Pebble Mine and their plans. I am a bit involved with MN's proposed PolyMed Mine for a number of reasons. Up here water resources is a big issue = the possibility of the mining efforts to contaminate our waters and using an inordinate amount of available water. This mine in Northern Minnesota will use an inordinate amount of coal for powering the high use of electricity needed for their operations. In this day and age when we are striving for clean, renewable sources for energy and working toward cutting back on the use of more dirty coal for power, it appears to me to be off to a bad start in that given area. Our planet does not need a vast increased output of CO2- Please ask DNR to require PolyMet to find a better source of power and leave the coal industry out of the picture. Thank you I cannot get this to change the salutation at the bottom. I will sign off here.' Sincerely, Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686 Sincerely, Mrs Mary Helen Stephens PO Box 1272 Valdez, AK 99686-1272

mary hoffman

47054

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to stop the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands. Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Respectfully yours, mary hoffman 12522 parkwood drive burnsville, MN 55337

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary hoffman

47056

Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to stop the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Respectfully yours, mary hoffman 12522 parkwood drive burnsville, MN 55337

Mary Hogan

40333

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mary Hogan 3076 S. Rodehaver Rd Guysville, OH 45735 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Holm

39873

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This is madness. Protect the Earth, don't rape it for the profit of a corporation and its shareholders. This kind of violence to our source, ripping it apart for materials to make objects which will in short order, relatively speaking, become obsolete, will only bring our own destruction. This mine will break forever the beauty of our North Woods, one of our most valuable industries in tourism and forestry products. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Mary Holm 5240 Kimberly Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345-4429

Mary Jane Manion

41601

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Mary Jane Nelson

54897

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Jo Kingston

35689

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. With the history of desecration of our clean forests, lakes and rivers perpetrated by mining companies, it is not unreasonable to wonder what the hurry is in opening this mine. A delay of 10 or 20 years before undertaking this project would allow development and proof that they have indeed found ways to mine these elements safely and without damage to the environment. Let them demonstrate on other sites just how safe it is and how the environment can be protected as they assert. We will only have one chance to get this right so tell them to go practice somewhere else and come back with evidence that the processes they are proposing actually work. There will be no opportunity for a do-over if they make a mistake. Sincerely, Mary Jo Kingston 7774 Lochmere Ter Edina, MN 55439-2618 (952) 944-9022

mary Jo straub

39886

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Those who live in the horrible drought conditions of the west know how extremely valuable water is, especially clean pristine water such as ours. Why on earth would we want to sully and poison our water gem. It's total insanity. No amount of jobs are worth ruining, or even risking the ruin of, our precious natural resource. The Boundary Waters--one of the wonders of the world. Invaluable. Lake Superior--an even greater possession. Why risk it. If people need jobs give them jobs through rebuilding our infrastructure and installing renewable energy. That could happen easily and quickly if the political will exists. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms mary Jo straub 4520 Andover Rd Edina, MN 55435-4032 (952) 922-2403

Mary Joy Breton

42735

See attachment

Mary Judd

36629

Mar 2, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Many aspects of the impact of the mining have been swept under the rug. Enough covering up has happened in various "schemes" for pushing through projects that hurt people, the earth, environment, and air that people are not so easily scammed as before. What the mining company says will not happen and what actually will happen are two different outcomes. Northern Minnesota is an unspoiled area of this world that is becoming a "novelty" not a common occurrence across the countries of this world. The pureness of this area will be destroyed, the waters will be polluted, the animals will be affected in the worst way possible, the flora and fauna will change, people will become ill. Studies on the factors affecting humans needs to be studied. More studies by environmental protectors need to be done and provided to the public without the results being altered. The people who are trying to push this project through are being paid off by the very companies who are wanting to destroy our state.. It is a dishonest and criminal act that needs to be stopped. Please let's be sensible about this ..the ore that is going to be mined is going to China What is that all about Please give the honest answers.. Sincerely, Miss Mary Judd 207 5th St SW Braham, MN 55006-3058

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Kade 43268

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Please stop destroying environments that I want my future children to be able to utilize for educational and even just exploratory purposes. Save our communities. Sincerely, Mary Kade P.O. Box 396 Effingham, IL 62401

Mary Kamps 27394

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please block Polymet's open-pit sulfide ore mining project. It means quick profit for PolyMet and polluted waters across a wide swathe of Minnesota. We need to live within our means. Mary Kamps, Milwaukee Sincerely, Mary Kamps 3922 N Ridgefield Cir Milwaukee, WI 53211-2450 (414) 964-7128

Mary Kanuit 15923

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Kanuit 711 Stonebridge Circle St Paul, MN 55123

Mary Kanut 11250

To whom it may concern: this proposed site or any site for that matter for mining is basically game over for our climate, for our Boundary Waters, our drinking water, air quality and the list goes on and on.. Oh did I say tourism. And for what? More dirty energy, a few more jobs. When will the madness end? Do you have any idea the impact to habitat, water quality, air quality, our tourism? The last three we will never be able to get back once compromised. I will fight against this to the bitter end. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING-DO NOT LET THIS GO THROUGH. Oh and I love how the report purposely leaves out pages. What do these pages contain that the DNR doesn't want people to see. Respectively, Mary Kanut Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Kay Harris

44538

To the DNR, I hereby voice my opinion IN OPPOSITION to the proposed Polymet mine in NE MN. The much-touted advantages are short-lived, if that. In more likelihood they are illusory. Let's protect one of the most beautiful places on the face of the earth and be proud that it lies within Minnesota. Mary Kay Harris, Librarian Hennepin County Library Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.

Mary Klausen

37780

Mar 1, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Dirty energy is not the answer to our energy problems Wind and solar would create as many or more jobs for Americans and keep our air and water clean while keeping us in clean energy for the long haul - longer than 20 - 30 years AND no clean up to worry about saving billions of dollars in clean up and future health care costs to Minnesotans and the fish and wildlife (some of us eat fish and venison). Can't we just be smart and reasonable for once instead of getting yanked around by the promise of campaign funding or a trip to wherever Come on, it's time to get real and listen to the science. THERE IS NO CORRECT, GREEN, CLEAN, GOOD WAY TO SULFIDE MINE. PERIOD. THAT GOES FOR TAR SANDS OIL TOO. None of it will ever come to any good whatsoever and will only to serve to kill off tourism in Northern MN, one of the last pristine places on earth where man hasn't mucked it up yet. It's just the most unbelievable, ridiculous - can't even fathom it's actually being remotely considered idea I've ever imagined taking place in our watershed backyaRd Idiocy is too kind a word in this insane debacle. The cost to the environment will never be able to be recovered. EVER. Are we so self important that we can just wipe out what took millions of years to get that way for some freakin' copper, so we can build more shit to text more bullshit to each other while driving.. I can only hope reason will prevail before it's too late. The science has already been known since ancient times. You don't shit in your clean glass of water and then drink it. Sincerely, Mary Klausen Two Harbors MN Sincerely, Mary Klausen 404 Valley Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616-1480 (218) 834-2483

Mary Lagaard

38280

For 20 years my family has been spending some days between Christmas and New Years in the Boundary Waters Wilderness. We stay close to the hundred mile swamp which has been purported to be a filter for the run off from the holding ponds.This fragile ecosystem will be compromised by even low levels of uranium, radium, and radon. Additionally ground water supplies may be polluted by the listed materials. Minnesota's identity has been clean water. We loose not only an ecosystem, but a way of hunting, fishing, skiing, sledding, skating, kayaking which is part of our culture. Why can we not challenge ourselves to find a way to mine copper without water. - Mary Wotzka Lagaard, RN, CNP, DNP Assistant Professor 435 Whitby Hall Department of Nursing St Catherine University 2004 Randolph Street St Paul, Minnesota (651) 690-6126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Lawry

30511

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Have the proper environmental studies been done by an UNBIASED source. Open pit mining is a source of much pollution and destruction of environment. Have the company's methods of extracting content and proper handling of waste been reviewed. and their proposed response to any "accidental" discharge of same. the effect of said discharge on the environment. the cost to surrounding communities. Are the above in a written contract with a sizable monetary deposit (non-withdrawable) to begin cleanup of "accidental" discharges. What effects will Michigan and Wisconsin experience, since Lake Superior affects these States as well. Have you considered the drift of pollutants into the waters of the entire Great Lakes. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Mary Lawry 903 N Hanover St Hastings, MI 49058-1327

Mary Lawson

39708

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mary Lawson 4801 Jay St Duluth, MN 55804-2463

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Ledford

41779

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Mary Lein

39545

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please do not begin the slow destruction of these beautiful wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams in Minnesota. The impact on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Areas such as these must be preserved for all of the above reasons, and for future generations to love, appreciate, and enjoy. Reconsider your plans and leave this pristine beauty in tact. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mary Lein 81 Grande Isle Ave SW Rochester, MN 55902-3053 (507) 288-6009

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Lein

40397

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mary Lein 81 Grande Isle Ave SW 2612 Rochester, MN 55902 US

48777

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please do not begin the slow destruction of these beautiful wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams in Minnesota. The impact on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Areas such as these must be preserved for all of the above reasons, and for future generations to love, appreciate, and enjoy. Reconsider your plans and leave this pristine beauty in tact. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mary Lein 81 Grande Isle Ave SW Rochester, MN 55902-3053 (507) 288-6009

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MARY LINDEN

16048

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MARY LINDEN

45543

To the staff taking comments on the Polymet Copper sulfide mine: For the last two weeks at work I have toiled in front of a copy of the EIS for the Northmet copper sulfide mine. I've looked at it of course, but I still come to the same conclusion. The mine should not be permitted in Northern Minnesota. Much of the water in northern Minnesota eventually flows toward Lake Superior. People obtain their drinking water from Lake Superior. It is one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world. Fresh, clean water is infinitely precious in our overcrowded world. According to Mark Seeley, the state climatologist, Minnesota will face more of an impact from climate change than states at more southern latitudes. That could mean a disruption in our normal temperature and rainfall ranges. Is this a time to permit a Canadian company to come in to our state and endanger our water resources. I don't think so. The company says they will have a long wall to contain waste water down to the bedrock. Walls develop cracks over time. It has always happened and will happen again. I don't think the wall they build will last long enough to contain all the polluted water that is created. The company says they will force the polluted water through a filtration sheet, but these filters get gummed up, they clog, they can tear, they need constant maintenance. Who will maintain the filters and the wall after the company takes our minerals, makes their profit and leaves the state. To build such a mine near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area will bring additional development to the doorstep of an important Wilderness Area, degrading its pristine nature. Throughout the history of the United States, profiteers big and small have argued for and obtained the ability and the opportunity to exploit nature for their own benefit, leaving our natural heritage greatly diminished. This has to stop before we deplete the natural diversity that sustains us. The Polymet/ Northmet mining project is an excellent place for this exploitation to be stopped before it starts. In addition, the Native American people who rightly claim the authority to harvest wild rice, should not find lakes and waters that sustain them now, polluted by increased sulfides due to copper mining. Early in the debate about the mine the company reported that they would create new wetlands to make up for the ones they destroy during their project. To me it seems unlikely that a man-made wetland will ever truly replicate a natural wetland. Each place has its own unique mix of substrate, water chemistry, micro-organisms, plant and animal life. For example salamanders are thought to follow the same chemical trails to the same wetlands to breed every year. A man-made wetland somewhere else doesn't really accommodate them does it. While copper is used in industry and even in the plumbing of many homes in Minnesota, how much copper from the Northmet mine will be needed or used by Minnesotans. Polymet is a Canadian company with big contracts with China. Both countries have terrible pollution records: For Canada think of the Tar Sands project, or the clubbing of fur seal pups or the fact that when a Beluga Whale dies in the St Lawrence Seaway it's body is considered a hazardous waste because the water it lived in is so polluted. In China the air pollution is terrible, fragile lands are overgrazed, wildlife is exploited etc What do we want for Minnesota. Some people want mining jobs. I can understand wanting a job, especially one in the area where you are a resident. I would like to live surrounded by the beauty of Northern Minnesota, but I don't because I could never find a job up there. If there are no jobs in a certain region, the people there can make the choice to move to where there are more jobs. It sounds harsh, but people all over the globe are in motion looking for better opportunities, just as our immigrant ancestors did. Also people naturally see things with reference t

Mary Lou Hoff

42231

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Mary Lou Hoff 17844 Townline Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345-6147

Mary Lou Salawater

45115

Please do not allow Polymet to mine in Minnesota. Lots of money has recently been spent in efforts to clean up the St Louis river, why would we now allow a mining company to pollute it some more CRAZY we can do better things with our money if we would just try. Only a few will profit and we will all lose our natural resources. Our children deserve a world with less pollution. Sincerely, Mary Lou Salawater 70325 Caville Road Ashland, WI 54806

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary M Anderson

57932

Please Please Please do not allow toxic mining of copper-nickel sulfide! I am gravely concerned about irreversible damage to our amazing water RICH environment. Let's not make a mistake under Birch Lake! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Mary Manns

43695

Please don't allow Polymet to mine and destroy our beautiful north woods. Mary Manns

Mary Marcan

40207

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary McGilligan

9671

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, MARY MCGILLIGAN 814 5TH AVE TWO HARBORS, MN 55616

18537

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, MARY MCGILLIGAN 814 5TH AVE TWO HARBORS, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary McGilligan

19055

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: This is a very serious decision about to be made. I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, MARY MCGILLIGAN 814 5TH AVE TWO HARBORS, MN 55616 218-834-4891

42648

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary McGilligan

50613

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, MARY MCGILLIGAN 814 5TH AVE TWO HARBORS, MN 55616

Mary Megan

41900

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions:

- 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation.
- 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project.
- 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Mary Megan 17180 Gannon Way W Rosemount, MN 55068-5136

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MARY MOCHINSKI

40616

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. **WE SIMPLY CAN'T TRUST BIG BUSINESS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT SO WE MUST ALWAYS BE VIGILANT.** Sincerely,
MARY MOCHINSKI 1829 10th Ave S Apt 9a Minneapolis, MN 55404-2005

Mary Ness

42654

See attachment

42655

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary P Disch

44956

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. I have concerns about the pollution of waters where wild rice grows. Since wild rice moves around and does not stay in one area, it is crucial to protect the waters in areas beyond where wild rice is presently growing. Who will monitor these waters. I am concern about the present pollution in the former taconite mine area where Poly Met plans to mine. Will there be clean up of the site before Poly Met would be allowed to startup. Who pays for the cleanup. There seemed to be data that says there is already pollution into neighboring streams from the former taconite site at the planned Poly Met site. Are holding ponds for tailings and debris of Poly Met's mining lined underneath to prevent leaching into the groundwater. I saw plans for covering the mine debris and catching the runoff to filter, but I am unsure of what is under the tailings and the holding ponds to prevent leaching of toxins into the groundwater. How often are covers replaced as they deteriorate over time. Is there plans for replacement of covers. Is the present plan to use reverse osmosis to clean the runoff a viable process. Has it been used and shown to prevent toxins and pollutants from entering water from the mining area. If the reverse osmosis process is put in place and fails to keep runoff within water quality standards, are there alternative methods to clean the runoff. Will enough money be collected from Poly Met to pay for the continuing cleanup of pollution of the water in the area and for how long. Who will pay these costs if Poly Met fails to. Will taxpayers pay for poor planning of cleanup costs. How accurate are models that project cleanup processes. Is there an ongoing monitoring that corrects the models to represent the reality of the pollution being created. Is there accurate monitoring of runoff and water in the area to check pollution levels. Who monitors. Self monitoring by some companies has not always been up to standards. Will Poly Met self monitor or is there monitoring by outside reliable sources. How thorough is the regulatory process in Minnesota. Is this type of monitoring water quality in regards to mining already in place in Minnesota and has it been able to prevent water pollution from exceeding standards and reduce pollution that exceeds standards. Will the surrounding residents be exposed to air pollution from the dust created by the mining and extraction process. Can there be more aggressive ways to recycle the many minerals that are thrown into landfills every day in Minnesota, before mining for more minerals. I have huge concerns about creating more pollution from Poly Met's planned mine. The St Louis watershed affects Lake Superior's water quality. We cannot afford to pollute the largest fresh water in the world. I am afraid allowing Poly Met's planned mining operation will open new mines closer to the Boundary Waters area, a very sensitive area needing high water quality. I am not in favor of mining in the Boundary Waters watershed. Minnesota needs clean water to protect our health and our lives and our fishing, birding, and tourism industries. Sincerely, Ms Mary P Disch 8308 York Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-2747 (763) 560-6793

mary q mccallum

44958

Hello. I am a concerned Minnesotan writing to voice my opposition to the Polymet mine. While I understand the economic boon it could create, I feel that this is very short sighted. There is simply not enough evidence to support this type of serious endeavor. The land, the water, the people, all need to be taken into account for the long term. We won't get a second chance. With any sulfide mine there is risk of [HYPERLINK "http://savethewildup-org/2007/01/acid-mines-are-never-safe/"](http://savethewildup-org/2007/01/acid-mines-are-never-safe/)acid mine drainage. Sulfide mining in water-intensive areas has never been done without contaminating surrounding waters. The proposed "NorthMet" mine site (near Hoyt Lakes) is part of the St Louis River watershed, which flows into Lake Superior. Groundwater would be contaminated in the mining process, the question is how badly and for how long. Pollution from acid mine drainage can persist indefinitely ([HYPERLINK "http://savethewildup-org/issues/sulfide-mining-101/"](http://savethewildup-org/issues/sulfide-mining-101/)2500-10,000 years). One of the best things about living in this state is it's natural beauty, our access to natural resources for living, for recreation. YOU are the Department of Natural Resources. Once they are gone, they're gone. I urge you for myself, for my children, and for the communities across this great state, to NOT proceed with any sulfide mining. Be heroes to all, not just to some. If you listen to the voice of the people, not the voice of the money, you will do the right thing. I say this as a MN resident, parent, small business owner, MN state tourist, voter, and fan of the great state of Minnesota in all it's glory. Sincerely, Mary Quinn McCallum 1520 Fairmount Ave St Paul, MN 55105 tel: 612-968-0558

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Rose Phillip

38891

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Please carefully consider the world you are gifting to future generations. I tremendously enjoy seeing wildlife and the opportunity to get out into nature. With 500 years of toxic runoff, how would that be possible. The earth and its creatures are a gift, we are duty-bound to do our very best to protect it. The heading states "protect our water". I may not live in Minnesota, but those pristine places belong to all of us. They were set aside to remain pristine places so they would be there for future generations. I don't see why you believe you have the right to destroy that with your name scrawled with a pen. Even if you have no offspring to gift this legacy to, we your fellow Americans, intend on fighting for these pristine places. Last year, I received the greatest blessing in my life and took a five day Eco-journey to Ely, MN. During one of hikes I set my feet in the Boundary Waters; that experience gave me the drive to fight for those incredibly beautiful wild places. Please join me in the fight to keep these places pristine and do not fall under the spell of big mining business. If the people of MN need jobs, I propose Eco-tourism to bring others to see the magnificent wild places within in the boundaries of your great state. Blessings, Mary Rose Phillip Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mary Rose Phillip 7704 Creek Bnd Rockford, IL 61114-6668 (815) 520-2082

Mary Ruch

6547

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the EPA gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." I am very concerned about mining where spills and runoff can flow into Lake Superior or its tributaries. The recent water contamination from coal in West Virginia truly demonstrates how widespread pollution of waterways can be. Please ensure that the environmental impact studies are truly adequate and based on reasonable and truthful information. Sincerely Mary Ruch 1124 Nightingale Blvd Stillwater, MN 55082 651-253-4131

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Rummel

41744

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Mary Scheibel

15805

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Mary Scheibel 5305 Elliot Ave Minneapolis, MN 55417-1741

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Schoos

39348

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Schoos 21503 Arcadian Hill Rd Hancock, MI 49930-9696 (906) 370-0264

39375

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on Alces Americanus, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Mary Schoos 21503 Arcadian Hill Rd Hancock, MI 49930-9696 (906) 370-0264

Mary Scott

58148

At the St Paul public hearing I heard some very troubling facts about the SDEIS. It seems that some very basic requirements are missing. In addition there is a complete lack of backup plans if there are accidents polluting the environment with these heavy metals. Polymet has a history of polluting through mining. Our water resources are the most precious of natural resources. 100% of sulfide mining around the world pollutes massively. Why would we even think of doing this type of mining at the heart of our fresh water that's unparalleled in the world? The wars of the not too distant future will be over fresh water. We must protect ours allowing this mine will not do that. It's an unsound and far too distinctive to Minnesota.

Mary Sitko

18149

My name is Mary Sitko, M-A-R-Y, S-I-T-K-O. Thanks for the opportunity speak tonight. I work as regional sales manager for Pace Analytical. Pace is a nationwide network with certified environmental laboratories headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota. I also live in Minneapolis, Minnesota. We have two locations in Northern Minnesota in Virginia, Minnesota, as well. Pace supports the PolyMet project. We have worked with PolyMet for a number of years providing quality data in support of their environmental testing needs. Work from PolyMet has allowed us to expand operations in our Northern Minnesota laboratories as well as several high-quality, high-paying jobs to the area. We will continue to support PolyMet and other mining companies in Northern Minnesota. As they continue to grow, we plan to grow with them adding jobs to the area. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Slattery

45240

Ms Llisa FAy, EIS Project Manager , Environmental Review Unit. So much has been written and discussed on the problems of sulfide mining in water rich environments such as ours, that Polymet needs to do further work to convince you that their mine will be safe. Water will only become more precious as time goes by and populations grow. I suggest that PolyMet put in escrow the full amount of money it would take to do their 500 years of water clean up by reverse osmosis ,before they are able to get a permit to make the hugh profits they expect to make from the mine. The Durka mine pits are not cleaned up yet, and no agency is demanding it be done. 20 years of jobs are not more important than our water.. We need to put as much effort to come up with solutions, and more creative efforts than we have so far, to ending unemployment. We might find answers if we put as much effort into that, as Polymet is putting into pushing the mines without viable solutions. Please continue to demand they give better answers to the problems that will be created. THank you ,Mary Slattery ,2105 E. Superior St , Duluth, Mn. 55812

Mary Smith

19026

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Mary Smith 13998 165TH St 13998 165th St LITTLE FALLS, MN 56345

Mary Sorensen

42435

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Mary Sorensen 3801 Vincent Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412-1816

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary St. Michael

49434

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: • Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. • Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. • Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. • Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1- Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2- Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3- Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4- Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury in fish.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Suelflow

43964

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My daughter lives in northern Minnesota and my husband and I enjoy getting back to nature when we go to visit her. She also rices in the area. Once you eat hand harvested wild rice from Minnesota lakes, you will never be able to eat commercial rice again. It would be a shame to lose this natural and healthy food to mining. I am amazed that destroying this area is even being considered. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Mary Suelflow 508 Jewett Street Marshall, MN 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Suelflow

43966

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: My daughter lives in northern Minnesota and my husband and I enjoy getting back to nature when we go to visit her. She also grows rice in the area. Once you eat hand harvested wild rice from Minnesota lakes, you will never be able to eat commercial rice again. It would be a shame to lose this natural and healthy food to mining. I am amazed that destroying this area is even being considered. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Mary Suelflow 508 Jewett Street Marshall, MN 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Suelflow

43985

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Suelflow Mary Suelflow 508 Jewett Street Marshall, MN 56258

43986

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Suelflow Mary Suelflow 508 Jewett Street Marshall, MN 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Tacheny

39736

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Mary Tacheny 200 Nolden Ln Jordan, MN 55352-1722 (952) 492-5964

Mary Tambornino

37814

Attached is a letter asking that the PolyMet Mining proposal be denied. I will put it in the mail to Lisa Fay tomorrow. She should have it by Monday. I am sending it by e mail to make sure it gets to you. Mary Tambornino 3852 Susan Lane Minnetonka, MN 55345 HYPERLINK "mailto:mary@lakecast-com"mary@lakecast-com Phone: 952-473-2972

54772

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Tennis

41664

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Mary Texer

39023

From: Mary Texer [mailto:mtexer@visi-com] Sent: Sunday, March 09, 2014 2:24 PM To: Stein, John (DOT); Stine, John (MPCA) Subject: Sulfide Mining - DO NOT PERMIT
Mary E. Texer 113 Farrington Street St Paul, MN 55102 March 9, 2014 John Stein Commissioner Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road No. St Paul, Mn 55155 RE: Sulfide Mining In The Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds – DO NOT PERMIT. Commissioner
Stein: The request to allow sulfide mining in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds flies in the face of logic, documented environmental disasters and the science around this practice. We must not allow our environment and our water to be destroyed by this practice. It is our responsibility to defend and protect Minnesota's resources in perpetuity. If sulfide mining is allowed to go forward it is not a matter of if but when the disaster will happen. By looking only short term we would ultimately destroy some of Minnesota's greatest assets. There are other ways to address the needs for jobs in these areas. Thank you. Mary E. Texer Mary E. Texer

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Texer 40766

From: Mary Texer [mailto:mtexer@visi-com] Sent: Sunday, March 09, 2014 2:17 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Sulfide Mining - DO NOT PERMIT Mary E. Texer 113 Farrington Street St Paul, MN 55102 March 9, 2014 Lisa Fay Environmental Impact Statement Manager Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road St Paul, MN 55155-4025 RE: Sulfide Mining In The Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds – DO NOT PERMIT. Ms Fay: The request to allow sulfide mining in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds flies in the face of logic, documented environmental disasters and the science around this practice. We must not allow our environment and our water to be destroyed by this practice. It is our responsibility to defend and protect Minnesota's resources in perpetuity. If sulfide mining is allowed to go forward it is not a matter of if but when the disaster will happen. By looking only short term we would ultimately destroy some of Minnesota's greatest assets. The DNR is responsible for protecting the environment and up to now has done an excellent job. Please do not stop now. DO NOT ALLOW any sulfide mining permits. Thank you. Mary E. Texer Mary E. Texer

41110

Mary E. Texer 113 Farrington Street St Paul, MN 55102 March 9, 2014 Douglas Bruner Project Manager US Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Branch, St Paul District 180 5th Street East, Suite 700 St Paul, MN 55101-1638 RE: Sulfide Mining In The Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds – DO NOT PERMIT. Mr Bruner: The request to allow sulfide mining in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior Watersheds flies in the face of logic, documented environmental disasters and the science around this practice. We must not allow our environment and our water to be destroyed by this practice. It is our responsibility to defend and protect Minnesota's resources in perpetuity. If sulfide mining is allowed to go forward it is not a matter of if but when the disaster will happen. By looking only short term we would ultimately destroy some of Minnesota's greatest assets. There are other ways to address the needs for jobs in these areas. Thank you. Mary E. Texer Mary E. Texer

Mary Theresa Downing 47443

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study received a failing grade from the U.S Environmental Protection Agency in 2010 and nothing has changed. It is still inadequate. There is no analysis of effect of its pollution on workers or on nearby wells. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. How can a few hundred jobs lasting only 20 years be worth that price. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Mary Theresa Downing 19522 Waterford Court Excelsior, MN 55331 952-470-1301

Mary Tripler 10359

My two major concerns are, first, the lack of real cost benefit analysis and, second, the lack of a definitive answer on who will pay the costs of clean up over the 500 years remediation will be necessary. The minerals are part of Minnesota's legacy, and it seems like Minnesota citizens should reap a benefit equal to the costs to our natural environment. But how many jobs will actually go to Minnesota's residents. What kind of jobs will they be. How long will the jobs last What kind of income do we earn from the leases. What kind of continuing income will come to the state from mining profits. It seems that the mining industry takes more than it gives in return to the detriment of the citizens of the state. As I understand it, remediation will be necessary for up to 500 years. What sums will be escrowed to cover those costs. What responsibilities will the mining companies have in perpetuity to care for the mess they leave behind. We who live here care about this state. What incentive does a foreign, for-profit corporation have in leaving the land and water safe and usable for those who come after us. Thank you. Mary Tripler 1931 Crestview Circle Excelsior MN. 55331 Sent from my iPad

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mary Voight

20878

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: THE RISKS ARE TOO GREAT, just look at how many huge spills and leaks we have already experienced. Why continue to trust and hope "safe destruction" can be built. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Voight 951 McKnight Road South St Paul, MN 55119

49681

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: THE RISKS ARE TOO GREAT, just look at how many huge spills and leaks we have already experienced. Why continue to trust and hope "safe destruction" can be built. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Mary Voight 951 McKnight Road South St Paul, MN 55119

Mary Vollmar

42472

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Mary Vollmar 4945 3rd Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5629

Mary White

46152

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I believe the Drs and Nurses. Forty-six Drs. and Nurses from the Duluth MN area have raised questions about the added chemicals into our air, soil, water and fish and how they may impact the quality of health for an entire region of the state. I don't believe the impact statement adequately addresses these concerns nor does it specify who will treat the polluted water and for how long. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Mary White Clinton Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mary wilm

10406

Dear Lisa Fay and NorthMetSDEIS, My comment is that the SDEIS does not require the absolutely essential step which is to make absolutely certain that the nonferrous mining companies pay the costs of ongoing and final cleanup up front, before any more steps authorizing their mining leases, facilities etc It's too easy for them to liquidate through bankruptcy after the fact after ruining our water, Lake Superior and the BWCA lakes and rivers among other things. I think this assurance needs to be created as a state water trust fund which will generate interest or which goes into something like our state's general fund. In reading Rebecca Otto's Nov. 21 oped in the Star Trib, it sounds like 31 recently granted nonferrous mineral exploration leases also lack this environmental protection (WHY..), but back to the SDEIS. Why doesn't it include essential environmental protections. It reeks of pandering to the international mining companies at the expense our precious resource, a basic human necessity, water. I find myself as always when writing to advocate for WATER, our most precious resource, a basic human necessity, WHY don't the authors of the SDEIS and all other water users get this. These proposed nonferrous mining practices will create sulfates and acid drainage, as well as open the door to a myriad of greedy land and water exploiters. They are far too risky to exchange for the estimated 350 jobs. Please, let's get this one right. Thank you for this open comment period. Mary Lou Wilm

Mary Wolszon

46187

Thank you so much for your review of what is proposed by Polymet concerning Sulfite Mining. My name is Mary Wolszon. I live at 653 Lincoln Ave in St Paul, 55105- My husband's family owns a cabin in Northern Minnesota on the edge of the Boundary Waters. We go there every summer to enjoy life on Bear Island Lake and it's surroundings. My husband and I, when younger, went to the boundary waters every year with friends. I am opposed to the Polymet proposal for many reasons, primarily because it seems a poor trade off for a project with a 20 year life span verses a project that could harm a precious natural resource for possibly hundreds of years. It's not even primarily an American venture. This Canadian company, with Swiss backing, will be hard to go after if things go wrong. Company chair, Tolry Hayward, has a particularly bad history to be making proposals from. The proceeds from the waste tailings are to be placed in bins that I understand are already leaking. Even if not true, the potential for that in the future is very great. This project endangers many rivers as well, including Partridge and the Embarrass Rivers. The E.P.A. Identified hard rock mining as the largest toxic water processing industry in the country. The E.P.A. review of Polymet described it as inadequate and unacceptable. The history of sulfite mining in other areas is not good, associated with significant pollution. As a Minnesotan who goes to Ely often, I like what I see of how they are promoting eco-tourism. I believe many more jobs can be created in the long term if we have healthy forests and pure water ways. The Boundary Waters area is a national treasure. People come from all over to be in this environment which will become more of a treasure as the years go by, unless, by short sightedness, we fall for projects such as Polymet's, the Northmet Project and Twin Metals, LLC. I look for you all to be good stewards of our land and allow industry the opportunity to find more suitable sources of copper, nickel and other metals. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MaryAnna Foscett

40305

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, MaryAnna Foscett 101 Brantwood Road Arlington, MA 02476 US

maryc

19908

Hello DNR reps. We live in Houston County, too far south to be "directly" impacted by mining in northern Minnesota except that we use the north as our vacation, camping, hiking and biking getaways and we love the wild rice supplied to us by our Ojibwe neighbors to the north and we value clean water and healthy air in all parts of this state and scientists and geologists have noted that the PolyMet company can in no way guarantee the health and protection of the resources in northern Minnesota. Please deny this permit. The trade-offs are not worth it to us or our future generations. Thanks for hearing us out. Tim and Mary Crane Brownsville, MN 55919 tmcrane@acegroup.cc

MaryCarol Dart

40831

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this DIRECT DESTRUCTION OF HABITAT, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms MaryCarol Dart 149 Western Ave Cambridge, MA 02139-3702 (517) 464-1111

Alphabetical by sender's first name

marycarols2 .

43212

Our northern Minnesota legislators and those supporting sulfide mining do not seem to seriously consider the implications of sulfide mining and its effects on the waters of Minnesota, a state that is known for its "10,000 Lakes." Our lakes, rivers, and streams define us. Will we show the rest of the world the protection of our waters comes first. Asking questions is not about being against mining or jobs. It is about being for the lakes and for the health of our citizens. Rep. Tom Rukavina was mistaken when he said, "This is a policy issue and not something for citizens to decide." Who has more right to decide than the citizens of Minnesota. Mining may provide some short-term jobs, but it can also drive away creative professionals and knowledge workers, destroy entrepreneurial culture, diminish quality of life and damage long-term economic vitality. Sulfide mining, as it exists today, is not safe. Minnesota could learn from the disasters that have occurred in other states and in other countries. Or are we required to have our own disaster. Why not wait until sulfide mining can be proven safe and done without damaging our waters. There would be 500 years of cleanup. Who will pay for that. Certainly not Polymet. Just imagine, in the year 2540, PolyMet is still standing by, guarding the water supply. It is far more likely, though, that after mine is no longer producing maximum profit, or maybe a little while after that, PolyMet, or its parent corporation, Glencore, will tire of pumping water and will just abandon the mine. We have a name for orphan mines like this — Superfund sites. Cynthia Peterson 518 N 23rd Ave W Duluth Let us put our minds together and see what kind of life we can make for our children. Sitting Bull

43255

Sulfide-ore mining would be seriously harmful to the North Woods, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, to our Northwoods economy, and to the quality of our lives. Since the last Ely mine closed in 1967 and mining employment in Minnesota dropped from 12-600 in 1980 to 5-600 today, Ely has seen an upswing in industries based on the natural beauty (Boundary Waters and Superior NF) including manufacturing, a large increase in summer home development with its associated construction jobs and ongoing service jobs and support of main street businesses, large upswing in retirees moving to the area and supporting main street businesses and local volunteer-run community groups, and new residents who telecommute and/or start new businesses. In fact, the 3-county Arrowhead area is above average in entrepreneurial and creative people. We have the necessary attributes to be successful and have a stable, sustainable, and diverse economy; this is happening organically now. By supporting our local businesses and encouraging people to move to the Northwoods because it is a great place to live, we can help the community to prosper. But the big problem is sulfide-ore mining. If current prospecting and mining holdings are developed, the Northwoods will be surrounded by a massive industrial mining district. The forests would be transformed and lost forever. No sulfide-ore mine has avoided extensive toxic pollution to waters, and the Northwoods is a high risk area for water pollution. At risk are more than numerous resorts, camps, and campgrounds downstream of sulfide-ore mining, as is the Boundary Waters. The path of pollution will flow into Basswood Lake, damaging a world-class fisheries and exposing humans to the toxic effects of methylmercury. What will the Northwoods lose. Its economy (summer/winter tourism is an important part but the Northwoods' economy is broader and based on being a great place to live and the entire economy will be harmed) its culture, and its healthy waters and forests. the Northwoods will displace its current economy and much of its new population with the boom and bust of sulfide mining, social upheaval, and man-camps. Is mining inevitable. I think not. These are low grade deposits and are dependent on high prices and low costs. If China slows down, the numbers won't work unless the costs drop dramatically. The trend is for recycling (at least 1/3 of every product). All of this is the reason I say our Northwoods area is too valuable to gamble on the most toxic form of mining with little return and a lot of cost to us. Cynthia Peterson 518 N 23rd Ave W Duluth

43257

Northern Minnesota has a strong mining heritage. Iron Rangers have a right to be proud of their contribution to our country. But that contribution came at a price. One effect of mining has been the corresponding removal of other employment options. When the minerals are gone, the mines close, and there is little reason for other businesses to locate in areas stripped of a landscape that draws people to a community. Mining is the only option, but without minerals that option no longer exists either. Sulfide mining will not bring stability. The minerals are finite. When they are gone the mining areas will again be left struggling to find viable options. And this time our lakes will need perpetual treatment for acid and toxic heavy metals. Is this what we want for future generations. Let us assume for a moment that PolyMet manages against the odds — and they are really long odds — to contain all the sulfuric acid that it produces during mine operation. What happens when the mine closes. If Freedom Industries, the Department of Homeland Security and other government entities can't keep track of one storage tank in West Virginia for less than a quarter century, how are we going to keep track of a toxic site on Lake Superior for five centuries. Cynthia Peterson 518 N 23rd Ave W Duluth - Let us put our minds together and see what kind of life we can make for our children. Sitting Bull

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Marylee Fithian

40110

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Marylee Fithian 3735 Pillsbury Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55409-1220

marylougofcfp@aol.com

43230

AS A LONGTIME RESIDENT OF NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, I FIND IT IRONIC THAT WE ARE SPENDING MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN RESTORING OUR POLLUTED WATERS, WHILE CONTEMPLATING A COPPER SULFATE MINE IN NORTHERN MINNESOTA. THE MINE HAS THE POTENTIAL TO DESTROY EFFORTS THAT ARE BEING UNDERTAKEN AT THIS TIME. THERE IS NO COPPER MINE IN EXISTENCE THAT HAS NOT HAD MAJOR EFFECTS IN DAMAGING THE ENVIRONMENT. WE WOULD BETTER OFF RECYCLING THE TONS OF PRECIOUS METALS THAT ARE BEING DUMPED IN LANDFILLS; AND IN THE PROCESS EMPLOYING PEOPLE IN AN INDUSTRY THAT RECLAIMS RATHER THAN ADDS TO THE DEVASTATION OF OUR ENVIRONMENT. THIS CORPORATION HAS NO ALLEGIANCE TO OUR STATE, AND AS A MULTINATIONAL WILL TAKE ITS PROFITS AND LEAVE US WITH THE RECLAMATION. PLEASE DENY THIS PERMIT.

Marylyn Irrgang

48170

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Marylyn Irrgang 170 Good Counsel Drive Mankato, MN 56001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mason and Gwen Myers

45918

Mason C. Myers - 12009 Hilloway Road West - Minnetonka, MN 55305 Email: salmyers@ix-netcom-com March 12, 2014 Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Lisa Fay, MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Tim Dabney, US Forest Service RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay, Mr Dabney, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed PolyMet NorthMet Mine. My comments are to the SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetland destruction in the Superior National Forest My Background: I am a retired mechanical engineer, P.E., with 37 years practice in design of heavy equipment, bulk material handling systems, piping, plumbing, heating, ventilating and air conditioning. My association with the Boundary Waters almost antedates my birth because my parents canoed the area while teaching in Proctor.. MN, before they married. I now look forward to my 51st season at the family cabin in the Superior National Forest Summer Home Group on Hungry Jack Lake The PolyMet mine is the poster boy for many similar mines waiting to follow approval of it and the SDEIS will be the model for EIS' to follow. It is important that the document set a high standARd The failure in EPA review of the original document and subsequent reports in the press and from reviews of environmental groups indicate that the SDEIS is a flawed document as follows: 1- Bedrock Fissures: Fissures in the bed rock that may open to the aquifer are incompletely and inaccurately mapped; better data is reported to be available from Canadian maps. I ASK that the SDEIS include accurate fissure mapping. 2- Reusing Storage Site: Sulfide process tailings will be stored on an existing taconite tailings site that is known already to be leaking to the environment. Sulfide leakage should be expected. 3- Storage Basins a: I attended the meeting in St Paul and saw the diagram of the proposed system of sealing the bottom of a storage basin. The diagram showed a subterranean geomembrane intended to prevent leakage down to the aquifer and another geomembrane covering the pile to prevent rain from entering it. Very little made by man has survived 200 years and I doubt these membranes have been so tested. The cover is available for replacement but the underground one is not. The protection intended seems inadequate. I ASK that the SDEIS include consideration of leakage control with a punctured underground membrane. 4- Storage Basins b: I understand the SDEIS does not address the possible failure of storage site containment methods, whereas the history of containing dangerous materials is a litany of failure. Note particularly boiler fly ash in Kentucky, coal treating chemicals in West Virginia, above ground nuclear waste in Hanford, OR and liquid manure in countless Confined Animal Feeding Operations. Failure should be expected at this site sometime in 200 years, if not during actual operations. I ASK that the SDEIS Consider modes of failure and demonstrate capability to respond so as to protect the environment. 5- Model Flaw: The design model makes assumptions that seem intended to deliver the desired result, for instance, that 90% of drainage from storage basins will be captured and delivered to a treatment facility. This would require that underground piping would be installed and maintained so as not to fail in 200 years. It seems an overoptimistic assumption. Recall that the Canadian company Enbridge's failure record for its underground piping is not enviable. I ASK that the SDEIS include the costs of repairing/replacing the system piping at 30 year intervals to account for breakage due to settlement of the piles. 6- Reverse Osmosis: I encountered the reverse osmosis process on an office building project where it was considered for pretreating humidification water. I learned that the product stream is about 10% of the input, the concentrated 9

mason burch

41614

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, mason burch Steen, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mason C and Gwen S Myers

21552

Gwen Salisbury Myers 12009 Hilloway Road West Minnetonka, Minnesota 55305 March 4, 2014 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, Minnesota 55155-4025 Re: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the PolyMet Project. I have many concerns about this project and find the SDEIS to be completely inadequate, leaving me with endless questions. To focus on one area of concern, the proposed project, located in the Lake Superior watershed, will destroy or degrade thousands of acres of high-quality wetlands and cause permanent water pollution with sulfuric acid and toxic wastes. To be specific, the PolyMet Project would completely destroy 912 acres of wetlands, 65% of which the DNR describes as high-quality. High quality wetlands, such as the coniferous bog wetlands that make up 56% of the wetlands impacted, have a rich diversity of plants and provide a range of services to the ecosystem. These include reducing the severity of floods, water filtration, carbon sequestration and animal habitat. In addition to the 912 acres, the SDEIS admits that an additional 7,351 acres of wetlands would be degraded due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. This could be the largest single wetland loss ever proposed in Minnesota. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been unchanged for thousands of years and are important for water quality and for habitat for moose, lynx and other at-risk species. In addition, these wetlands bind up mercury, thus protecting the fish downstream and prevent further harm to the brain development of our children who eat fish from the St Louis River and Lake Superior. The wetlands that would be destroyed or harmed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. Though the environmental review process should propose alternatives, nothing is suggested to reduce impacts to wetlands in the SDEIS. The required wetland replacement for this loss is completely inadequate. There is no mitigation for the indirect wetland destruction and 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior watershed. Under the circumstances, please: (1) Reject the PolyMet proposal due to unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources; (2) Reject the PolyMet SDEIS due to the fact that there are no alternatives proposed that would reduce this harm; (3) Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all replacement wetlands are in the Lake Superior watershed; and (4) Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that would avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on the Partridge River watershed. In sum, please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's copper/nickel "sulfide" mining plan. Very truly yours, Gwen S. Myers

Mason C Myers

58131

The Polymet Mine Proposal threatens water purity of northeastern Minnesota and paves the way for additional mine proposals waiting off stage. Consider.1. Protective measures consists of products and equipment made by man which we are asked to believe will serve for hundreds of years. In face nothing man-made has lasted 500 years, most have crumbled in less than 2002. Review of the EIS shows that the supporting technology is based on incomplete mineral data and inaccurate water modeling data.3. No hard rock mine to date has failed to deliver and to the environment. Why has not this new technology been rushed to field testing on an existing mine to prove its worth?Is Minnesota's pure water supply to be the test medium for unproven technology? NO WAY. Technical preparation for protection is incomplete so we are not ready for full scale mining now. The project should be denied!

Mathews Hollinshead

28646

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Launching sulfuric acid into northern MN aquifers and watersheds is self-evidently stupid and immoral on any number of grounds that are being well-documented by qualified parties. A 500-year event horizon for sulfide waste might as well be nuclear. That's the level of arrogant idiocy we're contemplating. What's driving it of course is greed, not science or reality. Minnesota's tourism industry and general health apparently count for nothing against a few unions who know the mining jobs probably won't even be union jobs, and shell mining companies that have nothing else to do with MN. Humans can live without copper, but not without water. For those supporters who want me to "prove" my honesty by giving up my cell phone because it may contain copper I ask, do they wear cotton. I bet that in 1860, slavery supporters said there'd be no cotton without slavery. So, miners, if you wear cotton, you must support slavery, right. There will be no positive jobs, union or otherwise, in the giant superfund site this will become. The only work will be monitoring and vainly trying to make things appear as if the damages can be cleaned up. All the rest of us schmucks will have to show is our escalating tax bills and the far-off memory of a time when you could actually use the water in northern MN. Sincerely, Mathews Hollinshead 2114 Pinehurst Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1315 (651) 698-0260

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Anderson

43122

I am writing to express concern about the Northmet Mining Project and Land Exchange. I attended the public informational meeting at the St Paul Rivercentre and heard comments both for and against the proposal. But it seems pretty clear that this deal is not worth the price. It just seems that 20 years of employment is not worth basically permanent damage to an important part of this state. Drier areas like Arizona may provide reasonable risk for similar projects. But recent accidents in North Dakota, West Virginia, and the Gulf of Mexico prove these operations are not reliable. Any contamination of the surface or groundwater in northern Minnesota has the potential to spread and include areas far from the mining site. Glencore has a history of lack of concern for human rights, as well as environmental protection. A little searching quickly turns up a number of disturbing articles about Glencore projects in places like Columbia, Bolivia, Zambia, Ecuador, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Here are a few quotes from these articles: In a remarkably robust comment, [The Times Business Editor, Ian King] damned Glencore as " a business with dubious morals. It trades grain amid food riots and has been accused of profiteering and environmental offences in numerous poor and war-torn countries". He went on: "Most of those signing up to buy shares in Glencore's flotation are major Middle Eastern and Far Eastern investors. Few of the traditional City institutions will touch the shares with a bargepole " <http://moneytometal-org/index.php/Glencore> The giant commodity company remained controversial even after Marc Rich left in 1994- The Daily Mail called Glencore "morally dubious" in an article [Zambia accused the powerful company for trying to manipulate the financial accounts to reduce the taxes and "deliberately depriving that poverty-stricken nation of much-needed income."](#) The article also pointed out that the company sold to African dictators, Cuban communists and South Africa during the apartheid. The controversy that Rich had brought to the company trailed on after he had left Glencore. <http://www.globaljournalist-org/stories/2013/11/22/profile-glencore-in-zambia/> In Australia, Glencore Xstrata has been facing accusations that its Mount Asa smelter in Queensland is responsible for elevated blood levels of lead in children living nearby. In one lawsuit brought on behalf of a six-year-old girl, the plaintiff's lawyers successfully pressured the company to hand over internal documents about the matter. The case is pending. <http://www.wri-irg-org/node/22681> It seems like Minnesota should not allow a company like this to damage any part of our state. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Sincerely, Matt Anderson 1875 Oxford St N Roseville, MN 55113

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Beachey

38745

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Bollis

38927

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage and pollution nonferrous mining will cause to Minnesota's environment. Ou

Matt Dahlhauser

22160

Say NO to the proposed mine plan. Matthew Dahlhauser Senior Project Manager [HYPERLINK "http://qtcommercial-com/"](http://qtcommercial-com/)cid:image001-jpg@01CE6205-1B437F90 6909 Winnetka Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55428 [HYPERLINK "http://www.qtcommercial-com/"](http://www.qtcommercial-com/)www.qtcommercial-com O: 763-535-5831 C: 612-290-3155 F: 763-971-9883 [HYPERLINK "http://www.facebook-com/pages/QT-Commercial-Roofing-and-Construction/142322269183468"](http://www.facebook-com/pages/QT-Commercial-Roofing-and-Construction/142322269183468)cid:image002-png@01CD65CF.A5A2ADB0 [HYPERLINK "http://www.linkedin-com/company/quality-trusted-commercial-roofing-inc"](http://www.linkedin-com/company/quality-trusted-commercial-roofing-inc)cid:image003-png@01CD65CF.A5A2ADB0 [HYPERLINK "http://r20-rs6-net/tn.jsp.llr=od7t9xiabandet=1108901970510ands=0ande=001sXjGGN0kRd8ZtiUzI2rjeKbsSRQ0FokGRL4i8L62MAPbE_RVnFchq6_NdKYPvN0yJxgNJftMWQlVbn14xQGjb1a8rQaexYoUXwvUHLqiJaUOfX3zULA6GJWn0eVro5vO"](http://r20-rs6-net/tn.jsp.llr=od7t9xiabandet=1108901970510ands=0ande=001sXjGGN0kRd8ZtiUzI2rjeKbsSRQ0FokGRL4i8L62MAPbE_RVnFchq6_NdKYPvN0yJxgNJftMWQlVbn14xQGjb1a8rQaexYoUXwvUHLqiJaUOfX3zULA6GJWn0eVro5vO)cid:image004-png@01CD65CF.A5A2ADB0

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Englund

38777

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Matt Goblisch

41874

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Matt Goblisch Maple Grove, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Goodman

14483

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the SDEIS, the proposed PolyMet/NorthMet mine actions, as well as the proposed USFS land exchange. I believe that the costs far outweigh the benefits. The aesthetic toll cannot be measured and the economic benefits are negligible. Please, take another look at the online aerial imagery of the current/former mining sites on the Iron Range. Zoom out to see the entire state and then zoom back in to the Iron Range. This is what we have done to our land, for better or for worse. Next, imagine a drive through one of these towns. The impression one gets is that something big happened here, and whatever it was, it left a lot of destruction in its wake. Not only is the land permanently scarred - especially aesthetically - but the economy is so depressed. In fact, the only thing that seems to be able to inject a little life back into these Iron Range cities is another shot of mining, which only starts the vicious cycle over again. The only real benefit being touted by this proposed mining operation is economic and the anticipated impact is impressively feeble, especially in consideration of the scars that will be left behind. Won't this operation simply create another false/temporary economy. So what if 500 people have decent paying jobs for 20 years. When the jig is up, they'll find themselves jobless in a economically depressed wasteland. Minnesota has to stop sacrificing its land for a few meager (and essentially temporary) jobs. If these truly are our natural resources (the state tax-payers), then my vote is to please leave them where they are, in the ground. I appreciate your consideration, Matt Goodman 321 Minneapolis Ave Duluth, MN 55803

Matt Johansen

41560

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Johnson

19070

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Matt Johnson 3243 Grand Ave S Apt #1 Minneapolis, MN 55408 6122985509

41833

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Matt Johnson 3243 Grand Ave S # 1 Minneapolis, MN 55408-3708 (612) 298-5509

43447

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Matt Johnson 3243 Grand Ave S Apt #1 Minneapolis, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Jones

21

To whom it may concern, I wanted to express my concerns for the future of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. The Boundary Waters is one of Minnesota's greatest treasure. It is one of the hallmarks of our state. It is a far more valuable resource than the sulfides that it contains. This is in both an economic and sentimental sense. The preservation of the beauty of the Boundary Waters guarantees tourism revenue for as long as we can preserve it, which is undoubtedly significantly longer than the mining will last. What's more, I have many personal memories in the boundary waters and I want my children to have the same experiences that I had. I do not want to see Minnesota turn into a state that permanently destroys its beautiful wilderness for short lived economic benefit; we are better than that. Thanks, -Matt Jones

Matt Lauseng

40236

Hi, I would like to take a minute to voice my support in the Polymet mine project. I have read the summary SDEIS report. I find no reason to hold this project up further. From what I see in the report the homework has been done and all effects to the environment have been looked at. I attended two of the three hearings and did not hear anything that would give me concern with this mine. I can see this being a good thing for the people and businesses in the area. Some sacrifices will be made yes, but they are minimal when the size of the payoff for the area are taken into account. I live, hunt, fish, and raise a family in the area and would be one of the first people to stand up against this if it appeared to be a bad thing for the area. I wouldn't want my home destroyed in any way. Please don't allow influence from groups outside the area or ones in areas that this will not affect to put a stop to a greatly needed expansion of mining on the iron range. Thank You. Matt Lauseng 100 4th Ave N #358 Biwabik, MN 55708

Matt Miller

22128

Good day, My name is Matt Miller. I work for B. Miller Products in Hibbing, MN, and reside here as well. We are a 3rd generation family run company that supplies building maintenance and industrial supplies to businesses in the Northland. Northern Minnesota is rich in natural resources, and mining has been a way of life here for many generations. With the combination of today's strict state and federal regulations, I think this is the best place to pursue the Polymet project and this new era of mining in general. I trust and have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. The positive effects from a project of this magnitude have on our region and state, far outweigh any negative. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Let's make this project a reality. Thank you for your time and support of this project. - Matt Miller cid:644412017@02102013-1EE2 ESt 1960 Janitorial – Paper – Cleaning Equipment and Repair – Safety 218-263-8958 Hibbing Office 218-263-8583 Fax 218-969-5563 mobile phone HYPERLINK "mailto:mrmiller@bmillerproducts-com"mrmiller@bmillerproducts-com HYPERLINK "http://www.bmillerproducts-com/"www.bmillerproducts-com cid:644412017@02102013-1EE9

Matt Mlinar

38879

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I believe that the PolyMet mining project can be done in an environmentally sound manner. One of the safest sulfide mining operations in the world is being constructed in Upper Michigan and I believe that will also result in an environmentally sound mining operation. I urge you to please look at facts, not fear. The excuse "it's never been done before" draws upon horrible examples of past operations that are not a true indicator of mining today. I've worked at mining operations in Minnesota and copper-nickel-sulfide research and I believe mining this reserve is in Minnesota's best interest. Sincerely, Mr Matt Mlinar 19337 N Gama Beach Rd Grand Rapids, MN 55744-4966 (906) 361-5432

Alphabetical by sender's first name

matt pearsom

41597

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, matt pearsom minneapolis, Minnesota

Matt Schmitt

58147

I feel this is a bad idea for many reasons and should not be allowed. The following are just a few of my reasons. 1) Production of Sulfide Acid. 2) Never has there been a copper/nickel mine anywhere in the world that has not polluted water. 3) Polymet has never operated a mining operation. 4) The mine would be located 20 miles upstream from the largest fresh water lake in the world. 5) 20 years of mining with 500 years of monitoring is an unrealistic thought. 6) Threat to thousands of jobs in the recreational and tourist industry over the next 200 years, for a handful of 20 year mining jobs.

Matt Slawson

41598

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Matt Slawson Burnsville, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Straw

3474

Dec 21, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mining companies: NEVER hire as many people as they say they will, and the jobs are impermanent, creating a future unemployment problem. NEVER clean up after themselves, leaving a toxic, deadly mess for taxpayers to deal with for decades-sometimes centuries. NEVER aid tourism in the states or local areas where they are allowed to mine. NEVER end up having a positive effect on any economies, local or otherwise, in the long run. NEVER find less invasive or less toxic methods to mine, always opting for larger equipment, fewer employees, faster methods, and a much wider impact in terms of carbon footprints and environmental destruction-that's what they call "progress." Five hundred years ago, there was no United States. America had just been discovered. Most Europeans thought the world was flat. Expecting Minnesota to keep those chemicals from poisoning an entire region for 500 years is nothing short of absurd Nothing short of pure, stupid greed. You should be forcing mining companies to develop less invasive methods for smaller profits doled out over much, much longer periods of time, rather than allowing that tiny tail to wag an entire state. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Matt Straw 315 Bluff Ave Brainerd, MN 56401-2648 (218) 828-8136

51658

Dec 21, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mining companies: NEVER hire as many people as they say they will, and the jobs are impermanent, creating a future unemployment problem. NEVER clean up after themselves, leaving a toxic, deadly mess for taxpayers to deal with for decades-sometimes centuries. NEVER aid tourism in the states or local areas where they are allowed to mine. NEVER end up having a positive effect on any economies, local or otherwise, in the long run. NEVER find less invasive or less toxic methods to mine, always opting for larger equipment, fewer employees, faster methods, and a much wider impact in terms of carbon footprints and environmental destruction-that's what they call "progress." Five hundred years ago, there was no United States. America had just been discovered. Most Europeans thought the world was flat. Expecting Minnesota to keep those chemicals from poisoning an entire region for 500 years is nothing short of absurd Nothing short of pure, stupid greed. You should be forcing mining companies to develop less invasive methods for smaller profits doled out over much, much longer periods of time, rather than allowing that tiny tail to wag an entire state. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Matt Straw 315 Bluff Ave Brainerd, MN 56401-2648 (218) 828-8136

54136

I do not believe the potential for 500 years of poisoned water, ruined tourism, destroyed habitat, and ravaged state and local economies is a good trade for any benefits from any mine. Water is life. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

matt tuccitto

47428

My name is Matt Tuccitto, age 35, and I have lived in Minnesota my entire life including 4 years of college at Gustavus Adolphus College in St Peter, MN. I've done my best over the last few years to gather all information available on this project and the answer seems simple: issue Polymet a permit. I love the outdoors and have visited the BWCA 30+ times this mine plan will NOT harm the water in northern MN. The management of Polymet is capable of making this project great for MN. Northern MN is struggling and there are almost 0 jobs available for college educated people. This is tearing children and grandchildren away from grandparents who live in Northern MN. Our state has a valuable resource located beneath the surface (copper, nickel, platinum, etc) and its our job to extract it as environmentally friendly and responsible as possible. Polymet mining will ensure that is done. Its time to make MN great again and attract tax paying families and corporations from other states similar to what North Dakota has accomplished in the last 10 years. GRANT POLYMET A PERMIT, they will not disappoint. Regards, Matt Tuccitto

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Tyler

18084

Hello. I'm Matt Tyler, T-Y-L-E-R, and I live in Finland, Minnesota, and I want to thank all my union brothers and sisters for coming out tonight. I see a lot of folks in the audience. Although I'm not currently in a union, I grew up in a union family and I know that union wages helped pay for my college, and I got a degree in natural resources and forestry and so I'm reasonably scientifically literate, and I agree with a lot of what's been said here, David Dill and others, that we really should be paying attention to the data, and we have to make decisions based on data, not on emotion. I think -- I think that's sound. But having read through this, I've seen a lot of things that are pretty questionable, and I have friends that are professional hydrogeologists that clean up EPA superfund sites and I've looked at it with them and they've said, "Well, you know, there's not enough wells here, there's -- they didn't do this right, they didn't do" -- there's a number of things they pointed out, and one thing I'd want to focus on is that something that's not been talked about is that this SDEIS, if you actually work through it, didn't have any analysis of worker safety in there. Now, in a lot of other SDEISes for other projects, like when they redid the nuclear plant down in Monticello, they had that in there. When they've done environmental cleanup cases from Chevron, they've looked at worker safety. Now, they looked at, you know, what might happen with residents of Hoyt Lakes, but they haven't actually looked at worker safety in here and I think that's pretty grossly inadequate. I think, also, we know that that study came from out from of U of M recently about, you know, mesothelioma and so forth, and we know that a lot of folks on the Range who worked in the mines got mesothelioma about three times more often than average folks and I lived near Silver Bay, and I've had a lot of friends that have worked in the mines over the years and I've seen some people die of that. They were from strokes and heart attacks, and so I think we have to look at this critically and one of the reasons they might not have put worker safety in there is because their own data in the SDEIS, page 5 -- 439 -- to 4 -- 438 to 439, points out that about nine percent of the ore tailing and process water have those asbestos-like fibers in them, and you know, they didn't really look at what's that going to go to folks in the plant. They didn't really look at what the air treatment mechanisms are going to be. So I think before we sign up on this, we should really think critically about that and we should with be skeptical, because, you know, the companies aren't always right. They don't always honor your pensions. They don't always admit to stuff. Thank you.

18354

My name is Matt Tyler and I live in Finland, Minnesota and I am a professional enforcer by trade, so I am involved in resource extractions. And I do believe that we should use our resources. Having said that, we have to use them responsibly. The enforcer's credo is, you know, "The greatest good for the greatest number for the long-term." If I look at this proposal from that perspective, I don't really see it meeting that test. I think if you looked at the EISes before, very, very rarely do you see an EIS that has its own chapter where the agencies say, "We disagree with this, we disagree with this, we disagree with this." If you look at Appendix C, it is about 250 or 200 pages of the tribe saying all of the things that are wrong with the EIS, based on science and citations with their own models. Now, if we are going to say that that is adequate, and we have that much dissent, then that is purely illogical and ridiculous. The other thing that I want to say is I live right next to the taconite, you know, I live next to Silver Bay. And a lot of my friends and neighbors work in the plant over there. And, you know, it's been good to us and it's been bad for us, you know. And I think one thing that doesn't get talked about a lot, you know, is the mesothelioma and the increased risk of heart attack and stroke, you know, that a lot of people have experienced. And that is not really reflected in here very well. Someone earlier said that the risks are basically left out on purpose to detract (phonetic) from telling other people or from pointing this out on what they used to base those models. No other EIS has this little mention in it to workers' safety. Now, I would like to thank all of my union brothers and sisters for coming down here, but to be fair, I don't think the union movement existed to call for a project that is not safe for workers. I would encourage the folks to say, you know, "Until we fix these worker safety issues and until we get a project labor agreement for the adequate operation of this land," we shouldn't be endorsing it. So, you know, I just want to put that out there and say I'm not against mining, but this mine, this mine is a bad deal for the workers, it's a bad deal for our community, it's a bad deal for the taxpayers. And since I am also supposed to say something also substantial about the wetlands, I will just point out, the way they analyzed the wetlands impact on this thing is kind of ridiculous. I am friends with a professional hydrologist and he has told me time and time again, if you want to look at a wetlands study, you have to do a hydrological study, do a pump test, you have to do a laser test. They didn't do that. Why? Because they were lazy. They wanted to rush to get this done, and now it is still incomplete. The reason it takes such a long time is because it is a good project, it's a regular study (phonetic), it's because it is a bad mine. And thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matt Tyler

42895

Ms Fey, Mr Jimenez, and Mr Brunner, Attached, please find a technical memo I developed to comment on Financial Assurance in the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. My key findings include: * The annual long-term operating and maintenance post-closure cost estimates in the PolyMet SDEIS are significantly lower than the lowest estimates calculated from published estimates for similar reverse osmosis plants on the LTV property. This is a significant problem. Independent estimates of long-term annual OandM post-closure costs range from \$6-1 to \$10-6 million. * Lacking specific, detailed treatment water treatment plant plans specific to the NorthMet Project, there is still considerable uncertainty about annual long-term treatment costs. * Stochastic simulation of volatile investment returns and inflation rates show that the minimum beginning balance for the Long Term Treatment Fund required to ensure water treatment for 500 years after closure is between \$333 and \$694 million. * The Long Term Treatment Fund set aside is above and beyond the estimated \$50-\$200 million mine closure and reclamation cost estimates in the SDEIS (SDEIS, pg. 3-138). The SDEIS also fails to include an estimate of a financial assurance funds for accidents, natural disasters, and other unforeseen events. Not including additional contingency funds, the total financial assurance package should be at least \$383-\$700 million. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and technical Memo. Thank you, Matt Tyler Professional Consulting Forester PO BOX 511, Finland, MN 55603

Matt Zimmerman

54361

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager,I think that PolyMet Mining has a great plan for the reduction of environmental side effects and the output of ore. They appear to be trying to limit cultural and environmental damage through engineering.This mining would greatly benefit our state. It would create numerous jobs and help boost our economy. It would offer a lot of potential for future copper mines and would be one of the most productive.The apparent lack of disadvantages is a point that proves that PolyMet has a lot of experience in Inining and limiting damage. The advantages of such a plan would be more jobs, money, copper production and mining in the state.This will have a 1nimal impact on cultural resources in the area. It might affect a segment of the Mesabi Widjiu. Other than that it wouldn't affect important cultural resources that are valuable to America.The land exchange offers seem fair. They appear to trade the same amount of land between both groups. The offers would add to the Superior Forest. They would also add to PolyMet's mines.PolyMet Mining's plans seem to be fair and have as little impact on the environment and cultural resources in the area.Thank you for your• time,Matt Zimmerman

Matthew Davidson

6011

To whom it may concern, I live in the twin cities. I don't struggle to find a job like the neighbors to the north. It is a retreat and as someone who has worked in the outdoor retail and boat manufacturing industry, I've had the pleasure of meeting people from all over the country who have shared stories of their trips up north. We already have a valuable resources up north. I believe allowing a mining company in will destroy a part of our state and kill an industry that runs indefinitely. Trading a generations worth of jobs for 5 generations of clean up and monitoring seems foolish to me. Please don't allow polymet to ruin our home. Matthew Davidson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matthew Davis

15990

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Matthew Hennen

44007

There appears several key components to this project that are not adequately addressed in the Supplemental Draft EIS. My primary concern is that there is a severe lack of fisheries and aquatic organism related information and data collected in the document. Without this information I am not sure how this project would be allowed to move forward given the massive implications on a highly connected aquatic system. From what I can gather, the information that is provided is extremely topical (and in some cases outdated and unconfirmed [eg, assessing aquatic vegetation using aerial photographs] and does little to address potential impacts on aquatic organisms. From what I can gather, essentially just species presence and mercury accumulation information is provided which barely scratches the surface of the data that needs to be collected. Sensitive aquatic indicator species should be identified and monitored on much more frequent basis in order to make inferences about potential impacts. Massive amounts of research including fish behavior, recruitment, growth, mortality, etc needs to be done on waters potentially affected by this project. Until this information is collected and provided in the document, then the document is incomplete. Matthew J. Hennen 5430 Mineral Avenue Mountain Iron, MN 55768

Matthew J Eckman

54524

1. Have a balanced SCIENCE (i.e., geology, chemistry, hydrology, ENGINEERS) group travel to several active copper/nickel mining sites of PolyMet (or their "parent" company) to review for current or residual problems with sulfides/pollution. 2. If PolyMet is a subsidiary and declares bankruptcy, then who pays cleanup?

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matthew Johnson

38951

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Matthew Johnson 3244 44th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-4317 (612) 703-8686

Matthew Kilibarda

44121

To whom it may concern, I'm against this proposal to mine copper and nickel in Northern MN based on this proposal for a number of reasons. 1- Water quality, especially fresh water, is a hot topic these days. Our usage of it continues to increase at an alarming rate, beyond what is available in many areas. There are shortages all across the US and the world. I don't understand why we would take such a big risk polluting a resource that is going to be even more valuable and hard to come by in the future. 2- I keep hearing how we should do this mining here because we will do it right. Even if that were the case, and I'm not confident it is, to do it right will cost more, meaning the copper/nickel will cost more leading to issues we have had with other mining industries. We won't be competitive with these other countries. When we are not able to compete PolyMet and other companies will ask for concessions or worse cut corners in hopes they won't be caught. Many times the fines are more cost effective to pay than to invest in proper equipment to keep our environment safe. 3- I grew up in the Northland and still frequent this beautiful land to hunt, fish, camp and enjoy the peace and quiet. The long term effects of this type of mining are of major concern. Not only to the beauty of this land, but to the impact on game hunting and again water quality which will likely impact fishing, swimming and other water activities. 4- With the amount of jobs this project is promising to create (Depends on who you talk to, but around 200-300) it just does not make sense that for such few jobs we would take such a big risk with a much more important recreational industry and a fresh water system that will be a valuable resource in the near future. Matt Kilibarda Afton, MN (651) 436-2730 mnkilibarda@gmail-com Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or the individual responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, please be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the message, and return any hard copy print-outs.

Matthew McDonough

39334

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Minnesota greatest natural resource, and source of tourism revenue is the clean and pristine waters of the BWCA, and lake Superior. Any propose minning that slightly poses a danger to that is not worth doing. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Matthew McDonough 3109 Columbus Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-1534

Matthew Ott

19919

The risks of the Polymet mine outweigh the benefits. Matthew Ott 2121 Garfield Ave S. Apt. 201 Minneapolis, MN 55405

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matthew Schaut

16384

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Matthew Schaut 3720 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

42274

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Matthew Schaut 3720 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2512

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matthew Schaut

49949

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Matthew Schaut 3720 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Matthew Straw

40712

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Matthew Webster

44283

As an avid backpacker on the North Shore and as someone who has cherished memories of many canoeing trips in the Boundary Waters, I write to voice my concern with the PolyMet mine proposal. Namely, I believe the positive short-term fiscal impact from a 20-year operation is significantly outweighed by what I understand to be the exponentially longer period of remediation and environmental impact. I am concerned that, even with the best intentions, PolyMet may not be available to continue monitoring and funding these remediations in 50 years or 100 years, and that therefore the cost of this would fall either on Minnesota taxpayers or on this fragile yet beautiful environment itself. While I understand and support the quest for quality, long-term jobs for individuals on the North Shore and the Iron Range, I do not believe that the short-term commitment of PolyMet meets that criteria, and it comes with a significant and as yet unknown price tag. Respectfully, Matthew - Matthew Webster 982 Laurel Avenue St Paul, MN 55104 612-716-3503

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maura Dilley

40668

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Minnesota's identity, heritage and future is water. Growing up in Norther MN, my family's drinking water came directly from a pump in the lake. The proposed PolyMet mine means that never again will members of my family have the same connection to Nature. That is prospect is devastating and unacceptable to me. This path is ignoble. There is a better way. We should swim, fish and admire our spectacular water systems, not live in horrible fear of their toxic finger print. Sincerely, Ms Maura Dilley 7300 Rolling Acres Rd Excelsior, MN 55331-7722

Maureen Jensen

19355

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long and contains a great deal of technical details that need to be carefully read. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. These should be made available so that we can conduct the proper review. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about the ability to conduct this mining in a environmentally safe way that will not do substantial harm to one of the most valuable resources on the planet: clean water. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Maureen Jensen 1120 Schooner Way Woodbury, MN 55125 Maureen Jensen 1120 Schooner Way Woodbury, MN 55125 651-261-9007

Maureen Johnson

43000

A note back that this was received will be appreciated. Thank you. Maureen Johnson ---- Original Message ---- Subject: comments from Maureen Johnson Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2014 10:16:27 -0500 From: Maureen Johnson HYPERLINK "mailto:mjsciled@earthlink-net"<mjsciled@earthlink-net> To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us I'd appreciate a note back that this was received. It was sent in the morning of 3/13/14-

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maureen Johnson 43003

A note back that you received this would be appreciated. Thank you. Bruce Johnson

Maureen Keogh 12417

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. As you are no doubt aware, there has been much media coverage lately regarding polluted ground water in North Dakota as well as in other states and how it is affecting the human population which is fearful to use its tap water. It would be a shame to add Minnesota to the list of states that is unable to provide potable tap water to its residents due to a decision to allow a private mining company to mine federal lands. It gives the impression that the government cares more about profit rather than its residents and future generations. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. As a resident of Florida, I know of the dangers of man interfering with the environment. Thanks to Big Sugar and other commercial enterprises, the Florida Everglades which is a huge wetland is a fraction of its original size and much of it is polluted due to the run off from agriculture concerns. The Florida legislature now realizes that something has to be done to restore the Everglades and is trying to buy back land, but it is an extremely expensive and time consuming process and there are doubts whether this course of action will even be successful because of the extent of the damage. I sincerely hope that Minnesota learns from Florida's mistake and decides against allowing federal lands to be mined by PolyMet. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Maureen Keogh 5225 Versailles Ct Cape Coral, FL 33904-5666

Maureen Lahiff 13569

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I used to live in Minnesota and still have strong connections to the people and the land. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Maureen Lahiff 3800 Maybelle Ave Apt 9 Oakland, CA 94619-2152

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maureen McCarter

39082

---Original Message--- From: maureenmccarter@charter-net [mailto:maureenmccarter@charter-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 7:34 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Maureen McCarter 1931 17th St S Saint Cloud, MN 56301-4949

maureen polyner

9629

To Whom it May Concern: I am 65 years old, a resident of Ely, and lived my entire life in that area with the exception of military duty and pursuing an education. I worked for the tourist industry at a canoe trip outfitter while in high school and worked at a couple of mines as a young adult. One mine was a taconite venture and the other was a COPPER/NICKEL exploration mine (AMAX Exploration) at the exact site that Polymet is proposing to mine. Your records will show that we sunk a 1700' shaft and developed approximately a mile network of underground drifts. This was from 1977 to 1981 - 37 years ago. We did encounter, and dealt with, the problems associated with sulphides. Water pumped to the surface had a chemical (Alum) injected to the flow which settled out the sulphur particles in a retaining pond. The extracted ore, that was kept on site, was placed on sand and hypalon fabric to monitor the runoff. This was closely monitored by our environmental group as well as a group of your folks (Bruce Johnson, Steve Lampman, and Ann Wier) that shared office/lab space with AMAX. This was successfully done 40 years ago. Considering the tremendous improvement in technology since then, I am 100% confident that this area can be safely mined with NO ADVERSE AFFECTS to the area that we choose to live in. We are miners, That is how we have chose to EARN our living for generations. That is what we do. The mines provide us with an opportunity to make an acceptable living in a quiet, slower paced part of Minnesota that WE take care of. Thank you for your consideration and your time, Larry Polyner Larry Polyner 1560 North 20th Ave E Ely, MN 55731 218-365-3668

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maureen Rooney

41983

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Maureen Rooney North Branch, Minnesota

Maureen Skelly

18258

My name is Maureen Skelly. I am a native Minnesota. For years I have watched the exodus of half of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul go up to the Northwoods on Memorial Day and Labor Day Weekend. I wanted to just suggest that there may be some alternatives to another mine in northern Minnesota. I know that a lot of the small towns are having a hard time. There was a successful granola company in Ely with some creative marketing. So, I wanted to suggest that perhaps we come up with a plan where some of the 350 or 500 people that might apply for the jobs the mine is offering would consider creating some other jobs for themselves connected to the tourism industry; the fishing, the hunting, the canoeing, where people that go up there could commit to supporting them. Someone suggested green bucks that would be used only for hunting, fishing, canoeing. There are so many of us that love and use the north country. I would commit to going up once or twice a year to a specific bed and breakfast, if that would help to create a livable wage for somebody up there in lieu of such a destructive proposal as the mine. So, I just wanted to put forth the idea of the people sticking together, getting creative, using the mine proposal as an excuse to get serious about this, to help support the people in northern Minnesota that need jobs so badly. It would be much more destructive to our economy if the water becomes all polluted and the tourist industry all goes down and all of the other aspects of the tourism industry falls because of everything is polluted. That would be much more of an economic loss than whatever is being offered as a gain economically by this mine. I am a grandmother. I have the brightest grandchildren. I believe that the impact on future generations should be one of the primary concerns in debating whether or not to accept this proposal. I worked a summer at Isle Royale, I-S-L-E R-O-Y-A-L-E, Isle Royale National Park, which is an international biosphere preserve. The Aisle Royale is in Lake Superior, which I believe would receive pollution from the St. Louis River. We in Minnesota have a responsibility to protect the water, the land of 10,000 lakes, the source of the largest river in the North American continent and home to the largest freshwater lake in the world. It is a time period in history where water is becoming more -- fresh water is becoming more and more of an issue. Wars have been fought about it already. We need to protect our fresh water. We can't afford a proposal as dangerous as this, where there is a moratorium on this type of a mine in Wisconsin. And it has not been proven that this mine will be safe or non-destructive to the environment. That's all. I'm longwinded here.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maurice Menzel

16266

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mauricio carvajal

40340

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, mauricio carvajal viento norte 4018 santiago, ot 9291583 CL

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maurita Niedzielski

16004

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Maury Aaseng

11457

I would like to hear three conversations that I have not heard discussed much. 1). I would like to hear from those who are against the mine. I would like to hear what arguments they have heard from the pro-mining faction that they consider valid, and how they would address those legitimate points that are being made. 2). I would also like to hear from those who are for the mine. I would like to hear what arguments they have listened to from those who are against this mine that they consider valid, and how they would address these legitimate points. 3). Thirdly, I would like to hear people talk about solutions that take into account the economic need of the people in the region who stand to benefit from the mine while protecting against environmental damage and long term costs that many in the state object to. One idea that I suggest is to examine the viability of opening a precious metal recycling plant that would preserve the environment, provide needed metals, and provide jobs and industry. According to a recent publication by the Smithsonian Institute, there is an estimated 40 million tons of electronic waste generated annually that contain the metals we could use for these purposes. Consider what other solutions we could come up with if we work together instead of becoming polarized. Maury Aaseng Duluth, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maury Aaseng

18068

My name is Maury Aaseng. I am from Duluth. And I guess my concern is that there is a lot of talk about jumping to mining for the metals, which we all use, but I don't hear a lot about using the metals that have already been in existence. All of our electronics already have all these metals in them. And I recently read that 40 million tons of electronic waste is generated annually. And that's just tossed. All of which contain these metals. So before we go to having a problem where we pit jobs versus the environment, I don't know why we aren't opening a recycling plant that takes these millions of tons of precious metals in electronics and using them that way. In the same way we don't cut down a forest every time we want to have paper, we have recycling for paper. And then what we can't make up from the recycling then look into mining for that. But it seems that we're kind of putting the cart before the horse. Anyway that's one big concern I got. I just don't see it being addressed where the recycling plays into all this. It seems we've got twin ports or an international port. And waste is generated worldwide. So we have access to that material. And I have not heard myself about other people doing it. So it's an untapped resource. And unlike a mine, which has a lifespan of 20 years, a recycling plant that continues to generate electronic waste, because cell phones and computers aren't going anywhere, could operate potentially in a much longer term. So I see it as a win for the environment, a win for longer term jobs. And I'm failing to see a down side. But yet I'm failing to hear anybody talk about it. That's I think my comment.

Max Jodeit

2718

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. FIVE HUNDRED YEARS recovery. Please, please do not allow this.. It would be fine with me if tthree things happened: (1) new technology that would allow recovery within two years, when any mining stops and (2) DOUBLY sufficient money is deposited in an account controlled by the State of Minnesota DNR (for example) to ENSURE that the technology works and that recovery is essentially complete after two years, whereupon some of the deposit would be returned to the miners; half the original deposit if recovery is ACTUALLY complete, and an appropriate amount kept back temporarily to check the last steps. Otherwise, the whole amount would be used to complete the recovery work. (3) Penalties large enough to make the mining company think their project through for the long term should be agreed to by the company. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Max Jodeit 6025 Medicine Lake Rd Crystal, MN 55422-3329

51903

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. FIVE HUNDRED YEARS recovery. Please, please do not allow this.. It would be fine with me if tthree things happened: (1) new technology that would allow recovery within two years, when any mining stops and (2) DOUBLY sufficient money is deposited in an account controlled by the State of Minnesota DNR (for example) to ENSURE that the technology works and that recovery is essentially complete after two years, whereupon some of the deposit would be returned to the miners; half the original deposit if recovery is ACTUALLY complete, and an appropriate amount kept back temporarily to check the last steps. Otherwise, the whole amount would be used to complete the recovery work. (3) Penalties large enough to make the mining company think their project through for the long term should be agreed to by the company. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Max Jodeit 6025 Medicine Lake Rd Crystal, MN 55422-3329

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Maxene Linehan

9692

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. Minnesota's interconnected water table, lakes, rivers, streams and watersheds (including Lake Superior) are too precious to the future of Minnesota to allow feckless exploitation. Sulfide producing mines are better managed in dry regions. Please listen to all the scientists who are alarmed by Polymet's proposal and faulty research. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Sincerely yours, Maxene Linehan Hovland, Cook County, MN Maxene Linehan P.O. Box 278 Hovland, MN 55606

Maxine Hughes

41836

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Maxine Hughes 1950 Selby Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-5821

Maxwell Helmberger

57259

Polymet's promises are suspect at best. This project threatens to destroy wetlands, pollute our waters, and kill our wild rice stands. The loss of these ecological and cultural resources is not worth the metal from the ground, especially if the pollution remains here in the state long after the last speck of ore is carted away. Maxwell Helmberger 181 Vermilion Hall 1105 Kirby Dr Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

May Britt Lundstad

40314

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, May Britt Lundstad Torderødalleen 16 MOSS, ot 1511 NO

Mckenzie Merges

39262

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Mckenzie Merges 804 Juno Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102-3822

McKenzie Schultz

41897

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, McKenzie Schultz Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

McLaughlins 6527

Let's move forward with Polymet. The Iron Range needs an economic boost and Polymet will have a huge positive impact in our area of the state. Undoubtedly, Polymet will be responsible in their actions and, in turn, we, the residents of this area, need to be open minded about initiatives like this. Go Polymet. Kim and Paul McLaughlin Hibbing, MN

MEAGAN GILL 40342

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, MEAGAN GILL 209 S 100 E WELLSVILLE, UT 84339 US

Meagan Johnson 41882

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Meagan Johnson Audubon, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Meg Anderson

40709

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Megan Dawson

57964

I strongly oppose the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet Project, specifically the impacts it will have on water quality for hundreds of years to come. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Megan Locklear

41955

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Megan Locklear Minneapolis, Minnesota

Megan McGuire

44862

I have commented once already, but I would like to add more detail to my previous comment. This comment is regarding the lack of risk analysis in the document. While the standard processes may call for detailed risk analysis during a later stage of permitting, that would provide inadequate opportunity for the public to review and comment on the risk analysis. I would implore the agencies to conduct a thorough, detailed, and complete risk analysis to be included in the EIS to allow the public to comment on the analysis. A risk analysis is needed for many areas of the EIS and should be added. Potential impacts to water quality, habitat, and human health are discussed, but there is no risk analysis for these and other subject areas. I suggest that the risk assessment should follow the principles used by the Corps of Engineers for risk analysis. The analysis should include all potential avenues for harm to public health, environmental resources, and workers. These risks should include many forms of risk, such as events (eg extreme storms or mechanical failure), incomplete information (the risk of incorrect analysis), and human behavior (eg human error in operating systems, or the risk of political institutions changing before the contaminated water is mediated). These risks should then be described based on the likelihood of each risk occurring, the consequences, and the response. Event-based risks to be analyzed include, for example: the risk of leaching, the risk of mechanical failure in the system (eg pumps), the risk of a large rain event overtopping the basins, the risk of human error in system operation, etc These risks should then be analyzed with the following: 1) quantify the likelihood of each event happening over the first 50 years, the first 100 years, and the first 500 years, 2) determine the effects of each risk, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and 3) describe how this event would be addressed if it should occur. To summarize, there are many potential effects to human health, the environment, workers, endangered species, recreation, etc These effects should be analyzed with a risk framework that includes the LIKELIHOOD of each risk occurring, the CONSEQUENCES of each risk occurring, and the RESPONSE that would occur to minimize the effects of the event. This analysis is extremely important. While some worst-case-scenario events may be very unlikely, their consequences could be severe. The likelihood must be compared to the consequences. As a member of the public, I cannot have an informed understanding of this project if I don't understand the probability and consequences of various risks. Thank you, Megan McGuire Biologist

megan williamson

28957

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please DO NOT endanger Lake Superior How can protecting our largest body of fresh water not be a top priority. Sincerely, megan williamson 202 W Crystal St chicago, IL 60622

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Meghan Ihfe 54341

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, From reading about PGE mining I would agree that it is a hard choice to make. If I were you, I would do the project. I would do the project because not only is it going to benefit us it is also going to give us some disadvantages. If we do this project, we will be getting rid of some waste that is found in our earth. I think that the plan that they have right now would work out perfectly fine. I think it will also help Minnesota by, getting rid of our wastes and also earning more money for the copper-sulfate. Some disadvantages are how long this process is going to take, but at least we get something good out of it right? This project probably will not effect me but it will affect others. It will affect others by how close they are doing this project to their home town. It will also affect some others because if they do not agree with the project then they will want to make it difficult for the project to carry on. Afterall, I say get the project going as soon as possible and hope for the best of it. My final opinion is to do the project and make any changes if its needed. I have a feeling that if we do not do the project then we will regret not doing it because it will benefit us in many more was than disadvantage us. I would love to hear what the decision ends up being. Thanks, Meghan Ihfe (8th grade student)

Mehgan Blair 42590

See attachment

Mel Lahr 46052

Dear Mr Bruner, I would like to voice a few concerns I have with PolyMets 's Environmental Impact Statement While this is a large document it is still missing a lot of crucial information. Levels of contamination, acidity and corrosion that will result from the waste which would go into the HRF (hydrometallurgical residue facility) are not revealed in this report. We know that the waste will be hazardous though and therefore the site should be regulated as a hazardous waste landfill. Storage and disposal of such waste requires a separate permit in Minnesota. (Minn. Stat. 116-06, subd. 11) Minnesota rules protect water quality and human health by requiring that wastes must be solidified and stabilized after closure so they won't leak but PolyMet is proposing to use various types of liners including Geomembrane (which is known to degrade over time) and leave the waste in a toxic pond. PolyMet must be required to specify all HRF wastes and plan to treat their wastes as hazardous. The EIS states, "adaptive management would be implemented , if necessary, to protect the environment for the long term." What is "adaptive management." What if something happens in 40 years. Or 100 years. It is unlikely PolyMet still be around to practice this adaptive management. Other industries with similar risks, such as offshore drilling and nuclear industries, must include a Safety Emergency Management System (SEMS). PolyMet should also be required to layout safety precautions for possible scenarios instead of just saying we will use "adaptive management" when the time comes. Thank you for your time. Melanie Lahr 420 E. 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

46056

Dear Ms Fay, I would like to voice a few concerns I have with PolyMets 's Environmental Impact Statement While this is a large document it is still missing a lot of crucial information. Levels of contamination, acidity and corrosion that will result from the waste which would go into the HRF (hydrometallurgical residue facility) are not revealed in this report. We know that the waste will be hazardous though and therefore the site should be regulated as a hazardous waste landfill. Storage and disposal of such waste requires a separate permit in Minnesota. (Minn. Stat. 116-06, subd. 11) Minnesota rules protect water quality and human health by requiring that wastes must be solidified and stabilized after closure so they won't leak but PolyMet is proposing to use various types of liners including Geomembrane (which is known to degrade over time) and leave the waste in a toxic pond. PolyMet must be required to specify all HRF wastes and plan to treat their wastes as hazardous. The EIS states, "adaptive management would be implemented , if necessary, to protect the environment for the long term." What is "adaptive management." What if something happens in 40 years. Or 100 years. It is unlikely PolyMet still be around to practice this adaptive management. Other industries with similar risks, such as offshore drilling and nuclear industries, must include a Safety Emergency Management System (SEMS). PolyMet should also be required to layout safety precautions for possible scenarios instead of just saying we will use "adaptive management" when the time comes. Thank you for your time. Melanie Lahr 420 E. 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Melanie Erickson 52294

I am not in support of this mining project. The risk to ruining this precious area and even more precious water out weighs the benefits by far. Water will likely be a very precious resource in the future. Our technology is not yet advanced enough to extract the resources. The mining resources will wait and not disappear. The damage to water my be devastating and last for hundreds of years. Thank you. Melanie Erickson Little falls. Mn. 56345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melanie Lahr

18322

Hi, I am Melanie Lahr. I am from Duluth. I want to voice concerns I have with the environmental impact statement. It's a very large document. But if you look at some of the criticisms of it that there's holes, that there's discrepancies, you can actually find those in the EIS. Even a layperson can. Levels of contamination, acidity, that will result from the waste which would go into the HRF are not revealed in this report. We know that the waste will be hazardous though; and, therefore, the site should be regulated as a hazardous waste landfill. Storage and disposal of such waste requires a separate permit from Minnesota. Minnesota rules protect water quality and human health by requiring that waste must be solidified and stabilized after closure. So they won't be. But PolyMet is proposing to use various types of liners, including the geomembrane, which is known to degrade over time and leave the waste in a toxic pond. PolyMet must be required to specify all HRF waste and plan to treat their waste as hazardous. The EIS states, "Adaptive management would be implemented if necessary to protect the environment for the long term." What is "adaptive management"? What if something happens in 40 or 100 years? It is unlikely PolyMet will still be around to practice this adaptive management. Other industries with similar -- such as off-shore drilling and nuclear industry must include a safety and emergency management system. PolyMet should also be required to layout safety precautions for possible scenarios instead of just saying, "We will use adaptive management when it happens." Thank you for your time.

Melanie McPherson

40047

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Melanie McPherson 3227 Halifax Ave N Robbinsdale, MN 55422-3102 (612) 245-3590

Melanie Peterson-Nafziger

40559

Dear DNR, EPA, and other associated decision makers, I am contacting you because I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed PolyMet mines in northern Minnesota. In particular, the exchange of protected wilderness lands in tracts 3, 4 and 5 increase the risk of pollution in the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, the most pristine waters we have in Minnesota. Of course, the proposed PolyMet sites also endanger Lake Superior and the rivers that flow into it in that region of Minnesota. The trade off to create short-term jobs and tax revenue in Minnesota by permanently damaging our land; endangering our most precious wilderness areas; potentially endangering our human health and our resources due to acid mine drainage, sulfates pollution, and mercury and other heavy metals release; and exposing our region to unforeseen but somewhat predictable long-term impacts of the mine is not worth it. I am opposed to the development of the PolyMet mines in northern Minnesota as well as the land exchanges for the NorthMet project. Thanks for gathering and considering my feedback. Warmly, Melanie Peterson-Nafziger 1386 Saint Clair Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Melanie Tauring

38752

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Melanie Tauring 3843 Upton Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412-1810 (612) 670-6751

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melia Derrick

57885

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Melinda Suelflow

41053

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

43578

I'm not sure that I included my personal address. Here it is: Melinda Suelflow 6971 Cramer Road/ PO Box 503 Finland, MN 55603 218-353-7374 From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 2:20 PM To: Melinda Suelflow Subject: RE: Polymet SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melinda Suelflow

43587

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health and the environment. I work for the Organic Consumers Association and I live in Finland, MN, not too many miles away from the proposed mine site. I also harvest wild rice, it is a staple of my diet. The Organic Consumers Association has over 10,000 supporters in Minnesota who care about access to clean drinking water and safe, healthy and sustainable food. Wild rice and fish are common dietary staples in northern Minnesota. Fractures and Seepage The PolyMet tailings basin is proposed to be unlined, yet the SDEIS doesn't include the possibility that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants. This is an astonishing omission. Here in Finland we are finding out that pollutants from an old Air Base are being transported through fractures in the bedrock downhill from the Base site and into our community. It is also well known that fractures beneath tailings basins can transport pollutants. For example, in the Chevron MolyCorp Superfund remediation, the EPA concluded, "the pathway for contaminant migration is the leaching of tailings seepage downward from the tailing facility to ground water that migrates through fractures to surface water." It is wrong to assume that the PolyMet tailings site has no potential to transport pollution through fractures. Existing tailings seepage already exceeds groundwater standards. In addition, on the LTV site, adjacent to the tailings, the SDEIS has documented that Area of Concern #8 has a plume of pollution propagating through fractures. (SDEIS, p. 4-12). Another problem is the lack of analysis of tailings seepage to residential wells. The SDEIS reports that there are 27 residential wells downstream of the tailings basin, before the Embarrass River. Some of these drinking water wells already have high levels of toxic metals (SDEIS chapter 4, page 403-411). PolyMet's tailings pile would seep high levels of manganese and lead into groundwater. At its northern edge, lead in PolyMet tailings basin seeps would be more than 5 times as high as existing conditions. Manganese, already far above MN's health risk limit at the LTV tailings basin would increase by 45 percent. This is in the SDEIS at page 169 of Chapter 5- We all know that lead in drinking water causes brain damage. The MN Department of Health set a limit on manganese in drinking water because it causes neurological damage and reduces IQ in children. The SDEIS must anticipate that tailings contaminants will propagate through fractures and clearly disclose the impacts of leaching through fractures on surface and groundwater quality. The SDEIS must also be redone to analyze potential impacts of tailings basin seeps to groundwater on residential wells. Mercury Mercury is a big concern for me. I am also concerned about sulfates being released from the mine site and impacting the already impaired wild rice waters and fish in the St Louis River. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't include the information it should on how much mercury would be released into surface waters from mine pits, waste rock, draining piles of peat and polluted swamps. See for yourself at pages 5-107, 5-109 and 5-129- Mercury isn't even listed. PolyMet also doesn't tell us how much mercury pollution will be seeping out of the PolyMet tailings into surficial waters flowpaths right next to the huge n

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melinda Suelflow

43590

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health and the environment. I work for the Organic Consumers Association and I live in Finland, MN, not too many miles away from the proposed mine site. I also harvest wild rice, it is a staple of my diet. The Organic Consumers Association has over 10,000 supporters in Minnesota who care about access to clean drinking water and safe, healthy and sustainable food. Wild rice and fish are common dietary staples in northern Minnesota. Fractures and Seepage The PolyMet tailings basin is proposed to be unlined, yet the SDEIS doesn't include the possibility that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants. This is an astonishing omission. Here in Finland we are finding out that pollutants from an old Air Base are being transported through fractures in the bedrock downhill from the Base site and into our community. It is also well known that fractures beneath tailings basins can transport pollutants. For example, in the Chevron MolyCorp Superfund remediation, the EPA concluded, "the pathway for contaminant migration is the leaching of tailings seepage downward from the tailing facility to ground water that migrates through fractures to surface water." It is wrong to assume that the PolyMet tailings site has no potential to transport pollution through fractures. Existing tailings seepage already exceeds groundwater standards. In addition, on the LTV site, adjacent to the tailings, the SDEIS has documented that Area of Concern #8 has a plume of pollution propagating through fractures. (SDEIS, p. 4-12). Another problem is the lack of analysis of tailings seepage to residential wells. The SDEIS reports that there are 27 residential wells downstream of the tailings basin, before the Embarrass River. Some of these drinking water wells already have high levels of toxic metals (SDEIS chapter 4, page 403-411). PolyMet's tailings pile would seep high levels of manganese and lead into groundwater. At its northern edge, lead in PolyMet tailings basin seeps would be more than 5 times as high as existing conditions. Manganese, already far above MN's health risk limit at the LTV tailings basin would increase by 45 percent. This is in the SDEIS at page 169 of Chapter 5- We all know that lead in drinking water causes brain damage. The MN Department of Health set a limit on manganese in drinking water because it causes neurological damage and reduces IQ in children. The SDEIS must anticipate that tailings contaminants will propagate through fractures and clearly disclose the impacts of leaching through fractures on surface and groundwater quality. The SDEIS must also be redone to analyze potential impacts of tailings basin seeps to groundwater on residential wells. Mercury Mercury is a big concern for me. I am also concerned about sulfates being released from the mine site and impacting the already impaired wild rice waters and fish in the St Louis River. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't include the information it should on how much mercury would be released into surface waters from mine pits, waste rock, draining piles of peat and polluted swamps. See for yourself at pages 5-107, 5-109 and 5-129- Mercury isn't even listed. PolyMet also doesn't tell us how much mercury pollution will be seeping out of the PolyMet tailings into surficial waters flowpaths right next to the huge n

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Cathcart

39089

---Original Message--- From: melcathcart@hotmail-com [mailto:melcathcart@hotmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:34 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Melissa Cathcart 3018 38 Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2141

42014

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Melissa Cathcart 3018 38th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-2141

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Cleaver

40415

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Melissa Cleaver 13115 Walnut Lake Road Houston, TX 77065 US

Melissa Engel

42836

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Griffith

16069

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Melissa Harry

52262

Hello, I just realized I missed the end of the comment period. I am a very busy PhD student in Boston who is originally from Northern Minnesota and is returning home to live in Duluth over the summer. I also hope to return permanently once I finish my PhD. My primary concern with the PolyMet sulfide mining is the lack of 100% surety over the longterm environmental and water quality repercussions. What if another historic flood hits the area like what happened to Duluth in 2012- What would happen to water quality then. How do we know what the world will even be like in 100 or 200 years. Sure a few hundred jobs for a few decades would come from this mining, perhaps more if other projects are approved, but the bulk of the money won't go to northern Minnesota. It will go to companies like PolyMet. As far as I can tell, the cost of swapping land with the Superior Natural Forest should take into account the value of the minerals and other resources PolyMet expects to extract. Minnesota truly will be getting the short end of the deal if this project goes through. I am sure my comments will be ignored as I missed the deadline due to my hectic schedule. But if something horrible happens because of sort of mining, the first sulfide mining in Minnesota, and our comments are not considered (including those that made the deadline), I can only imagine the scale of the massive class action lawsuits that could hit not only PolyMet, but the DNR as well. Of course, if that happens it means the worst case scenario and our state's environment will be damaged. Will it be worth it. I don't think so. Find some other way to revive the state's economy. Dump this idea of sulfide mining. Thank you, Melissa Harry, MSW, LCSW Doctoral Student Boston College Graduate School of Social Work 617-393-0229

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Hodnik

18217

My name is Kevin Grotheim, and I'm going cede my time to Melissa Hodnik. My name is Melissa Hodnik, H-O-D-N-I-K, and I currently reside in Minneapolis, but I was born and raised in Aurora, one of the greatest towns on the Iron Range. I'm an environmentalist because I care about sustaining natural beauty and resources of the area and believe that mining can co-exist in that world. I also support the PolyMet project. For 18 years, I was able to grow up in a town filled with those who relish the outdoor opportunities that Northern Minnesota has to offer. From the biking trails to the picturesque lakes, the choices were endless. An area full of many different types of resources that we could share with one another. Right alongside those wonders of nature beats the heart of the Iron Range and another human resource, mining. Drive into any one of the small towns that dot the landscape and can see its footprints. From the skyline in Virginia to the railroad tracks running down to Lake Superior, our region is proud to have depended on the resources in the ground to sustain the area. Over time, the landscape has changed. This is because of the progress we've made working together to use the minerals we've been blessed with. But also to give back to an area that has been our way of life for over 100 years. For example, right next to Minntac, a premiere producer of pellets used for steel, are windmills dotting the horizon. It strikes a chord with me that the two can share the same plot of land and serve as just one piece of proof that we are in the business of sustaining, a reminder of our past and the telltale signs of our future. This is just one small example of the high standards the Iron Range sets for itself, not wanting to sacrifice its beauty for industry. A lot has been said about PolyMet over the course of eight years, some good and some bad. But what I feel makes this project different than other mining projects of the past is the disclosure piece. We live in state that requires the in-depth review of environmental impact. While it may be true that our ancestry did not have the technology to fully understand the impact of what they were doing, in contrast, we do. Everything written in the SDEIS statement that we are viewing today is based off of true science and longitudinal studies by respected government regulators, alongside of the PolyMet team. In short, they have collaborated with experts to ensure that every angle is tested and can be bumped up alongside any governmental standard of today. Even better, this is not a new site proposed for use. This will be a recycling of a piece of our past rebuilt to a higher standard. The idea has always been to do the right thing and to bring jobs to an area which desperately needs them. In closing, I want to stress that I am in full support of the PolyMet project. This means jobs for the many communities that are starved for work, done the right way, and an opportunity for the Iron Range to share the legacy that the Twin Cities offers so many of us today. I'm a firm believer that we can balance the good intentions of both sides and make this a reality and do so now. To say that those of us in support of this project do not care about what happens in our backyards is not only false but insulting. I support PolyMet, not an all-or-nothing proposition but the best chance for sustainable future here in Minnesota. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Jansen

38222

Ms Lisa Fay, I am concerned that the DNR role in this process seems to be one of promoting mining, and that promoting environmental protection is secondary. Somehow this seems backwards. At the very least, the DNR (especially the Division of Ecological and Water Resources) should take a neutral stance. Comments by those in charge of the EIS to the effect of 'it is our role to work with PolyMet to help them through the process' leave one with the notion that DNR has already decided that this mining project is a good thing and that it is in the best interest of the state to see that it happens. Whether one is for or against this project, they should question how the DNR has defined its role. I am concerned with the lack of a defined and dedicated funding source (one that is set up by the mining company, and not affected by future financial hardships the company may experience) for the treatment of sulfate- and other pollutant-laden wastewater / runoff from the mining operation. Leaving this major detail for the permitting process seems like a young couple deciding to have children but waiting until a few months after their child is born to figure out how/if they can financially afford to raise a family. The welfare analogy comes to mind here- will the public be left to pick up the tab for a decision made without proper planning and financial preparation. I am also concerned about wetland loss and other destruction of natural habitat. These seem to be viewed as expendable when it comes to mining. The natural forests and wetlands that will be destroyed are not replaceable. We can try to plant something that looks like what we destroyed, but it is always a poor substitute at best, at worst a sterile biological desert or weed-infested barrens. (Nonnative and potentially invasive plants are already turning up at many of the drill core test sites that are increasingly scattered through the forests of this part of the state.) I understand that if the decision is made to go forward with this mining project that natural habitats will have to be destroyed. I could better accept this fact if their true value was represented in the cost side of the mining equation. Finally, I am concerned that we too easily buy into assurances from the mining industry that things like this can be done in an environmentally friendly manner. There has never been a mine that has not polluted, nor a oil field that has not polluted despite the same sort of environmental assurances. If we weigh all the options and still decide to move ahead with this project, we owe it to our children to put the proper safeguards in place so that environmental accidents do not happen, or more likely, can be quickly and safely dealt with when they inevitably do occur. Regulation and oversight will be key here, and again not something that should be left to the permitting process. I think we need to step back and ask ourselves- is this really the right project at the right time. Is this as good a proposal as the people of Minnesota can expect, or more aptly- as we deserve. Is leaving the minerals in the ground at this time a better option, one that assures a better environmental outcome. Leaving the minerals in the ground now is not a defacto moratorium on this type of mining; it may actually be the best way to keep our future options open, both environmentally, and economically. Thank you for your consideration. M. D. Jansen-Lee 1026 Sunset Ridge Rd St Cloud, MN 56303

Melissa Orr

41628

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Melissa Orr Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melissa Roach

15887

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. . Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. Sincerely yours, Melissa Roach 1544 hwy 5 Cook, MN 55723

Melissa Weisser

57274

The decision to mine – pollute – this region or any other, belong to the PEOPLE who live and work in the region. My livelihood depends on the tourist trade and natural assets that make our region unique. Keep Polymet out or I will use my vote and influence others to vote against you. Melissa Weisser 4102 Gilliat Street Duluth, MN

Melody Exsted

36792

Corey Exsted 57914 highway 23 sandstone MN 55072 320 216-5530 On Sunday, March 2, 2014 10:01 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

36793

Lisa, We are the property owners just south of the current mine sit off of 117- We were not notified so we didn't get to attend any of the meetings. We bought this property about a year ago Corey a Exsted and Melody j Exsted. We have many concerns, we bought 165 acres for hunting, fishing, recreational use and our retirement. From what we can tell our land is in or very close to the new mine site. Our one whole side runs along the partridge river. We don't know what we need to do. Our concerns are about the wild life and water quality of the river and ground water if and when something goes wrong our land will be useless and not worth anything. We are one of the first properties down river if something goes wrong. When this mine starts up, their will be no one who will want to buy this land, no one will want to take the risk. I bought this land because I have seen moose, wolves, deer, grouse, bobcats and lots of other animals that cant be fixed if some of the toxins get out. They are just dead. Not to many of us would take the chance and drink the water that is coming off the mine site, but these animals will be forced to. I realize this would be great for the community and the state, but with all the protection around the nuclear plants their are still accidents. I don't think its worth the potential cost for just 20 years of gain. What happens when oops we were wrong and the toxins do leach out of these tailings even under water it just takes 50 or 100 years. If this mine starts I will be forced to move because i can't take that risk. It also will be very hard to get fair price for land. Please let us know what we can do, if anything. Thank you Corey and Melody Exsted

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melody Tilton

16300

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Melody Tilton 7916 64th Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

49929

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Melody Tilton 7916 64th Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Melva Schueller 58055

No mines - I prefer the clean BWCA and rivers! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Melvin Giles 42021

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Melvin Giles St Paul, Minnesota _____ There are now 2369 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to National Audubon Society by clicking here: [HYPERLINK "http://www.change.org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition"](http://www.change.org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition)

http://www.change.org/petitions/say-no-to-oozing-toxins-in-minnesota-s-waters/responses/new.response=f09da092d89bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=signature_on_sponsored_petition
[http://email.changemail-org/wf/open.upn=aGGv9wQ398j6-2FWVT4grdXbWUo0w-2FupjjjD-2Beylkg5XeInLuCEKc3fzdho8GXjxxiplFn6SybU80HWYOLHct2MhHcRv7ksg-2F-2Bt-2BBQdFBpjLzL5JRAAFAGBDXf4-2B-2Fcrihks7B3gqnED5CAK9mqMH5xhyKcaoqOkAXDgAaZgS8qQD70RcSvdic-2FiFyi-2FH0So657lhX0FudxTI9dJKpLWM4oWHCVkJe6RV1BQXlvMtPztdR2TXLjy1m-2B27EpyRIvyV2R6GYgkaSTQcEM3jBhgQXTVcOSD8-2FSGGNalfvIUyMVCVqnlfpHakVnbHQBxjYON-2FP4](http://api.mixpanel.com/track.data=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1andimg=1)

Melvyn Magree 54109

I've already sent comments questioning the long term impact of this project. Alan Hadnick has a conflict of interest as a member of PolyMet's board. This card came from Allele. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mercy myers

14526

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms mercy myers 1880 Grand Ave Apt 206 Saint Paul, MN 55105-1458 (612) 363-5346

40664

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms mercy myers 1880 grand ave 206 206 St paul, MN 55105 (612) 363-5346

42434

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, WE DON'T NEED PROFITS FROM POLLUTERS LIKE YOU SLIME OFF I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms mercy myers 1880 grand ave 206 206 St paul, MN 55105 (612) 363-5346

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Meredith Kolar

30448

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have spent time studying the wildlife and habitats of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and it is one of the few true wilderness areas of its type left. Its natural resources are crucial to the balance of the entire region, a natural balance which affects us humans, too. This precious wilderness area especially means so much to those of us who have spent time in it and observed its natural riches. I would be devastated to see any of this area be poisoned and destroyed by corporate interests. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Meredith Kolar 20450 Crooked Rd Butler, OH 44822-9488

Meredith Lorig

44882

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It is putting many Minnesotans at risk for years to come. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. As a fisher who frequently catches and eats walleye the PolyMet sulfide mine plan is of concern. The proposed waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. All of these are a concern especially the toxic metals and the effect bioaccumulation could have in people. One of my concerns is that the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." I don't know how it would be feasible to keep water clean from seeping for that long. I ask that you investigate further the PolyMet SDEIS and look closely at permits for the waste water discharge. I ask that written into the permit is that water quality is held to Minnesota standards. That if the water quality does not meet standards that the mining has to stop until the water quality meets state standards. I ask that penalties for permit violations are not just financial but are mandated to be fixed. I am proud to come from the land of 10,000 lakes and hope the lakes can be used for centuries for fishing walleye. Thank you for listening, Meredith Lorig 5613 Interlachen circle Edina, MN 55436

Meredith Sommers

16492

February 19, 2014 In the 1960s, I was involved in a study of Taconite mining in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota. The resulting report believed that this mining could be done without extensive harm to the land and water. We believed that the company, Minntac, and the DNR would oversee water quality standards. We believed that hundreds of people would be employed for decades and their quality of life would improve. We were wrong. Open pits remain; tailings have leached toxic heavy metals and sulfuric acid that eventually have reached Lake Superior; drinking water in the area is unsafe; unemployment in the area is still high. Why should we believe that the proposal presented by PolyMet Mining and its financier, Glencore, will be different. Glencore has a record of environmental disasters, plus irresponsible safety standards. PolyMet has no track record of operating mines like the ones proposed in Minnesota. I strongly oppose the proposal for these, and many other reasons. And I have a suggestion to address the need for employment in the Arrowhead region. Instead of mining for copper, nickel and other metals, the state of Minnesota could jump-start a facility for reclaiming and recycling metals from existing electronic devices, rather than sending them to China and Winnipeg. The Arrowhead is a treasure for millions of folks who live and travel there. The pristine nature would be destroyed by the noise, the truck traffic, the dynamite, polluted waters and disrupted land. Tourism, which is a sustainable industry, would be drastically impacted. Please make your decision based upon what is best for all of Minnesota in decades to come. Meredith Sommers 921 Bayless Ave C St Paul, MN 55114

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Meredith Sommers 42827

To Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Re. Copper/Nickel Mining in Minnesota. In the 1960s, I was involved in a study of Taconite mining in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota. The resulting report believed that this mining could be done without extensive harm to the land and water. We believed that the company, Minntac, and the DNR would oversee water quality standards. We believed that hundreds of people would be employed for decades and their quality of life would improve. We were wrong! Open pits remain; tailings have leached toxic heavy metals and sulfuric acid that eventually have reached Lake Superior; drinking water in the area is unsafe: unemployment in the area is still high. Why should we believe that the proposal presented by PolyMet Mining and its financier, Glencore, will be different? Glencore has a record of environmental disasters, plus irresponsible safety standards. Poly Met has no track record of operating mines like the ones proposed in Minnesota. I strongly oppose the proposal for these, and many other reasons. And I have a suggestion to address the need for employment in the Arrowhead region. Instead of mining for copper, nickel and other metals, the state of Minnesota could jump-start a facility for reclaiming and recycling metals from existing electronic devices, rather than sending them to China and Winnipeg. The Arrowhead is a treasure for millions of folks who live and travel there. The pristine nature would be destroyed by the noise, the truck traffic, the dynamite, polluted waters and disrupted land. Tourism, which is a sustainable industry, would be drastically impacted. Please make your decision based upon what is best for all of Minnesota in decades to come. Meredith Sommers 921 Bayless Ave. C St Pau, MN 55114

Merle G and Mary C Wovcha 54657

See attachment

Merv & Suzanne- Joy Curran 39298

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: After listening to debate on this issue on TPT, reading and discussing this in our faith-based community, and listening to many of those who live in that area of the state, we wish to send a comment which we hope will be seriously considered. Northern Minnesota is the site of 3 major watersheds. We and many states below us need fresh clean water. Northern Minnesota is NOT the area in which to provide mining rights to an outside corporation that cannot possibly provide adequate stewardship for the water and environment in this area. We do think jobs are important and we will support jobs in Northern Minnesota that are sustainable to all life in that area. We urge Minnesota to take leadership in promoting sustainable industry. This should not include copper-nickel mining in Northern Minnesota. Thank you for taking comments. Mervyn and Joy Curran 5146 Lonsdale Blvd. Webster, MN 55088

Mettameyer 44533

I am opposed to Polymet's plan for pollution management. The very idea that they can be responsible and held accountable for centuries into the future is crazy. Minnesotans will bear the practical and ongoing financial costs of this venture, and it's a bad deal for the environment and the taxpayers. Sincerely, Margaret Etta Meyer 225 E 9th St Unit 106 St Paul, MN. 55101 651-222-7859

MGK612 . 41647

To whoever is destroying Minnesota's future, Do not, DO NOT, allow PolyMet to mine. You KNOW it will destroy the environment for many, MANY years to come. I am completely against it. Archibald Kelley Benham IV Minneapolis, MN Full of disgust, Archie

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mia schillace nelson

43958

To whom it may concern, which in my opinion is the entire state of Minnesota and its future citizens. I have carefully examined the available evidence both for and against the Polymet proposal for a copper sulfide mine in Northeastern Minnesota. It is my opinion that at this time this project should absolutely not go forward. We as a state are not in a good position to trust that Polymet and its associates will be able to provide us with the environmental and financial assurances that we absolutely need to have before a permit to Mine is granted. One question that has been asked over and over and has gone unanswered is "Please give us an example of this type of mining that has not contaminated the watershed." No one has been able to show an example. Saying that this will be the first copper sulfide mine that won't contaminate the watershed and pollute the air is unacceptable. We have never mined copper in Minnesota and based on the fact that there is currently a global surplus of copper and nickel right now tells me that the risk isn't worth the reward. Particularly when it comes to who will actually capitalize the most on this project if it were to go forward. There is little in this for the state of Minnesota or its workforce. I know people on the range need jobs but this will not change the economy on the range based on the number of jobs it would create. This is also not a typical range project so it is very likely that many of the jobs created wouldn't be filled by locals. It is well known that Polymet has never operated a mine before but their largest shareholder Glencore has with a very bad history of contaminating the communities that it has mined. I think that they will not be able to guarantee 200-500 years of financing for monitoring and treating the water at both the plant and mine sites. The only thing I would consider guaranteed by them is that they will maximize profits for their shareholders, which is the primary mission of any for profit corporation. Jobs will be kept at an absolute minimum. I have yet to see an economic impact statement that wasn't created by the company itself in a best case scenario sensibility. There seem to be a great number of questions that have to be answered before a permit to mine is granted. These questions remain unanswered up to this point and therefore a permit should not be issued. If you can expect technology to change significantly in the years to come than let's wait until technology is advanced enough to do this safely. Copper will undoubtedly be worth more in the future and perhaps we can get a US company to do this so it's better for all of us in terms of economics as well as environmental and public health. These are the most obvious problems within the current SDEIS. "The PolyMet mine plan is riddled with problems that must be fixed: PolyMet would require hundreds of years of expensive treatment of polluted water. PolyMet would destroy thousands of acres of habitat used by threatened moose and lynx. PolyMet's mine plan lacks analysis of human health impacts from mercury and asbestos-like fibers. PolyMet's studies contain inaccurate water data that need to be corrected. There are many more problems with PolyMet's mine plan. All we want is to make sure that any sulfide mines opened in Northern Minnesota are safe, clean, and don't leave taxpayers with a bill. If we don't get this right the first time, the next 17 generations of Minnesotans will have to live with the consequences." The world keeps getting smaller and I think most of us Minnesotans feel that this is in our backyard. I'll ask again to find an example of this type of mining that hasn't contaminated the watershed. It's a simple question that no one has been able to provide an answer to. The risk must not outweigh the reward. Right now it's not worth it. We need absolute guarantees that they will finance and clean up the mess that this WILL create. In the not too distant future good, clean water will

Micah Elder

30814

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. At some point, we as a people (Americans) have to stop thinking about the short term and start thinking long term, ie, what type of future environment are we leaving for our children and their children. Profit has got to take a back seat some time, and those who argue only for profit are (of course) arguing for their own profit and no one else's. Therefore, we should be suspicious of their statements. As such, I urge you to protect the environment. I have spent some time in Lake Superior and I have always wanted to go to the Boundary Waters. But not if the water is poisoned. Micah Sincerely, Micah Elder 3716 Latimore Rd Shaker Heights, OH 44122-5025 (216) 371-3846

Michael

46936

I am for this project. The state has mined extensively in this area for a hundred years. We have learned lots about mitigation and it seems, in this case there is a good plan for control of pollution. The country needs these metals. A woman compared this to dumping tailings in lake superior. That is absurd. I live in Grand Rapids and have hunting land north of Orr. If I thought this project would ruin the area I'd be against it. Michael N. Felix 38664 Co Rd 19, PO 642 Grand Rapids MN 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Alexander

39985

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Michael Alexander 78 10th St E Saint Paul, MN 55101-2247

Michael Ander

28920

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Working as an environmental scientist for over 40 years, I have first-hand experience on the creation and effects of acid mine drainage. Therefore, I anticipate the environmental impacts created by the proposed PolyMet Mining project will be similar and, therefore, unacceptable. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The hydrology of this region is a complex and interconnected system of surface and groundwater that cannot help but be impacted by the proposed mine. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sincerely, Michael Ander 218 Sharon Dr Sleepy Hollow, IL 60118-1719 (847) 428-1647

Michael Anderson

5971

Dear Ms Fay, I came here from Alaska in 1975- Recently, the Environmental Protection Agency release a very critical assessment of the proposed Pebble mine, a copper sulphide mine, in the pristine Bristol Bay watershed area. It found that such mining was incompatible with the watershed and posed unacceptable risks for contamination of water and destruction of watershed habitat for fish, especially salmon. I am very familiar with Bristol Bay and it's lands and, other than the salmon, I see little difference between the pristine beauty of the area and the Minnesota BWCA and the Canadian Quetico. In addition, the hydrology of the watershed in the Minnesota Iron Range is remarkably vulnerable to the same kind of perpetual pollution described in the Pebble Mine EPA report. Please review the Pebble Mine study and consider it and it's findings as you look at sulphide mining in Minnesota. Michael Anderson 2554 Deer Path Red Wing, MN 55066

41892

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michael Anderson Shoreview, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Asuma 42516

See attachment

Michael Barrett 48153

See attachment

54781

See attachment

54848

See attachment

Michael Beauchaine 42582

See attachment

Michael Berglund 38742

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. My entire life I've enjoyed the pristine wilderness of the BWCA. Please do not allow the PolyMet mine to proceed. It is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Michael Berglund 18410 Kirk Ave N Marine ON Saint Croix, MN 55047-9618 (651) 295-4607

Michael Booth 38754

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Michael Booth 4413 Nokomis Ave Minneapolis, MN 55406-3719 (612) 483-9669

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Broton

47845

I have reviewed and entirely agree with the concerns and sentiments of the letter from Dr Youmans. I would reiterate the point that consumption of fish is already to be limited, especially to pregnant women and children. For many people in the state including our most low income populations, this can be a healthy supplement to the diet. Vascular diseases are still the number one preventable cause of chronic disease and death in the state and fish are our native low saturated fat nutrient source of meat. Thank you for your work on the matter. Sincerely, Michael Broton, MD, Caq Sports Medicine 569 36 1/2 ave Minneapolis, MN 55418

Begin forwarded message: From: william youmans <[HYPERLINK "mailto:youma001@umn.edu"youma001@umn.edu](mailto:youma001@umn.edu)> Date: March 12, 2014 at 10:05:35 PM CDT To: Mike Broton <[HYPERLINK "mailto:michaelbroton@gmail-com"michaelbroton@gmail-com](mailto:michaelbroton@gmail-com)>, [HYPERLINK "mailto:holly.stenzel@northmemorial-com"holly.stenzel@northmemorial-com](mailto:holly.stenzel@northmemorial-com), [HYPERLINK "mailto:kristen.helvig@northmemorial-com"kristen.helvig@northmemorial-com](mailto:kristen.helvig@northmemorial-com) Subject: Sign and send with your own signature if you agree

Begin forwarded message: From: william youmans <[HYPERLINK "mailto:youma001@umn.edu"youma001@umn.edu](mailto:youma001@umn.edu)> Subject: Concerns about the PolyMet NorthMet Statement Date: March 12, 2014 at 3:30:13 PM CDT To: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) Dear Ms Fay and Mr Westlake: MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“PolyMet SDEIS”) fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota’s Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Brouillette

39962

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Michael Buelow

38796

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. Their dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks to us and should not be allowed. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Very Sincerely, R. Michael Buelow 651-260-5528 1645 Palace Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105 Sincerely, Mr Michael Buelow 1645 Palace Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2136 (651) 260-5528

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Caldwell

42001

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michael Caldwell St Paul, Minnesota

Michael Carpenter

16037

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Chesla

38870

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael D. Anderson

37676

Please forward his to the Commissioner and anyone working on the issue at DNR. Thank you. Sent from my iPad Begin forwarded message: From: "Michael D. Anderson" Date: March 1, 2014 at 8:28:57 AM CST To: "HYPERLINK "mailto:dnr.updates@updates.mndnr.gov"dnr.updates@updates.mndnr.gov" Subject: Re: PolyMet Supplemental Draft EIS comment period deadline To be very candid, this neither surprises me nor does it show respect for the citizens of Minnesota. The issue was never about the need for the DNR to meet it's prescribed timeline. It was always about citizens, citizens who want to provide more information and even if the information appears to to be what you have heard before, you would have heard more citizens views. Would 60 more days have disrupted your timeline. No. Your unresponsiveness is poor environmental science and even worse government. But it doesn't really matter. Truly. And do you know why. Because most of us opposed to sulfide mining believe that the DNR Commissioner operates on the basis of serving constituencies and the constituency he wants to serve in this case is mining interests. Period. We've never had much faith in our own DNR on this matter and have always assumed the decision to allow mining had already been made. We all just going through the motions. The recourse for those who oppose this disastrous form of mining in our northern watershed is the EPA and the Federal Courts. What a disgrace for the State of Minnesota. What a disgrace for the DNR. Please forward this to the Commissioner. Thank you. Sent from my iPad On Feb 27, 2014, at 2:41 PM, "MN Department of Natural Resources" wrote: HYPERLINK "http://links-govdelivery-com:80/track.type=clickandenid=ZWFzPTEmbWFpbGluZ2lkPTIwMTQwMjI3LjI5NDUwMDAxJm1lc3NhZ2VpZD1NREItUFJELUJVTTC0yMDE0MDIyNy4yOTQ1MDAwMSZkYXRhYmFzZWlkPTEwMDEmc2VyaWFsPTE2OTA2NjQ5JmVtYWlsaWQ9bWRhcmFuZ2VyOEBnbWFpbC5jb20mdXNlcmkPW1kYXJhbmdlcljhaZ21haWwuY29tJmZsPSZleHRyYT1NdWx0aXZhcmlhdGVJZD0mJiY=andandand100andandandhttp://www.mndnr.gov"Minnesota Department of Natural Resources header DNR NEWS – FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE Feb. 27, 2014 Comment period for copper-nickel mine Supplemental Draft EIS closes March 13 The 90-day public comment period for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) will end March 13, according to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. So far, the agency has received more than 19,000 comments. While the co-lead agencies – the DNR, the US Army Corps of Engineers and the US Forest Service – received and carefully considered requests to extend the comment period, the deadline will not be extended. The requests received did not include any substantive arguments or rationales that were not already fully considered in the design of the original public comment period. The co-lead agencies appreciate the high level of public interest in the SDEIS and have made efforts to ensure the public has had ample opportunity to review and comment on the document. Those measures include a comment period that is twice as long as required, three public meetings and supplemental materials such as videos and fact sheets. The SDEIS provides an analysis of the environmental effects of PolyMet Mining Inc.'s proposed NorthMet project. The copper-nickel mine would be located in northeastern Minnesota, near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt. Public input on the SDEIS is a critical component to informing governmental decision makers about potential environmental consequences of the proposed mining project and associated land exchange. The co-lead agencies encourage the public to continue to provide comments until the deadline on March 13- Email comments can be submitted to HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us. Email submissions should include a full name and legal mailing address. Written comments may also be submitted to: Lisa Fay, EIS project manager, DNR Ecological and Water Resources Division, Environment

Michael D. McNally

40448

Attached please find a word document, together with an email text version below, of my comments on the Northmet SDEIS. I write with some expertise in NEPA review procedures, so you won't find mere rant. Thanks, Michael McNally - Michael D. McNally Professor Religion Department Carleton College Northfield, MN 55057 TEXT ALSO HERE:

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Dahl

18372

(Spoke foreign language.) I will speak English. My name is Michael Dahl, spelled D-A-H-L. I come from (inaudible). I am not Slovenian. My relatives have been here by far longer than anybody in this room. I'm standing up here on behalf of my people as a whole because of a number of things. Okay. Our family and our people have rights to these lands for thousands of years, not for generations. Thousands. These same lakes, these same rivers, these same streams, the same strains of rice we have raised here. My brother and I rice this area. As a people on average our families will finish upwards of 300 pounds of finished rice a year with an annual income to each household of upwards of anywhere to 2 to \$10,000. There are still people that make a living off of wild rice. As a people we came to this area and have been here for thousands of years. The same rice. The Sturgeon have already left this area once due to contamination and over fishing by non-native people. The moose are also becoming more and more rare. We do not want to see history repeat itself. The risk is unmeasurable. Science cannot prove the risk. Science does not know what we know. Our teachings and our legends told us for thousands of years any time we eat fish to eat it with a serving of wild rice and/or a serving of berries. Science comes along and proves the nutritional factors of rice and berries cancels the mercury in fish. Thus science has caught up to us and proven us right. We do not want to see that happen again. I have to refer to my notes. This is good. We are asking science not to wait to catch up to us again and prove us right again. For the first time in history pay respect and listen to the knowledge of this land and its qualities by its original indigenous inhabitants. This is ours. We managed it for thousands of years. The potential profits of mining to be made by few and enjoyed by few will never outweigh the proven risks to unmeasurable amounts of people, water, plants, and animals. Thank you.

Michael Donais

41743

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Doyle

42038

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michael Doyle Bagley, Minnesota

Michael Dunn

16773

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michael Dunn 7330 Butterscotch Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55346

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Dunn

50124

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Michael Dunn 7330 Butterscotch Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55346

Michael E Kaszynski

10238

We own property in St Louis County at 8709 S. Strand Lake Road, Cotton, MN. We are completely and utterly opposed to the proposed mining operation. It is too close to the Cloquet valley and huge tracts of wetlands. We think the project would eventually pollute the entire region. Perhaps not in our lifetime but eventually when the tailings containment systems fail and the company responsible is long gone. Mining operations in general never clean up the mess that they leave in their wake. It is not economically feasible to do so. The iron range itself is an unsightly mess and we don't need another environmental catastrophe for hundreds of years in the future for the sake of a few jobs. The BWCA area is a jewel that should be preserved for future generations - not exploited for the gains of a few. We are completely opposed to the project. Sincerely, Michael and Kerrill Kaszynski 13533 6th Street N. West Lakeland Twp, MN, 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Fisch

17715

Feb 15, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. The revelations about Polymet just keep getting worse. Please do not open up the territory to mining for Polymet or any other company. There is no such thing as technology without accidents. Where there are cars, there are car accidents, where there are planes, there are plane accidents and so on. This is not to say that we should refuse technology. In fact, I've devoted my career to developing sustainable technology. Rather, it is to say that we can't be so naive anymore so as to think that there can be mining without environmental damage. So I ask you, is it worth it. Are a few years of jobs and profits worth hundreds of years of pollution that translates into generations of children who will never know what its like to have a big trout or walleye on their fishing line and who will never know what its like to taste one of those fish or to drink directly from the lakes of the BWCA. Is it worth it. Sincerely Michael Fisch Assistant Professor, Anthropology University of Chicago Haskell M-134 1126 E. 59th St Chicago, Il 60637 Tel: 773 702 2128 mail: mfisch@uchicago-edu Sincerely, Dr Michael Fisch 1126 E 59th St Chicago, IL 60637-1580 (773) 702-2128

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Foss

13943

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

michael fritsche

46952

I want to voice my opposition to the mine. I think it is a terrible idea. We all can look at what happens to mines eventually, they contaminate the area around it. Our forefathers were smart enough to protect this area from ourselves lets not undo the good they have done for our children's sake. I hope that my great great grand kids can enjoy the same BWCA that I am able to. Do the right thing. Vote this mine down. Thank you

Michael Gallagher

5947

We know you must be receiving thousands of comments on this controversial issue, so we will make this short. It is unbelievable to us that anyone would want to risk our precious north woods, including the BWCA, and the greatest lake in the world, Lake Superior, to the incredible dangers this mining operation would present. A mining operation that would require centuries of water clean up should be enough of a deterrent by itself without even mentioning the open pit mine scar that would be left behind for millennia. This is another Superfund site just waiting to happen. What happens when PolyMet goes bankrupt and leaves behind a unfathomable mess which can NEVER be cleaned-up. How would you go about cleaning Lake Superior, or "fixing" the BWCA. It cannot be done. Ever. Impossible. Conclusion: No Mine. Mike Gallagher Linda Cullen 530 Deer Ridge Lane S, Maplewood MN 55119

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Garbisch 54143

No way! 20 years of jobs for 200 years of on-going monitoring and remediation? This is crazy. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Michael Gorman 29636

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I oppose the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project. This scheme endangers natural resources and public health in northern Minnesota and the Lake Superior region. My homeland. The risks it poses to water quality, habitat, and wildlife (including populations of lynx and Moose as well as spawning grounds for several species of fish) are simply too great. Everywhere sulfide ore mining has taken place has suffered from Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination. Sulfide mining, therefore, poses a grave threat to Lake Superior and the Boundary Water Canoe Area as well as the wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams surrounding (and feeding into) these natural wonders. The disastrous consequences of open pit sulfide mining outweigh all potential benefits. I vehemently oppose any Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land for this future environmental catastrophe. The health of our citizens, our wildlife, and our water are too precious to jeopardize. Sincerely, Michael Gorman 121 E Bayfield St Washburn, WI 54891-1132

Michael Hamilton 42531

See attachment

Michael Hentley 3237

---Original Message--- From: randall.doneen@dnr.state.mn.us [mailto:randall.doneen@dnr.state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:57 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR)
Subject: This E-mail was sent from "RNPF60159" (Aficio MP C2050). Scan Date: 12-17-2013 13:57:10 (-0600) Queries to: randall.doneen@dnr.state.mn.us

Michael Herman 38608

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Minnesota is a state that prides itself on being healthy and environmentally conscious. We value our outdoor experiences and wish to preserve our excellent environment and water quality for future generations. Mining operations that are so destructive and have negative impacts for hundreds of years have no place here. Severe pollution and groundwater contamination along with environmental destruction should not be allowed to go forwaRd In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Michael Herman 2812 Devon LN NE Rochester, MN 55906

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Hostetler

4642

My name is Michael Hostetler. I live at 209 Fairview Avenue South in St Paul, MN 55105- I am a proponent of the mining projects in northern Minnesota. I believe this project will create much needed jobs in the region, provide tax revenues for the state, bring investment dollars into the state, and it will provide opportunities for educated young people to find fulfilling, challenging employment in MN - so they decide to stay and raise their families here rather than move away. This is the single, greatest economic opportunity we will see in our lifetime to help our children prepare for Minnesota's future. I was fortunate enough to benefit from a similar economic situation over the last 20 years working in the medical device industry, which has been a tremendous benefit for the state and its residents. The mining projects will have a similar economic effect for the people of this great state. However, if the investment is not made in the mining projects, many will be forced to leave and find work elsewhere (eg, North Dakota, Texas, Florida), and many more will follow when the state turns to them for new tax revenues. Am I concerned about the environmental impact. Absolutely. My wife, four children, and I spend every summer vacation in northern MN enjoying its beauty. It is where we plan to live when we retire. I also studied at the University of Minnesota's Biological Station while attending college at the "U" and can appreciate the concerns many have with mining. But this is 2014, not 1970- We now have significantly tighter environmental controls. We have government oversight and watchdog groups. We also have an extensive, detailed SDEIS and countless precautions proposed such as employing reverse osmosis technology and advanced emission-control devices on mining equipment. So based on the documentation in the SDEIS and the commitments made by PolyMet, I am confident that impacts to the air, water or land will be minimal, if any, so my family and their families will be able to enjoy Minnesota's beauty well into the future. I am very pleased, as others should be, to see such a competent team leading this project to ensure Minnesota's environmental future. I congratulate and thank all those involved in producing such a thorough and comprehensive report. Respectfully, Michael Hostetler

Michael Hughes

43502

Please do not move forward with the proposed PolyMet mine in northern Minnesota. It is a bad bet to think the state will win in this deal when weighing the short-term revenues against the big and most likely high, long-term costs to the state. The EIR statistical model used to determine its environmental impact admittedly (per its staff drafters) does not take into account the less-frequent but certainly occurring devastating scenarios. It is a sham. All of the draft EIR's models only contemplate the most likely environmental impacts and not the less frequently occurring events (but it should include the more remote events which will occur in the longer time periods during which the project's risks will still be present). I hope we have learned from recent environmental disasters that we need to consider the impact of the worst possible outcomes, such as industry's assurance that "never-in-a-million-years" could there be leaching of pollutants into the groundwater from the Alberta Sands tailings ponds in Canada, and the discharge of toxic chemicals into the River in West Virginia (requiring the National Guard to truck bottled water to residents and restaurants for drinking and bathing). The probable scenarios do not account for less frequent but certainly occurring events, such as Duluth's recent 500-year flood. The holding ponds and mining and mitigation plans in the PolyMet proposal do not adequately protect against the effects of infrequent but certainly occurring events. Please do not trade short-term gains for long-term costs. Do not exchange public land for damaged quality of life of life in the state's future. Thank you. Sincerely, Michael Hughes Burntside Lake and Stillwater, Minnesota resident

Michael J Husnik

3064

Sirs, This is a very important cross road for our economy in Minnesota. I am confident that by going through all of the rigorous testing and analyticals to protect our environment these kinds of new protections for water and air will be more than sufficient to protect the lands under proposed mining companies sites. Let the process proceed to the final stages and now pass the final permits to get the projects going. Michael J Husnik Stacy, Minnesota

Michael J Kieffer

54802

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Jordan

7408

DNR Personnel, I am a biologist from the University of California, Davis. My wife and I have lived on Birch Lake, between Ely and Babbitt, for the past 14 years. I am writing to express my concern regarding the PolyMet proposal. After reviewing the history of sulfide mining and the PolyMet proposal specifically, my question is this : can the DNR and the state of Minnesota state unequivocally that our lakes, rivers and wildlife will not be harmed by this short sighted business proposition. The answer is clearly no. Since taconite mining and its tailings involved relatively inert substances, the mining process represented virtually no risk to our environment. By contrast, with sulfide mining the chemical processes are not inert, they are very chemically reactive and very harmful to our watershed. The supporters of the sulfide mines are attempting to equate taconite and sulfide mining as a means of placating and fooling the public. The DNR must use rigorous scientific reviews to analyze this proposal. The DNR must, first and foremost, protect our environment. The benefit to risk ratio of this proposal, minimal jobs and deleterious environmental impact, does not justify approval of this mining process in Minnesota. We have an obligation to protect our lakes and not implement a plan which requires a 500 year clean up due to the polluting hazards involved with the Polymet proposal. Our arrogance in thinking current technology will prevent environmental damage is foolish. We have made that claim, historically, only to realize our inability to prevent certain hazards. We cannot risk our lakes by allowing sulfide mining in Minnesota. Sincerely, Michael Jordan 218-827-8193 "Chance favors the prepared mind" Louis Pasteur

Michael Kahn

12453

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, This mine proposal is a shamefully shortsighted, terrible idea. Protecting our environment, as well as the massive tourism industry that thrives because of the boundary waters shouldn't be jeopardized. As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National ForeSt More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Michael Kahn 1747 Columbus Ave Duluth, MN 55803-2517

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Killian

39015

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Michael Kinzer

5988

The proposed copper-nickel mining and processing proposals by Polymet (to be followed by others) is a very bad idea and should be rejected completely for the safety of all Minnesota citizens and our descendants. I own a home in Minneapolis, and a cabin in Lutsen. I travel to the north woods with my family many times per year. We love to canoe in the BWCA and surrounding lakes and parks. We hike, fish, ski, and watch nature. I would not feel safe doing this if the Polymet proposal is approved in any form. I would blame the State of Minnesota for allowing such a catastrophe to occur. You might think I am just being overly concerned. I am not, I assure you. In my previous career, I was a construction lawyer for many many years. As part of my work, I represented contractors who performed work on these kinds of mines in Colorado. One such mine was the Climax Molybdenum Mine in Climax Colorado. Your staff should visit this site. I hAve Visit the leach ponds, where cocktails of arsenic, cyanide, acids and other disastrous chemicals still leak into the local watershed. Please do not pretend Polymet, or any of the other businesses that would temporarily benefit from this mine have any ANY intention (or capacity) to responsibly clean up the mess after they have created it. They won't. They probably can't. Our descendants will live for hundreds and yes, even thousands of years with this sickening, festering, leaching, ugly, dangerous mess in our most pristine lands. How many hundreds or thousands of lakes and streams are you willing to destroy in order to create a few hundred jobs for a decade or two. In 50 years, when Polymet and all the others are long gone, either bankrupt, merged, swallowed up, or just mining elsewhere, and we are left with the sinking leaching pools of filthy nasty chemicals, who will remember the small bump in economic activity. No one. They will remember though that you let this happen. They will. This is not New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada. This is northern Minnesota. The environment is far too fragile. Please reject this for all of us, and our children. Thanks, Michael Kinzer 4249 27th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55406 and 180 Caribou Trail Lutsen, MN 55612

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Kohout

39800

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, MICHAEL KOHOUT 8205 Able St NE Spring Lake Park, MN 55432-2058

43077

Hello- My name is Michael William Kohout, and I live at 4360 Brookside Court #116 Edina, MN 55436- I'm writing to convince the DNR to deny Polymet's mining permit. Given the extremely long maintenance period to protect the area from runoff, as well as the lack of any positive track record by this company in this type of operation the risk seems to high and the reward of only 300 long-term jobs seems too low this operation should be denied or delayed. Until the long term effects of their techniques and technologies can be determined (hopefully elsewhere), any report that attempts to define it is based only on conjecture and should not be considered sufficient enough to be used as the basis of this activity. thanks, Michael W Kohout 4360 Brookside Court #116 Edina, MN 55436

Michael Koppey

18344

Michael Koppe, K-O-P-P-E-Y. I am here to voice my concern regarding the proposed copper-nickel mine in northern Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, the proposed mine data says it is approximately 700 feet. There has been two studies on the plant sites. There have been no studies on the plant sites' subterranean water migration and whether mining elements and contaminants would be carried through these frackings (phonetic) throughout our fresh water aquifers and our systems. This must be a concern because of the natural falls running through Minnesota. The EIS 36, paragraph two, it states, "Storm water runoff will include lead above the acceptable levels." Also in EIS 36, paragraph five, it states that, "The project will increase the (inaudible) time to the Embarrass River." Finally, the EIS 39, paragraph four, it states, "Species will not be affected by all of this infiltration." It is hard to imagine that adding deadly chemicals, like lead and mercury, into the St. Louis watershed will have no effect on our wildlife and our people. We already have a high level of mercury in the St. Louis River. Should we be adding more contaminants without a proper study? We live in Minnesota, the "Land of 10,000 Lakes," more like 13,000, and next to the freshest water, biggest freshwater lake in the world; Lake Superior. I do not want to risk doing damage to these valuable natural resources. EIS 24, paragraph three, it states that this facility will be capped and double-mined for 500 years for toxicity. This is longer than the State of Minnesota has existed. No known studies have shown that a manmade structure can stand for this duration of time, or especially 500 years, especially when we (inaudible) and biodegrade. EIS 24, paragraph three, also states that, "Adaptive measures will be implemented, if necessary, to protect the environment for the long term." This statement acknowledges that the system may fail as designed and is an uncontrolled experiment. That means that we, the taxpayers, will be responsible for the costs of any failure and that our fresh water and all that depend on it will be threatened. You, the members of the DNR, are charged with protecting the natural resources of Minnesota and the people that live here. This SDEIS by PolyMet is inaccurate, ignores many of the critical questions and fails to protect the public interest. Therefore, I ask that you reject this SDEIS. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Koppy 42637

See attachment

42729

See attachment

42784

See attachment

54485

See attachment

54644

See attachment

Michael L Karels 6631

Based on the extensive documentation as outlined in the SDEIS, I am confident impacts to the air, water or land will be minimal, if any. Environmentalists vote every mining project down regardless. Half the time making baseless comments and publications in the newspapers and various other media without providing any real facts about the process. This project is being set up to do it right. Environmentalists want solar and wind energy and various other energy alternatives but don't take into account where the guts of these products come from or what minerals are used. If you are an environmentalist but you are ok with these minerals coming from China or elsewhere but don't care how they extract it they you are a hypocrite. America wasn't built without taking some risk and our advancement as a society will not come without risk. Let's get this project approved and show we know how to mine in this state in a way that is long term environmentally right. Michael L. Karels CFP Vice President - Financial Consultant RBC Wealth Management 612-371-7783 Direct 800-678-3246 Toll Free HYPERLINK "mailto:greg.s.johnson@rbc-com"michael.l.karels@rbc-com RBC Plaza 60 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-4422 612-371-2722 Fax Visit our website: <http://rbfc-com/johnsonkarelsgroup/> HYPERLINK "http://infonet/contents/MarketingPR/Statements/WM1211-004-PDF"Client Support Services Team 800-933-9946 Our client support service areas now have one toll-free number that you can call for help with your cash, banking and online needs. Service hours include evening, Saturdays and during tax season, Sundays. _____ RBC Wealth Management has been ranked "Highest in Investor Satisfaction with Full Service Brokerage Firms" in the J.D. Power and Associates 2013 US Full Service Investor Satisfaction StudySM. We believe this achievement reflects our firm's strong commitment to putting client interests first and carefully managing the wealth that clients entrust to our care. View the HYPERLINK "https://www.rbcwm-usa-com/news/cid-342360-html"press release to learn more. RBC Wealth Management does not accept buy, sell, or cancel orders by email, or any instructions by email that would require your signature. Please visit HYPERLINK "https://www.rbcwealthmanagement-com/usa/legal/cid-277586-html"RBC Wealth Management Email Disclosures for material details about our products and accounts, as well as for other important information. Disclosure information regarding potential conflicts of interest on the part of RBC Capital Markets, LLC in connection with companies that are the subject of any third-party research report included in this email message may be found at HYPERLINK "https://www.rbccm-com/GLDisclosure/PublicWeb/DisclosureLookup.aspx.EntityID=2"Third-Party Research Disclosures. RBC Wealth Management, a division of RBC Capital Markets, LLC, Member NYSE/FINRA/SIPC.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MICHAEL LANDWEHR

15799

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

15800

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr MICHAEL LANDWEHR 541 4th Ave N Foley, MN 56329-8433 (320) 968-7434

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Larmee

32791

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our vacations over the last five years have moved from Lake Michigan due to poor water conditions to Lake Superior. Algae of different types, low water levels and Zebra Mussels have harmed Lake Michigan. It was hard giving up Lake Michigan because we have lake front property on Beaver Island. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Please do not harm Lake Superior and all the waters down flow from the lake. Sincerely, Michael Larmee 19670 Donna St Livonia, MI 48152-1504 (248) 477-1440

Michael Latvala

38422

The depth and breadth of study in relation to the NorthMet project has been well conducted and thorough. I believe that the NorthMet project can be permitted in a way that thoroughly addresses potential environmental impacts while putting a vast, untapped natural resource to greatly beneficial use. This project will provide minerals that are unquestionably necessary for the existence of modern humans, and of critical importance for the future of "green" economies. The project will set new benchmarks for safely extracting and processing these minerals, and should become the new benchmark for copper-nickel mining worldwide. Michael Charles Latvala, PE 311 7th St, Two Harbors, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Lavelly

16229

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Leeling

40341

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Michael Leeling 829 Route 113 Souderton, PA 18964 US

Michael Lieberman

11372

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Michael Lieberman 250 Jersey Ave S Golden Valley, MN 55426-1530 (612) 408-9430

Michael Line

47163

Lets get people to work. Its a fact that these metals will be mined someplace in the world if we don't open this mine. It is almost assured that it will be done with less environmental regulation if that happens in another country. So lets have the mine here and benefit from the jobs and the economic impact for our state. The more than a decade review is enough.. Michael Line Barnum, MN 55707 218-389-0169

Michael M Greulich

42716

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael McCormick

43224

Dear Minnesota and Federal Agency Leaders: I am writing to express my strongest possible opposition to the proposed PolyMet mining project. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and the PolyMet project as environmentally harmful. Please deny any permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit. Please reject the proposed exchange of Superior National Forest land. PolyMet would be the wrong mine in the wrong place. The PolyMet mine would destroy thousands of acres of wetlands, create an immense and permanent industrial mining district in Minnesota's uniquely beautiful and most environmentally sensitive areas, and create a burden of environmental damage of mine dumps, pits, tailings ponds and acid runoff that would blight the landscape for generations and generations, and probably forever. I was drawn to move my family to Minnesota, and to raise my children as Minnesotans, by the promise of the unique natural beauty of the North. Since we moved here 25 years ago, several generations of our extended family have moved to Minnesota as well. Our experiences in the natural beauty of northern Minnesota are some of our most cherished experiences of our lives. We bring our friends and family from other parts of the US and the world to experience the unique beauty and solitude of northern Minnesota. We have seen many changes come to northern Minnesota in the last decades and have friends in those communities, and I am shocked by the existential threat posed now by the PolyMet mining proposal. I have read the various EIS documents and attended PolyMet events, including the open house in Hoyt Lakes in May 2013- I have talked with many people in northeastern Minnesota and farther afield about the proposals. I rode the bus to the LTV site with former LTV miners, who asked me if I was also a former miner, and who are now small investors in PolyMet hoping for their investment to bear fruit. I am worried about the economic opportunities for northern Minnesota. But the PolyMet mine is not the right thing to address that. Proponents of hard rock mining in northern Minnesota claim that opposition to mining equates with opposition to jobs for those communities. This is a fundamentally false and manipulative opposition. Local economies built on mining are boom and bust economies. First, the claimed short-term economic benefits of mining are dubious. PolyMet's claims of job creation deserve skepticism, as automation on the mines reduces the number of jobs, produces short-term low skill jobs, or requires workers with special skills from outside Minnesota. Then invariably the bust comes - relative to the lasting burden of damage, that bust comes in the very short term of 5 or 10 or 20 years. And the bust then endures in the form of impaired communities that people do not want to live in. Northern Minnesota is developing - and needs to continue to develop - a diverse and vibrant 21st century economy where tourism, retirees, telecommuters, service providers, artists, creative people, small businesses, and others can thrive in a way that is sustainable, and that is connected to Duluth, the Twin Cities and the wider world. That type of economy needs to be promoted, not an economy that will suffer the devastation of the other mining areas on the Range that are unlikely ever to thrive again. We are the custodians of what is already a damaged environment for our children and our children's children, and we cannot indulge short-term thinking for the dubious benefits of boom and bust industry. The "us versus them" arguments that pose the Range against "612ers" and others from outside northern Minnesota is also a false opposition. Many people on the Range oppose mining, many people actively go back and forth between these areas, the beautiful and important areas of northern Minnesota are the birthright of all Minnesotans and citizens of the world, and you are the guardians of all of those important places. I am alarmed at how PolyMet asks

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael McKenna

11007

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are threatened, endangered or of

Alphabetical by sender's first name

michael michel

40296

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, michael michel 6235 kester ave #228 van nuys, CA 91411 US

Michael Mlinar

9483

My name is Mike Mlinar. I've worked in the mining industry for nearly 40 years. I live in Duluth. I'm representing myself and will offer my personal opinion. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS for the Polymet Project. My comments are primarily targeted towards the language that relates to the modeling of compliance for an extended period after the operations are suspended. To frame my comments let me first state the obvious and undeniable need for a solid mining industry to support our US lifestyle. Everything we rely on every day of our lives has its source in mining, farming, timbering, or fishing. And it's important to recognize that all of these resource-based activities impact our environment. Specific to the Polymet project, valueless rock will be dug from the ground and processed to produce metals that can then be further transformed into products that we use everyday. So the real question to be answered before this project can proceed is "can it be done safely without significant harm to our environment." I believe the project can and will be successful in properly managing the environmental impacts for a couple of reasons. First, the people who make up the senior leadership of Polymet's Northmet project are all dedicated, credible, and proven mining professionals. I have worked directly with several and indirectly with most of the remainder. They are committed to complete this project in a safe manner with minimal impact to the environment. I trust them. However, even with the confidence that I have in the people who make up the Polymet organization, I was still concerned by the comments I heard by several speakers during the Duluth public hearing regarding the need for 100's of years of mechanical treatment of the waste water, post operation. In fact, my concerns led me to further investigate these claims. What I discovered through careful review of the SDEIS and through discussion with Polymet was that the SDEIS submittal included modeling of the all discharge water quality for an extended period beyond closure. And that modeling was done in an extremely conservative fashion including the highest possible predicted discharge concentrations, far in excess of what will reasonably be experienced. And the modeling included mechanical (active) rather than non-mechanical (passive) treatment as a worst-case scenario. And even given these extremely unlikely conditions the modeling did demonstrate compliance to all water quality parameter requirements. Therefore since the work done for the SDEIS demonstrates compliance even in the most extreme prediction of conditions, and that it further includes a commitment for treatment as long as necessary to meet regulatory compliance standards, I believe the project will minimally impact the environment and should proceed. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion of strong support for the agencies' approval of the Polymet project. Mike Mlinar, PE

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Moore

52292

I am a Minneapolis resident and a regular visitor to NE Minnesota and the BWCAW area. My in-laws live in the Duluth area and my wife grew up in Two Harbors. Why do we have to mine this resource right now. Why don't we wait till they have the technology to leave no clean up. Not leave a mess for my children and the next generation to worry about for the next five hundred years. I think this mine is a bad idea in such a water rich environment. Where contamination could be so easy and potentially disastrous. Thank you for listening.

Michael Noble

16246

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael O. Tichy

2239

I just want to say POLYMET would be great for Minnesota . I have worked in the mines for over 38 years it has been wonderful for myself and my family. The mines provide a great way of life for the people of the range. Mike Tichy

This electronic message and any attachments included with this message are for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to which it is intended to be addressed. This message may contain information that is privileged or confidential and thereby exempt and protected from unauthorized disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication, or the use of its contents, is not authorized and is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication and are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original message from your e-mail system.

Michael Okerstrom

21470

Comments regarding the SDEIS for proposed NorthMet Mining Project from: Paula Okerstrom 2537 34th Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55406 Hello, I am a resident of Minnesota, homeowner, and landowner in Northern Minnesota near Babbitt, MN. I am concerned about the proposed NorthMet Mining Project in Northern Minnesota. I question and wonder about the accuracy of the information in the SDEIS, and thus, its pollution affect on the land and water in that area. I question the sulfate, metals and mercury discharge containment and possible pollution to the land and waters in that area of our state. I questions the direct and indirect impact that sulfide mining will have on the nearby wetlands, lakes, water table, and ultimately water shed. As a cabin owner, on Birch Lake, near Babbitt, Minnesota, I question the effectiveness of the drainage of mercury into Birch lake, and that effect on the fish and wildlife, from the taconite mining in the past that has not been effectively dealt with over the years. If we are not doing it well, now, how do we trust another complex operation will be correctly watched and dealt with into the future. If copper mining has not ever been done successfully elsewhere without damaging lakes and streams in the past, we must be even more certain of the accuracy in the SDEIS now and it's possible negative affect on our resources. I question the financial commitment of International Corporations assurance to clean up the mess they will make in the future. These companies must be deeply invested to put up assurance monies to clean up the possible pollution on land and water. We must require them to put up greater sums of money to ensure their honesty and truth, so they don't walk away with the profits and leave the tax payers with the clean up. Thank you. Paula Okerstrom 2537 34th Ave So. Mpls., MN 55406 612-724-2729

46350

My name is Michael Okerstrom. I am a lifelong resident of Minnesota. I own land near Birch lake outside of Babbitt. Heavy Metal rock piles, rained on, make pollution. Heavy metal rock piles rained on create water pollution for many years. The Minnesota DNR has trouble getting the Bobs Bay problem on Birch lake taken care of. The mining company's leave with the profits but leave the pollution problem behind. They seem to become bankrupt or somehow untouchable and refuse responsibility. The Polymet proposal must provide details on financial assurance that the pollution they create they can take care of properly. Sulphide mining will create huge amounts of waste rock. Perhaps we are lucky as Minnesotans to have this valuable mineral deposit, - Perhaps not. As we all know, the track record for sulphide mining polluting surrounding surface waters is a fact that overshadows this whole proposal. This a water rich area of the earth. The border waters, Lake Superior, the many rivers. There is no rush to start such a high risk operation. The rocks have been there a long time. They are not going anywhere. The science and analysis of the Polymet proposal must be done correctly. Because the downside, the risk factor to the water, is too great. The time period of polluting too long. The methods and techniques are not proven. Polymet has never operated a mine before. The lead agencies must require any potential sulfide mining operators to demonstrate a successful sulphide mining facility. Based on the information, and lack of information provided by Polymet I do not believe Polymet can operate its proposed facility without damaging the surrounding water, nor take care of the waste rock and tailings for the hundred some years required. Another point no one is talking about is the amount of coal that will be burned in 20 years of operation. This should be calculated and be a consideration of this proposal. Polymet has little to lose and privatized profits to gain. The State of Minnesota and its water has much to lose. Let the minerals stay in the ground until they can be safely harvested. It appears they will only go up in value. The lead agencies should reject the Polymet project as environmentally harmful. The lead agencies should not allow Polymet a state permit to mine. The lead agencies should not allow any sulphide mining operations until the operator has a proven facility and provides proper financial assurance. Thank you for your valuable work. Michael Okerstrom 2537 34th Ave So. Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Osberg

15796

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Michael Overend

6027

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The PolyMet mine offers the lure of construction and jobs for people that are eager for this opportunity. The PolyMet mine also has the potential to create an environmental impact on 3 major watersheds, with no concrete certainty of the nature or degree of this impact. There is the potential benefit of many millions of dollars in construction and payroll over the next 20 years. In contrast, Lake Superior, the single largest body of fresh water on the face of the planet stands at potential risk of becoming adversely affected for generations of future citizens. If this body of water, or its neighboring watersheds, are damaged by this mining operation, the costs to reverse the damage will dwarf the potential economic benefits to the region. These potential environmental costs should be borne by the individuals that seek to profit from the mining. However, the mining industry has a history that does not inspire confidence in carrying out this responsibility. American taxpayers have shouldered the economic burden of dealing with EPA categorized Superfund sites as detailed below from companies that oftentimes denied their responsibility after causing environmental damages on an epic scale. As of November 29, 2010, there were 1280 Superfund sites on the National Priorities List in the United States.[2] Sixty-two additional sites have been proposed for entry on the liSt[2] As of November 29, 2010, 347 sites have been cleaned up and removed from the liSt. Due to the risk for centuries of potential work necessary to address the potential damage, there is no conceivable way that PolyMet can guarantee that they will address any and all damage that results from their mine. As a citizen of the region, my wife, children and I stand opposed to the PolyMet mine plan because of the risk to the priceless, and irreplaceable natural resources that it potentially jeopardizes. Sincerely, Dr Michael Overend 557 Scenic Drive Two Harbors, MN 55616 Michael Overend 557 Scenic Drive Two Harbors Minnesota, MN 55616 (218) 591-2514

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael P Savage 42761

See attachment

Michael P. Carlin 19974

To Whom It May Concern; I am contacting in regards to the proposal of the PolyMet mine in northern Minnesota. I am in opposition of the mine due to copper cobalt mines history of pollution. I also think that past performance is a direct indication of future output. Currently the water monitoring in West Virginia has failed to adequately protect its citizens and with governmental programs starved for cash flow it would be a poor decision to jeopardize the water quality. I do not support the PolyMet mine. I want to thank you for taking my email and as well as my thoughts on this matter. Best regards, Michael Carlin (952) 221 4672

37574

To Whom It May Concern; My full name is Michael P. Carlin. My address is 6901 Hillcrest Lane, Edina, MN 55435- I do not support the copper cobalt mine in Northern Minnesota. Never has there been a copper cobalt mine in the history of our planet that has not polluted. The PolyMet mine proposal will be no different. The idea of testing the water quality for 500 years is quite daunting considering the benefit of jobs in the short-term. Please do not let this mine destroy our biggest asset in North America: fresh water. Currently we are using fresh water at a rate faster than aquifers can replenish, and to threaten the little amount of clean fresh water we have would be detrimental. We would be doing irrevocable damage to our ecosystems, threatening wildlife as well as industry centered around a healthy environment. Minnesota as a northern most state, needs to set a precedent on water and habitat management. Thanks, Michael Carlin (952) 221-4672

Michael P. Savage 18989

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Michael P. Savage P.O. Box 115 1209 Lincoln St Superior, WI 54880 218-391-3070

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Patchin 10069

MN Department of Natural Resources: Please see attached correspondence relative to the above matter. Michael J. Patchin Colosimo, Patchin, Kearney and Brunfelt, Ltd. 301 Chestnut Street Virginia, MN 55792 Phone: 218-741-4500 Fax: 218-741-4508 _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avaSt Antivirus protection is active.

Michael Paulson 41887

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michael Paulson Wadena, Minnesota

michael PRIEST 38898

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to ALLOW the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents acceptable environmental risks and should be allowed. This sulfide mining operation IS needed for the future of America. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines . For all these reasons, I urge you to accept the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr michael PRIEST 4326 Miller Trunk Rd Eveleth, MN 55734-4044 (218) 744-5637

Michael R Boyd 57235

For the sake of argument, let's say the water can be treated to a standard of 100% clean and safe. Others can argue on that. I am all for mining (and logging) in the US if done correctly and enviro safe. We need mining jobs for at least 2 reasons: 1. Minerals needed for our industry coming from inside the US (national defense) 2. Jobs for Americans. However, how can any corp put aside money to treat water for the next 200-500 years for a mining operation that will last 30-40 years? How do you invest that money over that time period? In 1814 the "high" wage for a laborer was \$1.35/day or about \$450.00/year (Google in report on statistics of Labor – Mass Dept of Labor – 1885 – Labor Movement) They could have put \$45,000 in 1814 to reclaim a pit and water restoration for 200 years – do you think the money would have been invested wisely? In what form? Remember the countless "panics", recessing depression (1929 & 2008) in the last 200 years. What will the inflation rate be over 200 years? The US dollar has lost 95% of its value since 1913 to present! My prediction: PolyMet will mine, put away some money, go bankrupt, money (thru inflation and recession) will be used up 25 years after bankruptcy, all Minnesota residents will pay for the next 125 years, minimum. I say leave it in the ground until a tried and true method is found. It's not going anywhere. Michael R. Boyd 6689 Hwy 21 Embarrass, MN 55732

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael R. Huber

20182

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Ms Fay: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the PolyMet project. I find the SDEIS to be quite alarming. Major points of concern harvested from the document revolve around the centuries long period during which remediation will be required as a consequence of planned mining operations, and the speculative nature of the proposed remediation measures. The sustained pollution from proposed operations can, over a five century period, be expected to escape. To pursue such an operation at the headwaters of some of the largest freshwater reserves in North America strikes me as the height of folly. The ultimate costs in human terms alone will far exceed whatever employment/economic benefits might be realized in the next few decades. Add to that the reasonably anticipated damage to the state's natural resources, and you have an almost perfect picture of a losing proposition for the citizens of Minnesota and the Upper MidweSt Please count me as one Minnesota citizen emphatically opposed to having the PolyMet proposal move forwaRd Best regards, Michael R. Huber 3810 Vermilion Court South Eagan, MN 55122-3156

Michael Ramsey

6645

Dear Sirs, I have listened to a presentation by President, CEO and Director of PolyMet, Jon Cherry. Mr Cherry's presentation was well informed, thought provoking and insightful to this type of mining. As a previous supervisor from the paper industry, I can attest to the difficulties of running an operation while meeting the stringent requirements of a manufacturing process. The requirements include meeting air and water constraints while maintaining a safe operational environment for both the workers and the community that borders the plant. Without a doubt, this mining can be done safely and comply with the rulings placed upon it. No company would fail at its environmental stewardship while risking large amounts of capital. As a final testament, Mr Cherry did not push the doubters of the project aside, but answered to their concerns which show us the type of leadership we can expect from PolyMet. Let PolyMet proceed with the project. Thank you, Michael Ramsey Michael Ramsey 221 Bluffs Ridge Court Duluth, Minnesota 55811 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Rentz

43123

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Ms Fay et al.: I write to express my thoughts on the NorthMet SDEIS. Thank you for providing us this (legally mandated) opportunity. I have some concerns I will outline below
Minnesota Biological Survey: The SDEIS identifies that the mine site includes over 1,000 acres of habitat identified by the MBS as “Sites of High Biodiversity Significance” The SDEIS attempts to rationalize/minimize the acreage by arguing that the affected acres are a small fraction of all land identified as of “High Biodiversity Significance” and small fractions of the habitat types overall in the region. This represents a fundamental misunderstanding of what a site of “High Biodiversity Significance” means. These sites are identified as areas that are among the best examples of the habitat in the state. It is not meaningful to compare these habitats with others in other parts of the state, as they do not perform the same ecological function. Also, as units considered to be of “High Biodiversity Significance” they cannot simply be swapped out with less significant examples of the same habitat that are, by definition, of lesser ecological integrity.
Non-invasive plants: I applaud the stated intention to control erosion and potential invasion through re-vegetation, but have some concerns with the proposed species mix. Several of the proposed re-vegetation species are known to be invasive, and simply co-planting with native species and hoping the natives win out is unacceptable. The referenced mitigation measures to control for potential non-native invasives is vague, referencing a “monitoring and control program” with no details on how this would occur, nor any definitions of what would be considered an unacceptable level of non-native species in the reclamation, and at what date that target would need to be met to trigger the “monitoring and control program.” I would like to see a target date for the assessment of reclamation, and a level of non-native ground cover and species that would trigger control.
Lynx: The analysis of impact on this species does consider possible increased mortality as a result of increased vehicle traffic, a good example of deeper thinking. No mention is made, however, of the impact on this species of increased noise. If the animal is “spooked” by the mining noise, the effectively lost habitat could be greater than that which is simply within the direct footprint of the mine.
Noise: I was pleased to see the effect of noise on wildlife considered. However I would like to see this concern married with the noise level maps from previous sections to determine the total possible habitat loss, or lower use of habitat by mobile species such as the lynx, eagle, and other birds.
Moose: Little mention is made of moose in the wildlife section. What affect would the increased noise have on moose in the surrounding Forest. I have directly observed moose in the Skibo/Seven Beavers area, which could potentially be within the noise footprint. Given the decline in moose in Minnesota, any action which impacts this species needs to be approached with caution. I would like to see some effort made to address noise and vehicle/rail impacts on this animal.
SGCN: The list of possible SGCN does include the heather vole, but does not include 3 other SGCN mammals that may inhabit the region: 1) *Microtus chrotorrhinus*, 2) *Mustela nivalis*, 3) *Sorex fumeus*. The DNR does sample small mammals in the area of the mine (John Erb) and while none of us have captured these species near the mine, an absence of proof is not proof of absence. The last surveys which directly searched for any of these species are many years in the past, including those referenced for the heather vole (Christian 1993; Jannett 1998).
Thank you for your time and consideration. M

Michael Ripberger

27520

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Sirs/Ma'ams, Please accept these comments concerning the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Not just some, but ALL places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Being that sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota, based on its history it therefore poses a real and direct threat to wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. If it poses a threat to Lake Superior, would this not pose a threat to the other Great Lakes as well. How many citizens, industries, farms and how much wildlife, water sources and acres of soil would this adversely affect, not just in Minnesota but neighboring states as well. Remember, our fresh water is finite, not infinite. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Please place the health and well-being of citizens over those of corporate profits. Thank you very much. Sincerely, Michael Ripberger 1977 Cerro Crest Ct NW Los Lunas, NM 87031-8318 (505) 565-0379

Alphabetical by sender's first name

michael rose

41889

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, michael rose lauderdale, Minnesota

Michael Rota

14905

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I urge decision-makers to reject the PolyMet proposal to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Let's not sacrifice the long-term well-being of our state for some short-term economic gain, which only benefit a few. Sincerely, Dr Michael Rota 2143 Eleanor Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1357

Michael Saima

9663

My name is Mike Saima, I live at 1380 Terrace Dr apt 302 Roseville, MN 55113, and I am e-mailing you because I saw on Channel 4 News the proposal being reviewed to mine in North East Minnesota's Iron Range for copper and nickel. I am strongly against this as well as my family and friends for this proposal. The damage it would do to the environment is not worth this endeavor. Too much has already been done to this planet to extract and ravish the environment for material and monetary gain, it comes across as greedy and inconsiderate. I would never vote for any politician that would support big business over the environment. Can't you people have the foresight to see that preserving the environment is the best for our future generations. Our children and grand children will be judging us on how we treat this planet and in what condition we leave this planet for them. I hope you make the right decision and decide against this project and the potential damage it would do to the water system, that should not be overlooked. There are more people in the state of Minnesota who oppose this measure than support it and their voices should not be disregarded. We'll be monitoring your decision and if you choose wrong the people won't forget and may not forgive. Thank You, Sincerely Mike Saima

Michael Schelmeske

54829

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Smith

2859

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Lisa Fay, As a property owner in Lake County, I certainly feel that I have a vested interest in PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mining operation near Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. I'm also a private business owner and resident of Hennepin County. I understand Senator David Tomassoni's position that, "New mining opportunities provide critical jobs for Iron Rangers " I will acknowledge there is an ever-increasing demand for metals like copper and the benefits of tax revenues can't be ignored. However, these are hardly justifications to move forward with a plan that says next to nothing about the financial assurance of this proposed mining operation. If the role of the DNR is to protect and manage our natural resources, then why hasn't the DNR requested a more detailed financial assurance analysis. How these amounts were determined for example. In addition to the proposed cost to shut down operations, contain the waste, monitor the water quality and treat the water that becomes polluted, I have concerns about the "reclamation process." If I understand the report correctly, the reclamation process would consist of a need to monitor and treat the water for a minimum of 200 years at the mining site and 500 years at the processing facility. Even if the high-end cost-estimate of \$200 million were adequate to complete the reclamation process, 500 years is unimaginable. It makes absolutely no sense for the state of Minnesota to even consider such a proposal. PolyMet's proposed mine is not Minnesota's typical mine, but a new toxic producing mine. The long term environmental impact for the state of Minnesota could be [HYPERLINK "https://www.google-com/search.client=firefox-aandhs=ddnandrls=org.mozilla:en-US:officialandq=define+catastrophicandsa=Xandei=PXKzUpyAGcqV2QXqkoDoBwandved=0CC0Q_SowAA"](https://www.google-com/search.client=firefox-aandhs=ddnandrls=org.mozilla:en-US:officialandq=define+catastrophicandsa=Xandei=PXKzUpyAGcqV2QXqkoDoBwandved=0CC0Q_SowAA)catastrophic, leading to the impairment of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, toxic pollution of drinking water, ground and surface water. Mercury contamination of fish and threats to endangered species. I think it's a safe bet that PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine and tailings basin will leave behind a mess, whether the reclamation process is adequately funded or not. As a Minnesota tax payer I don't want to be a part of PolyMet's proposed mining operation and I urge the DNR to act in the best interest of the taxpayers of Minnesota not the PolyMet corporation. Sincerely, Michael Smith 4952 Newton Avenue South Mpls, MN 55419

42717

See attachment

michael sobania

41868

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, michael sobania Stpaul, Minnesota

Michael Stoos

47166

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Please reject the risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats, and Polymet will be long gone before they have to account for any of the damage done to our state. Sincerely, Michael Stoos 6072 Meadowood Ct Savage, MN 55378-3604 (952) 440-8610

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Tempel 42441

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Michael Tempel 8749 Stratford Xing Minneapolis, MN 55443-3842 (612) 703-8874

Michael Tezla 38949

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Michael Tezla 1876 Yorkshire Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-2404 (651) 699-0361

43258

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Michael Tezla 1876 Yorkshire Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55116

Michael Torp 54538

I am very concerned about any plan that calls for 200 or 500 years of remediation/maintenance by a private or public corporation. This is unprecedented and goes beyond any realistic that any entity could fulfil this type of obligation. In addition, the EIS does not address the plan, or lack thereof, how you plan to secure a 500 year financial commitment that is irrevocable to Polymet.

Michael Vanderford 19802

Feb 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. For 20 years PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream literally for hundreds of years. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michael Vanderford 4154 Blaisdell Ave Minneapolis, MN 55409-1513 (612) 827-3014

Michael W Youngquist 57247

My wife and I are strongly opposed to this mining operation. The actual and potential damage to our environment will be significant and long term regardless of their EIS. We cannot trade a few short term jobs for our beautiful and healthy northern Minnesota. Michael W. Youngquist 79 Maple Hill Dr Grand Marais MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Walker

39984

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Michael Walker 17762 Keystone Ave Lakeville, MN 55044-9365 (952) 435-0164

Michael Willemsen

39061

---Original Message--- From: michael_willemsen@yahoo-com [mailto:michael_willemsen@yahoo-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:58 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. I hope this information is correct. I haven't read all of it - I just heard some bad things from a really nice guy who came to one of our Sierra Club North Star Chapter meetings a while ago. I have a "No Sulfide Mining" button. I trust his expertise. I hope you're having a good day. Be well. Sincerely, Michael Willemsen 208 9th Ave South Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-1846

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michael Wozniak

16283

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

micheal erickson

40706

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Michele Bevis

44380

---Original Message--- From: mbevis@fmr-org [mailto:mbevis@fmr-org] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 3:59 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: Long after the mining has stopped, PolyMet would pose an ongoing risk to fresh water. The Embarrass, the Partridge, and the St Louis Rivers, as well as Lake Superior, are far too precious to be put at risk for so long by PolyMet in its present form. PolyMet should not be permitted unless, when the proposed mining stops, the groundwater and surface water is left in a clean condition, and surrounding streams, rivers, and Lake Superior are safe from risk of sulfide mine pollution. Work for Minnesota's environmental long term health. Sincerely, Michele Bevis 3442 35th Ave S. Saint Paul, MN 55101

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michele Bevis

47198

---Original Message--- From: mbevis@fmr-org [mailto:mbevis@fmr-org] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 9:03 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: Dear Decision-makers for the PolyMet Sulfide Mine; In January, 2014, I attended the StPaul hearing for the proposed PolyMet Mine in northern Minnesota. I was struck by the desperation of the citizens that want the mine for the sole purpose of providing themselves and their community with jobs for 20 years. As much as my heart goes out to them, I believe it is short-sighted and unsustainable to want jobs for a mere 20 years, then to have your children and grandchildren, and their children's children, deal with eternal water pollution that will affect them, even harm them, and possibly destroy or at least seriously alter, the environment that they profess to love. Not to mention the rest of the citizens of Minnesota who will be paying the taxes for eternal clean up. I do not believe that one of the purest watersheds IN THE WHOLE WORLD is a good place to take such a RISK.. of contamination. I do not believe that PolyMet will be the first, or one of the first, companies to operate a sulfide mine without creating dangerous pollution. They apparently have a questionable reputation in other parts of the world. What' in it for them to care about our community.. It is notable that within the last few days, a coalition of MN doctors and health care agents have expressed serious concerns about the potential chemical contamination and this health effect on Minnesotans. Please listen to these concerns. Please error on the safe side of this decision. If it's true that we only recycle 25% of available copper, why not create a copper recycling industry in northern Minnesota. Why not focus the best and brightest minds on creating sustainable, essential industries in this region, that will not harm the environment or our people. Thank you for holding public hearings on this serious, serious matter. Thank for all your efforts to listen to all concerns and be fair in your assessments as to what is the right thing to do. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE, do not allow this sulfide mine to happen in northern Minnesota. Not to mention that this would open the door to the other sulfide mines waiting in the wings for this decision. Thank you. Michele Bevis Sincerely, Michele Bevis 3442 35th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406-2741

Michele Braley

10005

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michele Braley 2215 - 27th Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michele Braley

18751

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michele Braley 2215 - 27th Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

50825

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michele Braley 2215 - 27th Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michele Gonyea

52366

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. My family and I have been camping in the BWCA for many years. I hate to think of the waters up there being destroyed and us not being able to enjoy the BWCA anymore. Please reject any possibility of mining in that area to help preserve the wonderful area that it is. Sincerely yours, Michele Gonyea

Michele Gonyea 3775 Black Oaks Lane N Plymouth, MN 55446

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michele Jimenez

52439

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Michele Jimenez Ellice Trail Apple Valley, MN 55124

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MICHELLE ANDERSON

16274

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

michelle coughlan

41623

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, michelle coughlan north mankato, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Duhant

43485

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I grew up on the Iron Range during the days of orange drinking water, blasts that broke windows and open pit mines that seemed to go on forever. Looking back, the environmental impacts were minimal compared the concerns I have with this operation. I now live in Finland, MN and enjoy clean water, pristine rivers, a crop of wild rice that is safe and air that is sweet to breathe. This operation may compromise the water, as the tailing's basin seeps into the ground water and could go in every direction. We are already home to a Super Fund site because of the previous Federal Air Base that was here for over three decades. People's health has been compromised and many deaths have occurred because of lack of vision and and a blind eye turned to the toxic waste in wells, soil and the ground water. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michelle Duhant Michelle Duhant P O Box 486 Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Duhant

43489

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I grew up on the Iron Range during the days of orange drinking water, blasts that broke windows and open pit mines that seemed to go on forever. Looking back, the environmental impacts were minimal compared the concerns I have with this operation. I now live in Finland, MN and enjoy clean water, pristine rivers, a crop of wild rice that is safe and air that is sweet to breathe. This operation may compromise the water, as the tailing's basin seeps into the ground water and could go in every direction. We are already home to a Super Fund site because of the previous Federal Air Base that was here for over three decades. People's health has been compromised and many deaths have occurred because of lack of vision and and a blind eye turned to the toxic waste in wells, soil and the ground water. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michelle Duhant Michelle Duhant P O Box 486 Finland, MN 55603

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Finn

40288

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Michelle Finn 1273 Prospect Place Cincinnati, OH 45231 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Franzel

15299

Feb 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Michelle Guyett

40120

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, People all over the United States are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Michelle Guyett 4140 N 35th Pl Phoenix, AZ 85018-4708 (602) 522-1680

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Haunsperger

15853

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Michelle Haunsperger 3549 Noble AveN. Robbinsdale, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Hensley

41778

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Javorina

41746

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Michelle Loseke

38512

I want to register my objections to allowing this mine to proceed. From what I've read, the companies and people involved either have dismal records on safety or have no record at all as this is their first foray into this kind of mining. Clean water is more precious than any ore or gas or oil - we won't truly realize this until we lose it, but then it will be too late. Respectfully, Michelle Loseke 2701 E Thomas Circle Sioux Falls, SD 57103

Michelle Raskovich

19526

My name is Michelle, M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E, Raskovich, R-A-S-K-O-V-I-C-H. I live at 1539 North 9th Avenue East, Duluth, Minnesota. I am greatly concerned about the water quality impact and what will happen over the years after PolyMet leaves. I feel that over 20 years of mining and we have to spend over 500 years with contamination that will be leaking continuously into our water. It just doesn't impact a small part of Minnesota. The waters continue to flow and flow for generations, spewing toxic waste. And there is no guarantee of containment, there is no follow-up on how they're going to pay for all of that, and when we're talking about our environment and our children and the generations to come, the 20 years of mining is a small -- small, ridiculous suggestion. That's it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Michelle Raskovich

39898

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Michelle Wendling

42039

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Michelle Wendling Rothsay, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mick 44373

America was founded on the idea of stealing lands, cheating hard working people, making quick profits, and being corrupt. It is a long standing tradition. Your company follows perfectly with this idea. Keep up the good work. Way to destroy our natural lands in order to make a quick buck. I'm happy for you as a large controlling company. I love swimming in arsenic polluted lakes and destroying the the lively hoods of hard working Americans in the tourism industry. In conclusion your mine will only hurt people, the economy, and most importantly the land and water surrounding our beautiful state. -Mick Lundquist

Miguel Bordayo 54176

The reason why you shouldn't drill for copper and nickel is because all the rocks and dirt has sulfuric acid and you are going to wash that into a river, and all that water will turn yellow and kill so much water life. And the TNT you are going to use, to make a 20 story building and a length of 5 football field you are going to kill everything. We all have been protecting that site for 30+ years and your [ILLEGIBLE] stay there for 20. All that damage is going to hurt the environment. It's never gonna come too life, its gonna stay dead forever.

Miia Suuronen 40357

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Miia Suuronen Muroleenkatu 12 b 28 Tampere, ot 33720 FI

Mikayla Rue 54352

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, I have read your website on the mining project in Northern Minnesota and I agree with this project's idea. I think this would benefit Minnesota in many ways. Some advantages are that it would upgrade utilities, roads, and railroads. It could also benefit the economy! The project could make 18,000 tons of nickel/copper hydroxide, 113,000 tons of copper concentrate, 32,000 tons of ore, and 500 tons of PGE precipitate each year. In some ways this can be bad, but for our growing economy we need to collect this stuff for manufacturing. Now there are some disadvantages with this project. There is land-clearing, which can be hard on the environment. We need to protect the land, it helps us in several ways. If the land is cleared this could allow erosion to happen without the trees there to protect the earth. This project could also affect cultural resources. The land is important to the Indian people for hunting, fishing, and planting. People also, don't like the noise, dust, earth-moving, vibration, visual obstruction, and excavation. The land exchanges would make sense. It would involve the transfer of 6,650.2 acres of federal lands from public to private ownership, and up to 6,722.5 acres of land to private to public ownership. But this would depend upon the results of the environmental analysis and federal real estate appraisals. This project would not affect me much. Mostly because I'm at a young age and I'm not part of the work force yet. I don't see this stuff happening. But I do think this project is a good idea! It will hopefully help our state in many ways. Sincerely, Mikayla Rue

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike 4268

Public Comment for PolyMet's SDEIS I would like to submit my public comments in support of PolyMet Mining. In order to support my standing on granting a permit to the PolyMet Corporation, a few items are listed below: First and foremost, science is a wonderful profession. My background is medical which I have been practicing since 1989- I see first-hand new technologies that at the start of my career were mind blowing and so "unknown" that people would say that would never happen. Today however, many of those things are now in mainstream practice and we look back thinking WOW . An example of this is genetics and our ability to actually change our chemistry (genetics) to cure a disease. Another is stem cell research where we can take the base cell of human existence and turn it into any organ we want. Another is the invention of 3-D printing where we are actually printing organs and tissue – you can read about the ear transplant that was created by a 3-D printer. In an era of great advances in science and engineering, we should never go in with blinders and say something is a bad thing. As a society, we should be open minded and say "how can we improve the current situation with current and / or experimental technologies and make it a viable operation that could potentially leave the environment in a better place than when we started." PolyMet has done their research. They have systems in place that not only will meet or exceed standards for environmental protection, but they may actually set the bar higher for other mining companies to keep our natural resources intact. Reverse osmosis is clearly a winning technology that will win the hearts of all living creatures in the area, including humans. I have reviewed the SDEIS, visited with company leaders and toured the mine and property, I am confident that PolyMet is a conscientious partner to have in the mining industry. Next of course is the economic impact that this mine will have on the communities involved. It is no secret the mine itself will be great asset to both the local area as well as the state of Minnesota. But the impact this project will have in the country will also be established as we see industries moving back to the United States from overseas. Our energy landscape has dramatically improved in the last couple years and because of that, interest in investing in America is returning. Resources found at the PolyMet site are required for America to rebuild and grow. The local job creation is directly obvious. The indirect job creation this country will see by having the combination of cheaper energy alternatives, as well as the domestic resources mined by PolyMet for building and retooling American companies will be impressive. PolyMet is a key player that holds the resources needed for innovation, rebuilding and science advancement. Having companies like PolyMet in areas like Minnesota are a great benefit for all, especially those of us in this country. Not only will we benefit from the economic boost that this mine will bring, but we will be reassured that quality measures are in place to keep the entire planet cleaner and greener. Having been able to see firsthand, the potential of this mine as well as the safeguards in place to keep Minnesota's natural resources protected, I have given my support by investing in PolyMet by becoming a shareholder. I believe the approval of this mine will be a game changing event in many ways for Locals, Minnesotans as well as Americans as a whole. With the permit approval, we will see; improved job markets and decreased unemployment, increased tax revenues, more conscientious partners in the mining sector, better advances in water purification, and understanding of the mining resource requirements needed in all industries. Respectfully submitted, Mike Tonne 7749 Meadow Lane Minocqua, WI 54548

Mike & Mary Anderson 3854

This is the 21st Century, not 1900- The greatly improved techniques for mining and our concern for the future of this planet go hand in hand. We can enjoy the benefits that our planet provides without destroying it. We just had our 1st great grandchild. We would support nothing in the name of greed that would not assure her of a future of fresh air and fresh drinking water. There is a new term that we have come to use frequently. "CAVE" People "Citizens Against Virtually Everything." We have become a nation of bitches, not doers. Move forward with this project. Create jobs. Create resources for our factories. And protect the Environment. Are we a great nation or does China now rule the world. Mike and Mary Anderson 484 N 600 E Angola, IN 46702 260-665-9376

Mike and Judy Peterzen 54876

See attachment

Mike Bergh 42584

See attachment

44376

One part I noticed that was not mentioned often enough, was that when they bury the waste ore, they can add limestone to neutralize the sulfate acid if there is a problem. Maybe this should be standard practice to help insure limiting potential pollution run off. Thank you. Mike Bergh 424 E. 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Bergh 44377

One part I noticed that was not mentioned often enough, was that when they bury the waste ore, they can add limestone to neutralize the sulfate acid if there is a problem. Maybe this should be standard practice to help insure limiting potential pollution run off. Thank you.

Mike Berkowitz 26516

I think I have received this message in error. I live in Michigan, not MN. Mike Berkowitz Legislative and Political Director Sierra Club Michigan Chapter 109 E. Grand River Ave Lansing, MI 48906 Office: (517) 484-2372 Ext. 13 Cell: (248) 345-9808 HYPERLINK "<http://www.facebook.com/SierraClubMichigan>" Like us on Facebook. On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 12:01 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Mike Carr 40062

I am sending my comment and recommendation to not allow PolyMet to risk the future by mining copper and nickel. I think the following quote sums up my opinion as well: "Trading 500 years worth of mining pollution for 20 years worth of jobs is irresponsible," argued Hillary Peterson of Sturgeon Lake, during the hearing in Duluth earlier this month. This is a place where I think government plays a very important role to protect the future of this state. Access to clean water is already a world wide problem, so I can't conceive why projects like this PolyMet proposal would gain consideration. Mike Carr Director Global Finance Solutions General Mills - 763-764-7510 Cell 612-803-5033 Mike.carr@genmills.com

Mike Dahlheimer 10895

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. DO NOT BUILD. MN DOES NOT WANT POLYMET. Sincerely, Mr Mike Dahlheimer 2760 Lancaster Ln N Minneapolis, MN 55441-3282

Mike Ferguson 42431

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mike Ferguson 418 W Pleasant St Mankato, MN 56001-2509

Mike Filipczak 42609

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Forsman

18074

Thank you, Mari. She's probably do a better job than I will, but I'm going to try anyway. I'm a lifelong four-generation ranger. I'm now in any 32nd year as the local elected official, the 20th year as the 4th District County Commissioner. I say that because I've represented the people of this area for many years, now. In fact, I can't remember not representing them. First of all, thank you all for putting this on. I mean, one of the things that I -- that I wanted to say is that I also spent 34 years as a United States steel worker. I retired, actually kicked out of the Reserve Mining Company when they closed the -- the doors there and then ultimately retired from a Minorca. I worked for five mining companies. Still kept the same locker as they kept changing names there, but at any rate, I've reviewed the EIS, read most of it, and I've attended most, if not all, of every informational meeting that has been held on the Range, in Duluth, and St. Paul. I have been to nearly every one of them, and as I've been to them, I've certainly become -- I'm not a scientist, so I rely a lot on the scientific knowledge that we get from NRI, from all of those people that have taken -- taken the time out to take and try to find out is this a good project. And among the scientists, and I don't mean among the people that are against this project and do not have the scientific background, maybe there are some that do, but to the scientists that have really looked into it, I think that I've developed a trust that this supplemental EIS and the people that have worked on it, Commissioner, Supervisor Halter and Colonel, we appreciate you being here, but I think that your offices have really worked to try to make this supplemental EIS and, as I read it, it says that this project is ready for permitting. That's what I saw out of it. I hear detractors that tell me about 500 years of monitoring, et cetera, et cetera, and you know, I was offered -- I did want the clean water thing because I believe in clean water, but I was offered the 500-plus years, you know, and the 20-some years that this mine's going to be on and I looked at myself and I thought to myself, you know, we started mining in Ely, Minnesota, over 100 years ago and that mine was going to -- they -- if they had environmentalists back then, I don't know if they did or not, not but it they did, they probably told them at that time that was going to be a five-year plan in Ely. Thank you.

42611

See attachment

Mike Garramone

19509

Mike Garramone, G-A-R-R-A-M-O-N-E, 4225 West Fifth Street, Duluth, Minnesota 55807. Phone Number 218-624-1280. My concern over the permit issue is I feel that this reverse osmosis creates a pretty toxic sludge or byproduct from the filtration of the water, and they're going to bury it, and three years later, they're going to rebury it in an on-site double-lined area. My concern is, I think in this permit they should have a shutdown clause, and the reason why I'm saying this is because a lot of these companies, it's easier to pay a fine than it is to fix a problem, so if the permit has a shutdown clause, like three violations and you're done until they fix it, that's what I believe should be instilled here somewhere. And I brought this up when they had an open public forum at the Concordia Lutheran Church in Duluth here, and they addressed my comments, but they didn't give me an answer as to whether or not that could be done. And what this instilled in the permit, it's a no-brainer.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Geisdorf

4011

To the residents of the State of Minnesota, In the past 40 years, I have seen the promise of numerous “big” projects come and go with the potential of hundreds or even thousands of jobs come and go right with them. Sometimes it was prospects for new technologies; Endotronics, Excelsior Energy. Other times it’s a new economic development entirely; a new Army National Guard base, NW Airline Maintenance Base in Hibbing, Paulucci projects X, Y and Z. ect ect. Besides the wood products industry, the only reliable economic development in Northern Minnesota was in the mining industry. They would come, plan, study and then build, with hundreds or thousands of jobs that came directly from the project. But today, the boom of the 1960s seems a distant memory supplanted by contraction, closure and crisis. Once thriving communities’ now just sign-posts along a highway, have become small bedroom communities with barely a local convenience store and a post office. Their schools and playgrounds closed, torn down and grown over as residents left to look for work elsewhere. The roads are a patchwork of torn up streets and alleys with asphalt patches and potholes the rule not the exception. The water and sewer systems in many cases are WPA products of 1930’s and 40’s but are now substandard in the best cases and essentially antiquated in the worSt The overflowing schools of the 60’s and 70’s are unrecognizable in name as district after district have consolidated with the loss of enrollment and the funding that comes with it. Lastly the churches of our communities, the pillars of the town, have withered away right with the rest of the town. The Polymet “Northmet” project represents a change in the fortunes of the Iron Range and Northern Minnesota. With the recent release of the SDEIS, the issues once troubling both residents and environmentalist alike have been addressed. The studies and engineering completed by the US Army Corps of Engineers, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota DNR, Barr Engineering, ERM and others have finally addressed the numerous water effluent issues of the active mine site. The studies completed by Polymet Mining with the reverse osmosis systems answers the water quality problems with a system that’s quite simple. The money Polymet will be setting aside address’s the legacy water issues for generations to come. This project and the resulting economic boom that comes with it, represents far more than just a few hundred jobs, it represents vibrant thriving communities with local business districts bustling. It represents modern environmentally friendly sewer systems and potable water treatment systems in our towns on par with the best in the state. It represents residents and travelers driving on clean new intact streets with modern storm sewer systems that direct heavy rains and runoff into proper drainage systems that don’t overflow our sewage plants. It represents school systems with modern amenities’ of fiber optics, high tech computer systems and modern science departments. But most important, our kids have hope. They have hope that remaining in our area will not lead to poverty on their part to remain up north, their home. They have hope that they will be able to raise families on incomes that will afford them a decent standard of living. That having a large family won’t penalize them allowing them to remain around parents and grand parents. That our schools will again become revitalized with children of people who have chose to stay up north for the clean air and water. We, the residents of Northern Minnesota, outdoorsmen, hunters and fishermen love our land, waters and the air we breathe. Nobody wants to see the unchecked environmental devastation of Sudbury Ontario. But this isn’t Sudbury, and Polymet is not INCO/VALE, Xstrada or their predecessors. We have demanded that this not be and Polymet has stepped up and answered our concerns. I and my wife finally believe in Poly

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Geisdorf 18093

My name is Mike Geisdorf and I'm from Aurora. I fully support the science behind the SDEIS, and I believe that it does address the environmental concerns of the people. Civilized societies advance because the needs of subsistence living was the mother of invention, the outcome of which are today's modern conveniences. My question to you antis are these: When to mine? Modern medicine -- and we heard the doctor speak -- modern medicine has revolutionized human life allowing us, in just 100 years, to move from subsistence life expectancy of some 40 years to soon approaching a hundred years, having mapped the human genome because someone said when was now, by utilizing our natural resources like copper-nickel, platinum, and palladium. Modern transportation has allowed mankind in that same hundred years to go from horse and carriage to now leave Aurora, Minnesota and be in Beijing, China and put our head down on a pillow that night and go to bed, all because of someone saying when was now by utilizing our natural resources copper-nickel, platinum and palladium. Modern communication, which we all have right here, and I see a lot of you guys out – the antis having this, modern communication has advanced in the last 100 hundred years from hearing news from weeks ago in the newsprint to now receiving instantaneous communications from around the world, in Beijing, China, of unchecked pollution because someone said when was now, utilizing our natural resources like copper-nickel, platinum, and palladium. Modern electrical systems have made, in that same 100 years, the life of the common man equal to the wealthiest man amongst us, giving us all the same modern necessities, due to all of the things I've already mentioned, but also due to central heat, air-conditioning, modern water systems, modern sewer systems, which we need, because someone said when was now, by utilizing our natural resources like copper-nickel, platinum, and palladium. Modern scientific advances of 100 years ago began having discovered began mastering entropy, electromagnetism, X-rays, radioactivity, special relativity, quantum physics, to now, we're actually sending probes out of our solar system, doing scientific experiments on Mars, discovering the Higgs boson and utilizing super conductivity because someone said now was the time by using our natural resources like copper-nickel, platinum, and palladium. We talk about sustainability but forget about responsibility. Let me ask you antis this. Where to mine? You who all utilize the same modern inventions the rest of us do. Which third-world mine and where do you want your copper-nickel coming from? The Norilsk mines in Russia? The South African mines? The Chilean mines? The Chinese mines? There's limited choices. Sustainability comes with responsibility and here in Minnesota, in our time, with the best pollution control agency in the world, we can do this right.

Mike Harrington 38843

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mike Harrington 1392 Pine Tree Dr Maplewood, MN 55119-7115 (651) 214-5309

Mike Higgins 42534

See attachment

mike hughes 36944

i am writing to comment on the proposed precious metals mining that is proposed for northeastern minnesota by polymet. i believe that the permitting should be granted and that the environmental reviews, coupled with governmental oversight, will protect the natural resources from harm. thank you for allowing me to comment. mike hughes 35599 west mcavity lake Rd grand rapids, mn. 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Johnson

18109

My name is Mike Johnson. I'm the current president of the Engineer's Club of Northern Minnesota. The Engineer's Club of Northern Minnesota is in support of the PolyMet Mine. (Inaudible). PolyMet has provided a positive economic impact to the region (inaudible). The engineering club members have been involved in every step of this process and consider the project as described to be economically viable and environmentally sound. The Engineer's Club of Northern Minnesota is in its 100th year of organization. We are dedicated to the advancement (inaudible) economical return, societal growth, and environmental protection. We believe the PolyMet project is respectful in the great tradition of mining in Northern Minnesota while at the same time continuing to improve the various mining processes and results. Minnesota and the United States of America have a process for approving projects such as this. PolyMet has gone to incredible lengths to satisfy the regulations and the law. It is time for the DNR and other agencies to create a positive decision (inaudible) will allow the benefits of the project to be one step closer to reality for the individual businesses and communities for Minnesota and the United States. Thank you.

mike kaufman

40209

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr mike kaufman 1 Winona St W Saint Paul, MN 55107-3354

Mike Klein

39444

Please accept these comments into the public record on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Having reviewed the SDEIS, and the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, I am concerned that the potential environmental risks and economic, environmental, and social costs associated with the project outweigh the potential economic benefit. To encourage careful accounting of costs internal and external, short- and long-term, I propose that a trust fund be established by the mining interest, in an amount determined by a third party assessor, and to be administered by the state, to set aside adequate funds to cover potential environmental impacts over the entire span of project - and subsequent impact - upon the land and waters of the project area. Calculations for the fund are certain to be contentious, but the calculation process would allow all parties to fully assess the predictable environmental impact and unintended consequences of the project, and to internalize those costs that might otherwise be externalized; ie: to other landholders, to water treatment facilities, or to future generations who will not benefit economically, but will be impacted by the long-term timeline established in the SDEIS. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this significant and long-term project. Sincerely, Dr Mike Klein 1790 Jefferson Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Kuitu

6270

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, My name is Mike Kuitu, I live at 1114 w 6th St in Duluth 55806- I ask that you reject the Polymet SDEIS and deny permits to Polymet to proceed with their Northmet Mine. I have worked all over the State of Minnesota on construction sites, My very first construction job was at The Minntac Mine in 1974, my last was at the Mesaba Nugget mine in 2011, shortly before I retired. Throughout my career, and particularly at the taconite mines, we workers were informed of the environmental hazards at the Jobsite. Mitigation methods for these hazards were presented to us and their use made mandatory and non-compliance often resulted in termination. There is no identification of the specific environmental hazards present to the workers working at the Northmet Minesite, let alone the levels of toxicity. There is no mention of asbestos or asbestos like fibers becoming airborne. If this is present all over the Mesaba Range, one should conclude that, they will exist at the Northmet mine. There is no mention of how Polymet will protect these workers from that plus arsenic, mercury, and sulfuric acid. There is no mention of the cumulative effects of these hazards on workers health. Because of these omissions, one must conclude that Polymet does not respect workers and their health. We must deny any permits to Polymet. Sincerely Mike Kuitu Mike Kuitu 1114 W.6th St Duluth, MN 55806 (218)391-6367

18387

Hello, everybody. It's sure been a long night. My name is Mike Kuitu. I was raised in Cloquet and I live in Duluth right now. I've been -- I'm a retired operating engineer, which is I was a building trades member while I was working. And you all heard the president of the building trades, Craig Olson, talk about the good paying jobs. And honest to God the construction workers that work at PolyMet will have good paying jobs. But that's where it ends. We don't know what PolyMet is going to pay their lowest paid workers. And that's what scares the heck out of me. Right next door to PolyMet is the Mesabi Nugget Mine. It's a taconite mine. It's a direct reduction facility. And at times those workers have been paid only \$11 an hour. And they disguise that by giving them a lot of overtime. And whatever happened to the 40-hour week? So you give people a 60-hour week and so now it seems like they are starting to get a halfway decent job. I really have a problem with that. The SDEIS does not recognize some of these environmental -- these economic environmental hazards that are going to drawdown the rest of The Range and Northeastern Minnesota. Let's consider this: You have the Nugget Mine that's already non-union. There are no agreements for PolyMet to be a union mine. There's no secret agreement with a union where that mine is going to be union right off the bat. And it's not likely that an organizing vote is going to go well there, because the Nugget Mine right next door just turned down an organizing drive two to one. So you got the PolyMet Mine, if that goes non-union -- and I don't know what the plan is at SR or when you get to Twin Metals. I don't know. But if you start getting all these mines together and they're paying \$11 an hour, what kind of impact is that going to be to the union mines, Minntac, and ArcelorMital, and United Taconite, and all those folks that are making \$20 an hour at a minimum. And those \$20-an-hour jobs, those are premium jobs. That's family sustaining. Those miners don't have to go back to moms and dads and say, "Can you buy me a cell phone?" Or "Can you make my car payment this month?" Or something like that. So I would like to see -- I would like to ask this question of PolyMet: What is the lowest wage you're going to pay?

Mike Larson

58120

I am a life long Iron Ranger and have been involved in mining my entire life. I am fully supportive of the Polymet Project. I firmly believe that mining can be undertaken in a fashion that is not harmful to our environment. We need jobs that pay liveable wages.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Ledin

16055

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Lein

45324

I offer these comments on the NorthMet SDEIS as a degreed professional who has worked in the environmental protection field for 38 years. This experience includes water quality protection work with the US Forest Service, a private company, and two Minnesota counties. Along the way I have worked alongside of staff of all Minnesota environment and natural resources agencies and many private consultants. If I could state that only one lesson I have learned from all this private experience, it would be that things go wrong. Again, despite all the best laid plans, the latest technology, and stringent local, state, and federal permit conditions, things go wrong. And the second lesson would be that when things go wrong, there are not always easy ways to fix the wrongs. I have traveled in western states and seen miles of western state trout streams ruined by mining runoff and not yet "fixed" after more than a century. I have personally seen the Zotrman Mine in Montana and the impacts it's operation, closing, and pollution has had on the local environment and people. I have operated water treatment plants where equipment broke, concrete crumbled, and dikes were breached. I have dealt with major companies who were allowed to continue operating and polluting for years under outdated or expired permits due to lack of political will, lack of enforcement resources, and lack of funds to implement expensive changes that might shut a facility and kill jobs. So I am suspicious of this proposal that allow a mining technique that has a proven track record of failure and pollution to operate in Minnesota, to be operated by a company with no previous experience, and to be operated with no specific backup or contingency plans. Viewing the document presented on the SDEIS has brought little comfort. Even for a seasoned professional such as myself, there is too much to absorb and comment on during a 90 comment period. And at the same time, despite the hefty stack of documentation, there isn't enough data to make a determination even if the time allowed and I were an absolute expert on that particular chapter of the SDEIS. It's a classic case of "show your work". This hasn't been done. Where's the documentation of consideration of worst case scenarios. It can't be found – at least by me. The scale of the treatment technology when considered over 500 years and the sheer size of the project – even without planned expansions – is untested in the world – at least as far as I can determine. The complexity of the work and modeling has added to the confusion surrounding the project. One day we hear that the water quality model used incorrect flow data and needs to be corrected. The next week we hear that the correct data was used, but it was buried so deep in the model that it took the experts a week to find out is was correct. At a minimum, slow the project down - extend the comment period and offer details on financial assurance, even if not legally needed now. Once again, show us that State employees have done their homework on an immense project that has no proven track record other than failure, operated by a foreign company with no operational experience, that will need care and maintenance for 500 years or more. Mike Lein 513 Casper Circle Norwood Young America, Minnesota 55368 fishlein@mchsi-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Link

6126

To the hearing officials and state and federal agencies reviewing the PolyMet permits I need to make sure there is no confusion about my position. I oppose the Polymet Mining projects in Minnesota unequivocally. The rationale for these mines has one basic flaw – and that is that they cannot help but harm the only planet I can live on. The location of these proposed mines raises the immediate concern for two of our regions greatest resources – the Boundary Waters Canoe Area – and Lake Superior. In January 2012 the Environmental Protection Agency released its annual survey of pollution discharges in the country. Mining operations similar to what PolyMet and Twin Metals propose were once again identified as the single biggest polluter in the country, responsible for 41 percent of all toxic releases. The EPA report for Mining Operations as Nonpoint Source Pollution in the Mid-Atlantic Region states that in the Eastern United States, “More than 5,150 stream miles have been contaminated, causing the loss of aquatic life and restricting stream use for recreation, public drinking water and industrial water supplies.” This acidification is caused by two sources – again according to the EPA “abandoned mine drainage - which results from water flowing over or through abandoned mines, and by acid air deposition - primarily from the burning of fossil fuel; this produces acid rain.” The source of this information is <http://www.epa.gov/reg3wapd/nps/mining.html>. The impact of the mine will have a positive economic impact for the community in the short run, however, let’s be clear – these are International companies and as we know the laborers do not get the majority of earnings. These companies have no concern, no commitment to our resources – they simply see profit. But profit for the mines actually means loss to the state and nation. Our resources will be diminished and our state and federal taxes will be required for the infinite treatment of their wastes. And I would like to emphasize – INFINITE. There is no expiration date for the wastes, no time when they convert to some innocuous compounds – this is a forever commitment that we should not make and one that we know the corporation cannot make. Should they decide to convert their company and sell off the assets they can declare bankruptcy and we will still have the problem. The fact that we have had Iron Ore mining in this region is not sufficient justification - when rain falls on the waste from iron mining, it makes rust; when rain falls on sulfide ore waste, sulfuric acid is produced. - See more at: <http://www.friends-bwca-org/issues/sulfide-mining/#sthash.U6R6aaYl.dpuf> The real economic engine of this state is the unspoiled landscape and waters of the canoe country and Lake Superior. In a time when we know there is a coming water shortage on this planet we cannot afford to compromise the quality of our water. We cannot afford to see degradation and diminishing fresh water resources. We cannot canoe in bottled water, we cannot sit beside bottled water and enjoy the fresh breezes and breaking waves, nor can we swim and fish in an aquarium. When my wife and I walked around Lake Superior we chose to emphasize the fragility and importance of Fresh Water. We saw how much effort and money is needed to clean up bays if they are polluted, but more than anything we saw that the people really cared about their lake and the same can be said for the Boundary Waters. These are not anonymous places, they are in our heart and they are places the state and nation are obligated to protect. Say NO to the mine. Mike Link 82119 Bennett Road Willow River, MN 55795

40026

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I never feel that my responses are adequate. Everyday we learn new lies. We find more coverups. Just say no to this unethical corporation. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mike Link 82119 Bennett Rd Willow River, MN 55795-3079 (218) 372-3507

49074

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I never feel that my responses are adequate. Everyday we learn new lies. We find more coverups. Just say no to this unethical corporation. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Mike Link 82119 Bennett Rd Willow River, MN 55795-3079 (218) 372-3507

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mike love & jeanine kelley

41359

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney, We have grave concerns about the SDEIS and the potential mine and wetland destruction permits for the NorthMet mine operation. Protection of the area's wetlands and water should be the number one concern when considering the permits. The US and the state of Minnesota have lost too many important wetlands already. PolyMet proposes to create 913 acres of destroyed wetlands, but manmade wetlands never have nearly the biodiversity of natural ones that have developed over hundreds of years. The bogs and peatlands in the area will be especially difficult to replace. In addition, there is no plan to repair damage from pollution and reduced water flow to several thousand acres of other wetlands. It is our understanding also that most of the mitigation will be outside the Lake Superior basin. Lake Superior is the most vulnerable of the great lake to pollution because of its cold temperature and lessened ability to clean itself. The Lake Superior Basin needs more wetlands, not less. This is an unacceptable environmental degradation and we request that you deny the wetland destruction section 404 permit. Minnesota Rule 6132-3200 states that a mine must be maintenance free when it is shut down. The timeframe for treating the water from the mining site and the tailings site is several centuries. How can this plan comply with state law and how can it be taken seriously. No one today can guarantee that the treatment will be continued that far into the future and that the company can put up enough money to ensure this. How can we know the current amount of money that will be sufficient to monitor and treat these sites for that long. We don't even know all of the details of the current treatment plans or how adequate they will be for keeping pollution out of our surface and ground water. Sulfide mining has never been done before in water abundant areas without causing pollution. What proof is there that the proposed treatments will be effective enough. Will there be backup equipment for immediate use in case of equipment failure. We think there should be stringent and frequent monitoring of the surface and ground water for pollutants and continuous monitoring of all discharges into the local rivers. What plans are in place to repair damage and stop the mining process if excess pollution is found. If the pollution control plans don't work as advertised, will a correction be possible. We don't believe that the cumulative effects analysis area was large enough. Along with the Partridge and Embarrass Rivers, the St Louis River should be studied for the cumulative effects from the proposed NorthMet mine. The city of Duluth has spent millions to clean up the St Louis River for recreation and plans to spend millions more in the future. With all of that effort, it would be a shame for PolyMet mine to add more pollution to the St Louis and Lake Superior. Our country has had a poor history of honoring the treaties with and rights of Native Americans. We are troubled that the local Minnesota Indian tribes disagree with many of the findings in the SDEIS. The rights of Native Americans should not be impeded to live off of their lands without serious concerns about the water quality for drinking, fishing and wild rice harvesting. Wild rice has been declining in the state and a safe sulfite standard has not yet been definitely determined. The state should err on the side of caution. Wild rice is part of our state heritage. PolyMet has never mined before. The major company hiding behind them, Glencor, has a bad track record for pollution, lack of clean up and poor working conditions. There has never been a sulfide mine that has not polluted the near by waters. Wetlands that protect other waters will be eliminated and impaired by the proposed mine. We don't believe that the alternative of an underground mine was fully studied. Native Americans and all area water users are afraid of the consequences of the mine and ta

Mike Lundstrom

6136

PolyMet Project Comment In the dialogue about allowing the PolyMet copper mine project in Northern Minnesota, It is important that we turn down the volume of rhetorical extremism from both sides of the spectrum. The policy decision cannot be driven by those who believe that this process should be allowed without question or those who believe that any measure of risk should not be tolerated. To me it comes down to facts and truth. Lay people cannot begin to wrap ourselves around the research and data generated by the 2169 page EIS report required by regulators. I take solace in the fact that Minnesota has some of the most stringent policies in the nation regarding the permitting of mining. I also recognize that with any progress made in life, there is some inherent risk in moving forward. We cannot expect or guarantee absolutes in outcomes. We can, however, with the proper research and monitoring minimize potential negative consequences for the greater good of our society and for the quality of life in this region. We must trust in our process and in our governmental institutions to make wise policy decisions as a necessity to a functional society. From everything I have read and heard, the PolyMet project can and will be managed and scrutinized in a manner that will be of low risk for a high gain to the local and the national economy. Please permit this important project. Mike Lundstrom Executive Director Hermantown Area Chamber 218-729-6843 [HYPERLINK "http://www.hermantownchamber-com/"](http://www.hermantownchamber-com/) www.HermantownChamber-com Description: HERMANTOWN CHAMBER LOGO WITH BLUE BACKGROUND

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Maleska 19525

My name is Mike Maleska, M-A-L-E-S-K-A, and I'm from Hibbing. If this type of mining is allowed to proceed, these communities will fill up with families and churches and other industries and groups and interests, and that's an economy. What I want to know is what entity will have the authority, or more specifically, the courage to call a halt to this mine when a disaster occurs? Who will tell the workers in their communities that it's all over? What politician wants that responsibility? Is it going to be the Forest Service? Is it going to be the DNR? Is it going to be the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? I stand up for whistle-blowers and any other entity that wants to make what is needed to be done on a disaster of any size. What magnitude of disaster will it take to -- to have this mining process stopped and halted and repaired forever? Is a little poison for a little while okay? Is a little poison for a long time okay? Is a lot of poison for a little while okay? And again, what magnitude of disaster does it take to make people realize that this is a permanent change to the ecology and the environment? That's all I have to say.

Mike Malling 52314

I'm concerned about the long term impacts of the project. Noise, water pollution, long term contingency plans if the project fails, the endangered lynx, and the fact that this type of mining has never been done without impacts to water are concerns. I'm a biologist and understand the project. I don't understand why the forest service would consider this project. By the way, your commercials are less than effective and poorly timed. Thank you Sent from my iPhone Mike Malling

Mike Markell 16202

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm 69 years old and have been user of the BWCAW for 50 years. My father was a user and guide before me in the 1930's. Although not opposed to mining in Minnesota, I am opposed to this project. There is no scientific evidence that the waters of the BWCAW will be protected and preserved under this proposal. This is of utmost concern to me. I'm not convinced that the cleanup projected to take maybe 500 years (hard to comprehend) is even viable. Companies come and go and how can we ensure that there are enough funds to first, protect Minnesota's treasured lands and waters and second, if the proposed project is approved that there will be enough dollars to for protection in the short term and clean up longterm. If we need 300 jobs in Northern Minnesota let's have the Legislature approve a CCC type project (with corresponding funding) of good paying jobs rather than use that as an argument to approve this project. Give the IRRRB the funds and have conservation related jobs created. Mike Markell 17809 Covington Road Minnetonka, MN 55345

Mike McGill 39236

Please see the attached letter reflecting our opposition to the proposed PolyMet mining project and the inadequacy of the PolyMet SDEIS. Thank you. Mike McGill

Mike Mcparlan 18170

I'm Ed Borchardt. I and I yield my time Mike McParlan. Like he said, I'm Mike McParlan. That's M-C, capital P-A-R-L-A-N. I would like to start my time by telling you I guess a little bit about myself and what I do. I think it will add context to my remarks. I was born in Duluth, Minnesota. I've lived all my life in Duluth. My wife, Mary, and I have raised five children in Northern Minnesota. Like many of us here in Minnesota I care a lot about the outdoors. It's a major part of my life. We began with our children in Bear Head Lake State Park. And as they got old enough to carry the canoes and paddles and gear, we graduated to the Boundary Waters. And we've raised all of our children enjoying the outdoors of Minnesota. I also work in Northern Minnesota. I work in construction. My job is -- I'm a COO for API Group, which is a parent for numerous construction companies throughout North America and the UK. 15 of those companies are based in Minnesota. Four of them in Northern Minnesota. My whole career has been in construction. And I guess to add context to my remarks, I really feel the need and the benefit for the jobs and the economic and the input that we will get from a project like this. But having grown up in Northern Minnesota, I also highly value the environment and the quality of life that we have. And I wouldn't change that for anything. I wouldn't trade that away for anything. But thankfully in this process I feel that we have an opportunity to repurpose an existing mine site. And I think we have the technology and the capabilities to do this right. I put my faith in the process. And I look at the room here tonight and the push and pull between different points of view. I believe we in Minnesota can assure that this project is delivered safely; and that we have the capabilities to hold ourselves and the company accountable for a safe, long-lasting, positive project for our future. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Menzel

18273

Mike Menzel, Edina, Minnesota. I understand that this is a very difficult process, given the unemployment rate up in northern Minnesota. And that is being balanced against environmental concerns. However, I feel that we need to explore other job opportunities for the folks up north because this mine has great potential for being an environmental catastrophe. Many great points have already been submitted about why the mine should not go through. Most of them refer to water quality and toxic sulfides and other chemicals ending up in the watershed. And I understand that there has never been a sulfide mine in a water intensive area ever before that has not resulted in contamination or pollution to our waters. One point I have not seen brought up is, that I feel needs to be addressed in the EIS, is the high likelihood of catastrophic climate events. And I am referring to the fact that we have already had four one thousand year floods since 2004 in the State of Minnesota. We have seen massive winds, with terrific blow downs up in northern Minnesota, leaving the potential for epic fires. We also know from university scientists that our Boreal forest is dying off rapidly; massive dying of trees. That also will result in epic fires. And I don't see that there is any way to prepare for any of these climatic disasters. We will see. We have a great likelihood of massive flooding in the mine site, as well as epic fires that could cause the operation to shut down, with loss of electrical power. And who knows what will happen to the mines that we have during that period of time. Thank you.

43033

Please see the attached comments. Thank You, M. Michael Menzel

Mike Miklas

41866

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mike Miklas Shakopee, Minnesota

Mike Neaton

17576

Feb 16, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The Supplementary Draft Environmental Impact Statement has many failures: 1)to address the correct flow of base water, 2)specify the under water crevices that will allow water to flow in pathways that are sited as clay, 3)show the correct flow to the 100 mile swamp feeding eventually to the WCA and 4)fails to address the health regarding the working conditions. If these and many other aspects are not failures to protect the public, the purposed operation is expecting a public monitoring for 500 years and counting.. No business enters a contract with liabilities that extend for a time period of this length. This suggestion is both ridiculous and irresponsible. The primary concern is the requirements and satisfaction to offer the public an environmental analysis to assure the public. It's many lacking and incorrect information should stop this now. Lastly the state of Minnesota will be in partnership with Glencore/Polymet with an environmental history and ruthless business profile that should make anyone realize this is dancing with the devil. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Mike Neaton 4433 Upton Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1931 (612) 226-3801

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MIKE NIES

36482

Our Address is Mike Nies Nies Electric P.O. Box 6211 St Cloud MN 56302 On Mon, Mar 3, 2014 at 10:35 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd - Mike Nies Nies Electric

36496

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resoures Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, box25 St Paul MN 55155 Dear Ms Fay, I am writing the email in support of the Polymet Mineing Project. Minnesota has a long history of Mining. It has not been without probleMs The rise and fall of the employment at the iron Mines. the tailings piles of generations past, just to name a few. Though out all of this Minnesota has developed the models for the regulation of the industry. I am in the construction industry. The recession hit us haRd many of us lost our homes. Many more lost jobs, forcing them to move out of state. The financial impact will be here for generations. This project will generate over 800 million in wages and benifits to workers like me. Therre will be Billions in economic benefits over the life of the project. There will be tax revenues for the local cities and the state. I have a hard time with the premise that there is not a way to do this and deal with the impact in a manner that is environmentally sound. We are and always have been environmentally concious. We can find a way. Please help me support this Project - Mike Nies Nies Electric

Mike Nordin

47796

Mike Nordin [mailto:mnordin41@gmail-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 8:19 PM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: Polymet Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: • Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. • Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. • Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. • Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1- Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2- Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3- Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Perala

18105

Good evening everyone. My name is Mike Perala and I'm from Virginia. I have deep roots in both Ely, as well as the Twin Cities (inaudible). I speak to you tonight in support of the review process put forth here, as well as in support of one of the most extensive and expansive recycling projects in Minnesota history; the PolyMet project. I have a keen perspective and interest in the project area. As many in the audience know, I once wore an orange hard hat proudly as an employee of LTV. The final pellets produced in the area glomerator (phonetic) were done under my watch. And through my work experience there, I gained a deep and unique knowledge of the infrastructure and of the mine site. I've seen firsthand the devastating impacts that the LTV closure has had on the east range. You know, I was one of the lucky few, because I found a job in short order. In my role at Minnesota Power now, I'm able to do what I can to add value to the region and the PolyMet project. Excuse me. I speak tonight in support of the review process managed by the Minnesota DNR. Some people think it a long process. I think that the length of the process has been dictated appropriately by the complexity of the project and the robustness of the area mine site. Admittedly, it has also been partially driven by corrections along the way. As best said in last week's comments by former Ely mayor, Mayor Scraba (phonetic), and I paraphrase, "The process is being conducted by professionals, with input from experts, and if at the end of the day the project receives a determination of adequacy, then it certainly should go forward. On the other hand, if the process requires further review, then that review should take place. And that echoes my sentiments to the tee. Review of the process indicates that accepted study practices have been followed in all steps. You know, I'm really amused by the misrepresentation behind the 200-year and 500-year impact numbers being bandied about by the media and the project opponents. I see the only relevance of those numbers, of any significance, as to provide parameters beyond those of reasonable impact. Sound science and basic design of experiments both indicate that you want to extend a study period beyond that time frame of which you reasonably expect impacts to occur. I point to the treatment station at the Dunka Pit as a prime example of this. A facility originally intended to treat discharge based on threshold measurement, which hasn't needed to run for years based on those ongoing measurements and due diligence. I also speak tonight in support of the PolyMet project. I have been personally involved with the PolyMet project since 2005, and coupling my work experience, my background as an engineer and a project manager and my working relationship with PolyMet, altogether has lead me to conclude that the project is a strong one. There is a level of responsibility, ethics and competency with John, Joe and their team, and it is at least on par as that with our other mining companies. In closing, I look forward to the successful completion of the public process and the decision of adequacy. I want to stand on the Rod Mill (phonetic) deck and watch the mills go around in this area. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Schrage

45109

March 12, 2014, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Jiminez: As a resident of northeast Minnesota I have many concerns about the proposed NorthMet project. The greatest natural resources we have are our abundant public lands, clean water and healthy populations of fish and wildlife. These resources have both economic and intrinsic value and properly cared for they are infinitely renewable. They should not be put at risk for comparatively short term profits. I don't feel the SDEIS adequately considered the costs and benefits of alternatives (including not doing the project at all) to open pit mining. The lead agencies should at least give full consideration to the costs and benefits of extracting this ore by other means including underground mining. Just because open pit mining is the most economically feasible way to get this ore does not mean it's the best way when all other concerns are considered. I don't believe the SDEIS has provided adequate financial assurances the residents of Minnesota won't be stuck with clean up and reclamation costs following the mine's closure. Whether the horizon is 50 or 500 years in the future, it's clear the consequences of this project will last a long time. I remain unconvinced PolyMet and its stakeholders can or will be held responsible for any unforeseen consequences or failures in cleanup strategies after the mine is closed, profits have gone elsewhere and no one alive today is still around. The proposed land exchange should not include 382 acres of Lake County land. This represents a net loss of public land opened for hunting, fishing, trapping and other forms of outdoor recreation. The Forest Service land is lost to mine development, and the County land simply changes government ownership. No part of this or future mining projects should result in a decrease of public lands. The Biological Assessment and the Biological Evaluation accompanying the SDEIS are limited to discussions of impacts to federally listed species and Regional Forester Sensitive Species. The SDEIS does not adequately discuss impacts to outdoor recreational pursuits such as hunting and trapping nor does it adequately discuss impacts to traditional game and furbearer populations. This is a major discrepancy in these documents as healthy wildlife populations of all species, not just rare or sensitive ones, is critical for many residents and visitors to northeast Minnesota. The existing wildlife corridors are inadequate to maintain connectivity across the Iron Range. As evidenced from aerial photographs, they're narrow and often heavily intruded upon by roads, utility corridors, mine pits and urban development. These features serve as barriers to many kinds of wildlife. While the existing corridors may function well enough for large, mobile species like deer or wolves, they are inadequate for smaller, less mobile species. The SDEIS admits increasing development of urban areas alongside the corridors will render some of the existing corridors less suitable for wildlife in the future. Increased urban development and associated transportation and utility infrastructure should be expected if the project provides the economic benefits stated in the SDEIS. This issue should be mitigated before NorthMet or additional mine development goes forward through the establishment of dedicated and protected wildlife corridors and the reclamation of existing mine land. It's clear NorthMet is only the first of these new mines to come. The SDEIS shows ore deposits that are increasingly distant from existing mines and on landscapes in more pristine condition. Future mines may seek to exploit these deposits and will use the environmental review process for this project as a template. While any individual mine may not have significant impacts on the landscape or natural resources by itself, the cumulative impacts of habitat loss will begin to add up for populations of fish and wildlife and our access to the

Mike Williams

42082

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mike Williams Moorhead, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mike Zicus 38487

I have 3 questions. 1- If comments are sent by mail, is a postmark of March 13th OK. 2- If the comments are emailed, to whom should the email be sent. 3- Is there a list of reference citations someplace. I've searched all over and couldn't find any. I found some documentation that I think is questionable and I'd like to see the original source of the citation. Thanks

42908

Comments are attached.

mikem28 38400

Michael Mardirossian 3001 lake east Dr apt 2118 Las Vegas, NV 89117 Although not a native of Minnesota, I have had close friends in the area for years. The financial benefits are a deciding factor in my opinion to approve. You just need to make sure the environmental factors are accounted for. As long as the company can take responsibility for their actions, the economy needs a boost in jobs and tax revenue. Thank you. Sent from my MetroPCS 4G Android device

39660

I am no longer a resident of Minnesota but I have close friends there. Please approve pPolymet. I don't want MN to end of looking like Detroit. Had industry in the past but no longer..thanks Michael Mardirossian 3001 lake east Dr apt 2118 Las Vegas NV 89117 Sent from my MetroPCS 4G Android device

miles holets 21979

I wish to add my voice of support to the PolyMet project. It seems that this company is aware of the environmental implications and is willing to comply with all standards required. I believe they will be excellent stewards of this land and water that I grew up with. I am a life long resident of northeastern Minnesota and love the area I call home. I support the development primarily for two reasons: 1- Our country is stronger when we do not need to rely on foreign countries for our infrastructure minerals and materials. 2- Economic strength jobs and taxes will provide. Thank you for your work on behalf of us all. Miles J. Holets 3777 Keene Creek Lane Hermantown , MN 55811

Miles Kramer 41807

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. We cannot, for our sake and the sake of our children, put short-term small-scale economic progress ahead of long-term, large-scale ecological devastation. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Miles Kramer 44 Bates Ave Saint Paul, MN 55106-6339

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Miles Kramer 41828

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Miles Kramer 44 Bates Ave Saint Paul, MN 55106

Miller 54741

See attachment

Milt Sundeen 22063

it is obvious that polymet has met the burden of proof that they can do this project while meeting all the standards that the state would like, hopefully we can proceed to make this another wonderful asset to the state of minnesota milton sundeen motorhead@q-com

Mimi Jennings 10715

Dear Ms Fay, I'm a longtime resident of Saint Paul, a mother and grandmother, a public school teacher, a union member who's walked picket lines twice. Everywhere I turn I find reasons against sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. I wish to draw your attention to one of many, many arguments against this proposal. I'll focus on its parent company. Most galling: while PolyMet has never operated a mine anywhere, it's owned primarily a known quantity with an abysmal environmental, ethical and labor record: the Swiss international commodities and mining giant (50% of all mines worldwide), GlencoreXstrata. Glencore was originally called the Marc Rich Company (charged with tax evasion, accused of doing business with Iran during the hostage crisis, pardoned by President Clinton right before he left office – that Marc Rich). Now Tony Hayward is chairman of Glencore's Board of Directors. He's the guy who was running BP at the time of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Remember that he botched the handling of the fire and then attended a yacht race while oil polluted the Gulf, announcing that he "wanted his life back." That Tony HaywaRd Some Glencore history: · BBC investigation accusing Glencore of dumping copper refinery acid into a river in the Democratic Republic of Congo · more than a million dollars in environmental fines worldwide since 2010 · 500,000 Euro Belgian court fine in a corruption case · various contracts with Iran during sanctions · named the number one most difficult company to do business with by an international coalition of environmentalists · Glencore subsidiary fined for violating copper trading rules. Why do we even want these guys in our state, let alone undertaking such delicate operations in our pristine waters. It's like letting a known child molester babysit your own kid. Not wise. Wrong. Bad decision. Please stand up for what's right. Please look impartially (as the EPA has done) at this deal (warning: hold your nose). Pleadingly, Mimi Jennings

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mimi Jennings

19395

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also reschedule the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. Please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This simply isn't fair. Please also make available to the public the long list of references in the document claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions but not found there. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS, at 2,169 pages long. * The SDEIS is not well written. It is neither clear nor concise. It obfuscates, repeating the same information over and over without once providing the basis for its conclusions. Much work is needed just to make sense of what is there. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues, for instance, why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed or why the level of financial assurance proposed is needed. * The SDEIS does not respond to, not even to dismiss, well-documented Tribal Major Differences of Opinion which call into question main points, such as claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. The public must be allowed to find and check on references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. Given the level of public mistrust we fear this is by design. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of suspicion that government decision-makers are not impartial - not at all interested in either the science, the financial risk, or what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period are essential in reassuring us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation. Science and the opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just short-term gain and ideas of foreign corporations, must matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Mimi Jennings 2222 Hillside St Paul, MN 55108 651 644 4510

21456

Feb 22, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's alarming plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is insufficient and should not be approved because, among many reasons, it lacks vital information about centuries-long water treatment and how it might be assured-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. How can anybody seriously entertain a proposal to assure water quality for longer into the future than our country has existed. What person or agency can reliably follow up on transgressions or mishaps over that time. It's almost comic. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest No precious-metal mine anywhere in the world has ever operated successfully in wetlands. More than 900 acres of wetlands would be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment would affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food would be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need would likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. As an Audubon Society member, I take seriously the duty to protect avian wildlife. I ask the US Army Corps of Engineers to explain their reasoning for supporting the Section 404 wetlands permit. I ask the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this dangerous proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ms Mimi Jennings 2222 Hillside Ave Saint Paul, MN 55108-1609

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mimi Jennings

40898

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. This is an exceedingly risky proposal with little upside, which is reason enough to distrust estimates provided by PolyMet without independent state verification. In addition, its parent company's checkered history and that of its board chair demand extra vigilance. That is what I ask you to carry out. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Mimi Jennings 2222 Hillside Ave Saint Paul, MN 55108-1609

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Minnesota Department of Health 42933

Please find a revised comment letter from MDH is attached – the previous version did not have a figure attachment. Thank you. Michele Ross Phone: (651) 201-4927
Email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:michele.ross@state.mn.us"michele.ross@state.mn.us](mailto:michele.ross@state.mn.us) From: Ross, Michele (MDH) Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 1:54 PM To:
*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Cc: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: MDH Comments - NorthMet SDEIS Ms Fay, Please find the Minnesota Department of Health's comments on
the NorthMet SDEIS attached. Thank you for this opportunity to review this project and please feel free to contact me with questions regarding this comment letter or any
other questions related to health impacts. Thank you. Michele Ross Environmental Review Coordinator Health Risk Assessment Unit Environmental Health Division
Minnesota Department of Health 625 North Robert Street PO Box 64975 Saint Paul, MN 55164-0975 Phone: (651) 201-4927 Fax: (651) 201-4727 Email:
[HYPERLINK "mailto:michele.ross@state.mn.us"michele.ross@state.mn.us](mailto:michele.ross@state.mn.us)

Minnesota Environmental Partnership 19176

Good afternoon: Please find attached MEP's request for an extension of the PolyMet/NorthMet comment period. Please do not hesitate to contact Steve Morse, or me, with
any questions. Sincerely, -Matt Matt Norton - Campaign Director [HYPERLINK "mailto:mattnorton@mepartnership-org"mattnorton@mepartnership-org](mailto:mattnorton@mepartnership-org) || direct line: 651-
789-0651 [#1](http://bit.ly/vTFItD) [#1](http://bit.ly/vTFItD) high impact environmental nonprofit in Minnesota by local experts. – Philanthropedia The Minnesota Environmental
Partnership is a coalition of more than 75 environmental and conservation organizations working together for clean water, clean energy and protection of our Great Outdoors.
We engage state leaders, unite environmental efforts and help citizens take action for the Minnesota they love.

43052

See attached

54503

See attachment

54504

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Minnesota Geological Survey 43014

Attached to this email, and also copied below, are comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. Sincerely, Anthony Runkel Chief Geologist Minnesota Geological Survey 2642 University Avenue West St Paul, Minnesota 55114 612-627-4780 ext 222. Comment on the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I recently read much of the November 2013 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) entitled "NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange", as well as several of the reports referenced in the document. The purpose of this commentary is to offer some suggestions that can be considered for improving the conceptual model of hydrogeologic conditions at the proposed Mine Site and Plant Site/Tailings Basin area. Improving the quality of the conceptual model will lead to improved prediction of potential impacts to groundwater, engineering of containment systems, and design of monitoring systems. Broadly summarized, my comments focus on improving the understanding of flow through fractured bedrock. The current conceptual models in the SDEIS characterize the Duluth Complex and Giants Range Batholith bedrock as bulk masses of rock with low, uniform permeability. Although this type of characterization is sometimes deemed sufficient for some purposes, such as numerical modeling of water budgets (flux) at relatively large scales, it has well known deficiencies when applied to numerical modelling of smaller-scale sites, especially for predicting solute transport. Instead, the development of conceptual models that employ techniques whereby discrete fractures or fracture zones are more fully considered, results in improved prediction of solute transport, including better estimates of travel times, and recognition of variation in flow directions and discrete pathways in three dimensions. Investigations aimed at characterizing the hydrogeologic conditions of fractured bedrock for the purposes of predicting solute transport in crystalline bedrock elsewhere on the Canadian Shield routinely use a number of well-known techniques that were not applied in the hydrogeologic studies at the NorthMet Mine Site and Plant Site/Tailings Basin area. A key component of those investigations is the acquisition of hydraulic and water chemistry data at relatively discrete intervals of bedrock, with the focus on fracture characterization. In part this is accomplished through testing and water sampling of boreholes constructed with relatively short open hole intervals at variable depths (eg "nested" wells) and/or discrete interval packer testing and water sampling of long open holes. When these techniques have been used in generally similar hydrogeologic settings elsewhere on the Canadian Shield, the results support hydrogeologic conceptual models that differ substantially from those proposed for the Duluth Complex and Giants Range Batholith described in the SDEIS. Of particular significance for solute transport, the conceptual models commonly include key fractures or fracture zones of relatively high hydraulic conductivity, and multiple flow systems within the bedrock at individual sites. These flow systems are variably connected to the surface water system, have variable residence times, can have upward and downward vertical gradients within a local area, and horizontal flow directions that differ from one another. The data collected thus far from the proposed NorthMet Mine Site and Plant Site/Tailings Basin area are not sufficient to recognize the kinds of hydrogeologic features known to be characteristic of other crystalline bedrock settings on the Canadian Shield, described above. Nor are the data sufficient to adequately support the simpler conceptual model currently depicted in the SDEIS. The comments below specifically address where improvements could be made to the conceptual models for the Mine Site and Plant Site/Tailings basin area. Mine site The SDEIS indicates that hydrogeologic characterization of the mine site i

Minnesota Historical Society 42937

Attached is our comment letter dated 13 March 2013, regarding the Supplemental Draft EIS prepared for the NorthMet Mining Project. -Sarah Beimers Sarah J. Beimers Manager of Government Programs and Compliance | State Historic Preservation Office Minnesota Historical Society | 345 Kellogg Blvd W | St Paul MN 55102 tel: 651-259-3456 | fax: 651-282-2374 | e: HYPERLINK "https://mail.google-com/mail/.view=cmandfs=1andtf=1andto=sarah.beimers@mnhs-org"sarah.beimers@mnhs-org

Minnesota Izaak Walton League 38074

Ms Fay; Please find in the enclosed attachment, comments on North Met SDEIS on behalf of the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League. I also sent you a hard copy via UPS yesterday afternoon with instructions for over-night delivery. This email forward is simply redundancy given the nearness of the 3-13-14 deadline. I have presumed that MDNR will deliver all comments to Co-Lead agencies. Please confirm. On behalf of MN IWLA Dave Zentner, Past National President 2116 Columbus Avenue Duluth, MN 55803 218-724-3926 218-391-6918-cell dzentner@charter-net From: RICHARD AND CAROL STAFFON [mailto:rcstaffon@msn-com] Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 1:53 PM To: David and Margo Zentner Subject: SDEIS Comments Here you go DAve Rich

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Minnesota Nurses Association 40485

Please review the attached letter from the Minnesota Nurses Association in regard to the proposed PolyMet Mining project. Linda Hamilton, RN, President Minnesota Nurses Association 345 Randolph Avenue #200 St Paul, MN 55102 _____ The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments may be proprietary and/or confidential information. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, or use of this e-mail, any attachments, and/or any contents thereof is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us at the e-mail address above.

Minnesota Power 42892

Dear Ms Fay, Please find attached my comments relating to the NorthMet project and land exchange SDEIS. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at 218-341-6004- Al Rudeck

54767

See attachment

54813

See attachment

Miranda Steinmetz 38885

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Miranda Steinmetz 1239 Brainerd Ave Duluth, MN 55811-2427 (715) 271-3183

Miriam Snyder 58068

Stop the mines! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Missy Bailey 43597

Dear Ms Fay, To all who have a vote, Will you please consider the environment above all else and deny the permit for PolyMet. I am not going to restate the reasons that so many others have written but simply say, I live on White Iron Lake in Ely and it is one of the most beautiful places on earth. We have direct access to the BWCA and have enjoyed the peaceful forest and lakes for over 30 years. Please help us preserve the waters in the BWCA. There is no other place like it in the United States and my hope is it will continue to be enjoyed in its pristine state by many generations to come. Thank you for your consideration. Missy Bailey Missy Bailey 1620 Hill Ridge Terrace Minnetonka, MN 55305

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mitch Gunderson-Palmer 10754

My major concern with this proposal is the possible impacts on groundwater. Minnesota still has one of the most unspoiled natural environments and a wealth of clean fresh water. I predict that in the not too distant future clean water will become the most valuable resource on the planet. Any short-term economic gain from the mine would be worthless to us if it contaminated our water and environment. Please be careful.

Mitch Kezar 40211

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mitchell Brunfelt

43580

Dear Sir/Madam: My name is Mitchell J. Brunfelt and I reside at 5751 Rocky Road, Aurora, MN 55705- My e-mail address is mbrunfelt@colosimolaw-com I am submitting this e-mail, as part of the public comment process, to confirm my support for the Polymet draft EIS. First, I would like to note that, as a resident of the eastern end of the Iron Range, I live relatively close to the site of Polymet's proposed processing facilities. In addition, I am an avid outdoorsman and conservationist My family and I spend a considerable amount of time enjoying and engaging in various outdoor, recreational activities in the area fairly close to Polymet's proposed mine site, as members of my family have seasonal cabins in the area of the Skibo road (Partridge River/Colvin Creek area) and between Skibo road County Rd 16- So, we have a deep interest in protecting the environment, particularly in that area. With that being said, I believe that the Polymet draft EIS demonstrates and proves that the science is there to proceed forward with this very worthwhile project and that it can be done while at the same time protecting the local environment. This very detailed and thorough draft EIS shows that modern day science and engineering allow for this type of non-ferrous mining to be done in a way that protects and safeguards the environment. From the draft EIS, it is very clear that Polymet intends to employ the latest advancements in technology, science and engineering to make certain that this project fulfills all environmental safeguards and regulations. Finally, there needs to be a note of reminder here that the site of Polymet's proposed processing facilities (utilizing the former LTV property), and the area surrounding those facilities, already is an existing brownfield, industrial site. Polymet's proposed project will put that site back into a productive use and a use which (with modern day advancements in technology, science and engineering) will likely be more environmentally sound than the existing state of that site. Thank you for the opportunity to submit this commentary in support of the Polymet draft EIS and in support of this very worthwhile and important project. Mitchell J. Brunfelt

MK

39679

I was skeptical at first, but after reading reports and various research I now believe this Project is a wonderful venture. It will give many people jobs and help our local, state and federal economy. Also I read there is a kickback to MN schools fund with the use of the land. This is a great investment for MN growth in many many ways. Keep up the Great work PolyMet.. Michael Krohn 2108 55 St NE Buffalo, MN 55313

MK Smith MD

16611

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, MK Smith MD PleaseUseEmail Mankato, MN 56001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

MK Smith MD

50005

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, MK Smith MD
PleaseUseEmail Mankato, MN 56001

mlanger@goldengate.net

44518

Please do not allow mining in the BWCA. It is a fragile environment and will suffer under this kind of mining. As a resident of Minnesota and a person who enjoys the wilderness, I believe this project should not go forward. Thank you.

MN Chamber of Commerce

42906

From: Harmon, Joan [mailto:JHarmon@mnchamber-com] Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 11:13 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Cc: Kwilas, Tony Subject: Letter Lisa, Please see the attached letter regarding the SDEOIS from Tony Kwilas, Director of Environment Policy at the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce. The original letter is being mailed to your office for you as well. Please contact us if you have any questions. Thank you. JOAN HARMON Public Policy Assistant Minnesota Chamber of Commerce 400 Robert Street North Suite 1500 St Paul, MN 55101 P: 651-292-4695 F: 651-292-4656 HYPERLINK "mailto:jharmon@mnchamber-com"jharmon@mnchamber-com HYPERLINK "http://www.mnchamber-com/"www.mnchamber-com If you print this email, please recycle it. Only a few other materials are as renewable, sustainable and recyclable as paper.

Molly BARTZEN

47092

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. As someone who loves to enjoy the beauty and safety of the North Shore and Boundary Waters I ask you to please consider what we are risking. The damage this mine could cause could last until my great grand children's generation. The costs outweigh the benefits. PolyMet will no be creating long-term jobs for Minnesotans or benefiting the communities they could potentially destroy. Please carefully consider the stakes of this matter. I hope you're not really to risk it either. Sincerely, Ms Molly BARTZEN
6312 Overlook Ct Savage, MN 55378-3617

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Molly Bugamelli

35573

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Threats to the Great Lakes impact not only my home state of Michigan but all of the surrounding states. So much depends upon maintaining the health and integrity of these waters for tourism, the enjoyment of future generations and the surrounding ecosystem. The implications of so much that is done in the name of profit to our waterways is only beginning to be understood. I have watched throughout my lifetime as beaches, lakes and rivers have become unsafe for swimming, their fish unsafe for eating and the environment toxic to the wildlife that have become dependent upon us for their future survival. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Molly Bugamelli 39323 Columbia St Harrison Township, MI 48045-1745 (586) 954-0920

Molly Cooney

42075

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Molly Cooney Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Molly Johnston 45875

Good afternoons, I am writing to express my concern with the proposed PolyMet copper nickel mine operation in NE MN. I have the following concerns and respectfully request a considerable slowdown on the permitting process to adequately address these concerns. Revise the PolyMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrological impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I understand the regulations are in place to ensure adequate safety and environmental standards. I have not seen evidence that PolyMet will be able to responsibly (Financially or environmentally deal with "accidents" that will happen whether true bizarre accidents, or acts of human negligence. I live in Ely, am raising 2 young children and are happy to call this home. We owe it to ourselves and our children's' children to not do anything that will cause irreparable damage to the state and region. We are trusting you and others to watch out for the well being of our community, region and state. Sincerely, Molly Johnston Molly Johnston 737 S. 5th Ave E Ely, MN 55731 218-235-8209 cell: 612-730-0828

Molly Streiff 54838

See attachment

Mona Lee 42644

See attachment

Monaya 40726

I am absolutely opposed to the Polymet mine. How can a few hundred jobs for 20 or so years compare at all to 500 years of pollution. Let's get our priorities straight here. We should be encouraging green energy industries and getting jobs related to those up to the people on the range rather than risking our most precious resource – our water - with such a dangerous undertaking. I am stunned that this project is even being considered. Thank you. Monaya Lund Frazee-Vergas Forum Advertising HYPERLINK "mailto:ads@frazeeforum-com"ads@frazeeforum-com 218-841-7519 _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Monica Hansmeyer

15788

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Monique Reed

27174

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I spent a wonderful summer in northern Minnesota one year, so I know what's at risk. PolyMet Mining Corp.'s NorthMet mining project is not in the best interest of the health of the ecosystem-or the residents of the area. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Why should we expect it to be different here. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Monique Reed 1414 Southern Plantation Dr College Station, TX 77845-8775

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Monique Yenamandra

16109

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Monique Yenamandra 16110

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Montana D 15280

Are you guys crazy. No to copper and nickel mining in northern Minnesota.

Morgan Ekmark 46013

Hello, My name is Morgan Ekmark and I am a second year Metallurgical Engineering Student, minoring in Geology, at South Dakota School of Mines and Technology in Rapid City. I graduated from North Woods High School (first graduating class) in 2012 from Cook Minnesota. I full heartily support Polymet. Here are a few reasons why; 1- Increase in Jobs. 2- Polymet has worked hard in improving its environmental impact. (Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), DNR, 2013) 3- Polymet plans on "refurbishing" the land that will be mined after the project is completed. 4- Mining has changed a great deal since the start of environmental protection acts. 5- A large group of people who are apposing this plan do not even live in the Iron Range area and have no education towards the processes and chemistry involved with sulfide mining. [HYPERLINK "mailto:morgan.ekmark@mines.sdsmt-edu"](mailto:morgan.ekmark@mines.sdsmt-edu)morgan.ekmark@mines.sdsmt-edu Cell: (218) 966-0928 chrome-extension://lifbcibllhkdhoafjfnlhfpfnpldf/call_skype_logo.png(218) 966-0928

Alphabetical by sender's first name

morgii.muraski@yahoo.com

44290

To whom it may concern: I am writing on behalf of young Minnesotans (I myself am a high school senior) who are concerned about the proposal for the copper nickel mine Polymet is attempting to construct. Personally, I firmly stand against the building of such an establishment. The reasons bolstering this opinion are varied and abundant. Firstly, Polymet has no experience dealing with mines of this sort, and building a mine of this magnitude as a "test run" could have devastating consequences. Polymet's promise to maintain and rehabilitate the area during and after mining seems far fetched to say the least. The people of Minnesota have no assurance that Polymet will even be in operation hundreds of years into the future (when the clean up would still be occurring). Further speaking on environmental facets, this mine is essentially an assurance that the Boundary Waters, Minnesota's ecological crown jewel, will be urbanized or destroyed in part. Copper nickel tailings, as you must well know, are extremely dangerous to ecological systems. The environmental impacts are inextricably linked with economic ones. It is clear that Polymet will glean an incredible profit from the mine, but it must be realized that this company boom comes at the expense of stability in neighboring rural communities. Mines such as this perpetuate the boom and bust cycle that plagues mining towns not only in Minnesota, but across the nation. This is not even to touch on the fact that the proposed mine would create far too few jobs for that to be considered an initial benefit. Polymet is preying earnestly on those that are less economically established, and this portrays a devastating lack of propriety on the part of the company. In short, Polymet has neither the means nor the ethical rights to construct this mine. Mining institutions such as this desecrate valuable natural environments and essential ecological resources. Economically speaking, this mine benefits no entity but Polymet. The domineering nature of the proposal is in itself alarming, and Polymet's horridly evident lack of experience does nothing to quell the fears of those who will be impacted by it for hundreds of years to come. The legalities may, in the end, work out in favor of Polymet. However, it can be ascertained by common sense that no company wants to be remembered as one who destroyed lives or the world which we all share.

Moriah Ulbricht

54355

Moriah Ulbricht
Adv. Science; Hour 4
Mrs. Christopherson
February 11th, 2014
Dear Ms. Lisa Fey, EIS Project Manager.
My name is Moriah Ulbricht and I was excited to know that we were writing these letters for science. Why? I already knew about the mining that might take place and I was already quite unhappy about it. I ask that you read this letter, thinking about my statements and opinions with an open mind instead of merely as another child's uneducated thoughts. To begin, have a few questions about the effects of the mining.
• How does this affect the BWCA? This is my main concern about the mining and it's how I knew about it in the first place. Your website stated that, "Neither the proposed mine nor the processing facility is in the watershed containing the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness." This may be true but we all know that harmful toxins can be carried away from the mining site by streams or rivers. So, in thinking that the worst will happen, does the site affect the BWCA in any way shape or form?
• Does the mining site affect any other water bodies?
• Do the mine's benefits outweigh the disadvantages?
I am happy to hear that "PolyMet proposes to avoid and minimize wetland effects by optimizing the placement of mining features such as the mine pits, waste rock and overburden stockpiles, haul roads, water management systems, and supporting infrastructure." I am also pleased that PolyMet wants to minimize their effect on cultural resources. I have one final concern. I feel as though after the 20 or so years of mining; in addition to the 18 mos. of preparation, it would leave about 6,700 acres of land stripped and demolished. Including 913 acres of wetlands that would be permanently lost. That sounds like an awful lot of lost land and it leaves me to wonder, is it worth it? To conclude, if proper safety precautions take place, I am not entirely opposed. However, I am still not in favor of the mining to take place.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mose Picard

6162

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” Reading about the proposed mining project greatly worries me, as a young person, 18 years old, I will live through the effects of this project longer than those who are planning to gain from it. We would not benefit from this in the long run, long after everything is mined deemed of value the effects of this hazardous operation will remain. I am worried about our ecosystems, wildlife will be greatly impacted. Wildlife is not something for us to look at and think it is pleasant, and sacrifice it for short term profit, for short-term jobs. Without our wildlife, there would be nothing. We cannot risk to poison what we have left of our precious wildlife, which is still home to many beautiful species. I am worried that Polymet will poison our waters, our animals, our plants, which has been food and medicine for countless generations. We cannot continue to separate ourselves from the natural world, because after all that can be mined is mined, and there are no jobs, except for toxic clean up jobs, we will realize we have poisoned our precious earth that provided health and happiness, and what is life without that. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Mose Picard mose Picard 2826 Fillmore st NE. Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mr. Evans

41786

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

mr. g. west

40329

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mr g. west everett wa everett, WA 98201 US

Ms. Melody Scott

41624

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Melody Scott Perham, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ms. P. Sullivan

16087

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Muriel

43561

Considering the prospect of disturbing even more of this fragile environment equipped with the present level of human understanding is a true measure of our damning "Uncivilization". The everlasting detriment far outweighs the prospect of any (fleetingly) happy corporation stockholders and the temporary jobs (which will peter out after maybe one generation or two). Every rock turned over to satisfy man's greedy quest is an insult to this Earth we happen to inhabit.. Please do not proceed. We do not know enough to risk so much..

Musa Abdel-Rahman

42790

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Mylee Khristoforov

40456

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Mylee Khristoforov Trenton Denver, CO 80231 US

Myra Arnold

4070

I would like to comment on the proposed mining project in Northern Minnesota. I think we should not go ahead with this project until Polymet comes up with a better plan to monitor and maintain the toxic seepage caused by the mine. So far the mine plan requires an absurd and unachievable level of monitoring and maintenance for many centuries to come. Taxpayers could be left with enormous clean-up costs, polluted water and land and economic disaster. The natural resources in the watershed of Lake Superior are too precious of a national treasure to jeopardize their well-being for centuries to come. Please do your job, DNR, of protecting our natural resources and do not let the plan go forward as it is. Myra Arnold [HYPERLINK "mailto:arnol005@umn-edu"arnol005@umn-edu](mailto:arnol005@umn-edu)

Myra Theimer

47655

Dear Ms Fay, I am concerned that the PolyMet SDEIS does not reveal the effects of fibers in the rock at the Mine Site. If these fibers are toxic and are dug up and released into the air it could pose a significant health risk to Minnesotans that breathe the air either locally or carried in the wind. There are so many unpredictable events that could happen in the next 200 to 500 years, especially with global warming. I can't see how the project can estimate and protect various pollutants, such as mercury, from eventually negatively affecting the ground water. We should be extremely vigilant of protecting our water especially in light of how precious it will be in a warming climate. I think this project and the other projects that are being proposed combined will certainly have a negative effect to human health. Thank you for taking my comments, Myra Theimer Box 1452, Grand Marais, MN mtheimer@boreal-org Boreal Access Web Mailer

Myrl Moran

58024

I think the risks far outweigh the benefits. Let's not do it. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

n. w. hyslop

44312

hi there, i'm writing to register my concerns about the polymet mine proposal. my primary concern is that it seems very shortsighted with respect to environmental impact. while we may only get a few decades-worth of commercial benefit from the mine, minnesotans may be dealing with environmental consequences ranging from water contamination and species dislocation for hundreds of years. we need to be better stewards of our natural resources for the coming generations. thanks for your thoughtful consideration of this project, n. w. hyslop minneapolis

Nadine Lee

11424

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Nadine Lee PO Box 205 Saint Francis, MN 55070-0205

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Najeeb Jindeel

45059

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Najeeb Jindeel 1626 London road #741 Duluth, MN 55812

45060

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Najeeb Jindeel 1626 London road #741 Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

nalco 39249

My mailing address is: NALCO Printing Company – 1 West Water Street Suite 90 – St Paul, MN 55107- _____ From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:15 PM To: nalco Subject: RE: Poly Met mining Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd No virus found in this incoming message. Checked by AVG - www.avg-com Version: 9-0-932 / Virus Database: 3722-1-1/6671 - Release Date: 03/09/14 07:57:00

39268

To the DNR officials considering Copper/Nickel mining in northern Minnesota: Although being sensitive to the issues of employment and future job opportunities in the northern Minnesota area, I have many questions and concerns regarding the environmental impact of copper nickel mining in northern Minnesota. The impact of mining sulphite ores was first brought to my attention while traveling about 35-40 years ago through the Sudbury Ontario area of Canada. While I realize that there have been improvements in mining methods and techniques I was absolutely astounded by the moonscape appearance of the area. The effects of sulphite mining and the potential for polluting the lakes, rivers, underground water tables and the wild rice beds in our state worries many of us. Our family travels north often during the course of the year to utilize the BWCA and park areas in and around Ely and Lake Superior. We are indeed blessed to have these pristine areas in our state. The concerns of many people that I have talked with are that too often officials and agencies have assured us that all the safeguards and sure fired protections are in place on projects such as this. However, we have come to realize that through the use of official variances, oversights and just human error the environment has been degraded and compromised. I believe it is time that we consider the environmental impact of this type of mining, weighing the short term unsustainable gains as opposed to becoming true stewards of our environment. Please be thoughtful and deliberate in making your decisions. Stephen Nippolt President of NALCO Printing Co.

Name Illegible 54123

All this just so someone with lots already can get more? [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Nan Corliss 2757

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I have been a Boundary Waters tourist for many years and to even think about this area being compromised (and it will there is no doubt) makes me sick. The area is a treasure to our state and country and a mine that will pollute the waters and land for years, a mine where accidents WILL happen and leaching WILL take place and polluted waters will stand and seep and damage for many years is unthinkable. How can anyone with a conscience approve such a plan. I don't care how much money a company would put aside for clean up. This does not do anything for clean water and land, a healthy environment or a bright future for tourism or businesses which have to reside and make a living in a damaged area for years. Does it make sense to anyone. NO. Don't let it happen. There will be more regrets than praises in the end. And it will be too late.. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Nan Corliss 10300 Morris Rd Bloomington, MN 55437-2825 (952) 835-6832

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nan Corliss

15819

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nan Corliss 10300 Morris Rd 10300 Morris Rd, Bloomington, MN Bloomington, MN 55437

51943

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I have been a Boundary Waters tourist for many years and to even think about this area being compromised (and it will there is no doubt) makes me sick. The area is a treasure to our state and country and a mine that will pollute the waters and land for years, a mine where accidents WILL happen and leaching WILL take place and polluted waters will stand and seep and damage for many years is unthinkable. How can anyone with a conscience approve such a plan. I don't care how much money a company would put aside for clean up. This does not do anything for clean water and land, a healthy environment or a bright future for tourism or businesses which have to reside and make a living in a damaged area for years. Does it make sense to anyone. NO. Don't let it happen. There will be more regrets than praises in the end. And it will be too late.. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Nan Corliss 10300 Morris Rd Bloomington, MN 55437-2825 (952) 835-6832

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nan Langevin 17876

To whom it may concern, As a lifelong Minnesota native, I am writing to express my great concern and dismay at the prospect of the Polymet copper mine. The possible environmental issues that may plague our beautiful and beloved natural areas for years to come - for the sake a 'blink of the eye' 20+ year job producer - is ridiculous. The mere fact that 500 years is even mentioned as a possible time frame for remediation and clean up processes is a dead give away that the project is completely and absurdly unrealistic. Our country isn't even 500 years old, does anyone actually think that a company entity will last that long. And if they did, that they would cheerfully and willingly pay to clean up their putrid, toxic mess for such an unimaginably long time frame. Honestly, who in good faith could ever realistically propose such a preposterous idea. And for what. Twenty some years of work for a relatively small group of people. People in Northern Minnesota do need good work with liveable wages, but this is not a good solution. It Is a solution proposed by greed and supported by those in desperation. We can do better. Minnesota is innovative and forward thinking. if this is really a priority to our state, then we need to put some effort and resources into finding a healthy, long term, innovative strategy to not just create a few short term jobs, but bolster the economy and nurture the people of our state. I am urging those that have the power at the DNR to please come to their common senses and reject this dangerous, short sighted, small profiting yet incredibly giantly consequential project. Most sincerely, Nan Langevin St Paul, Mn Sent from my iPad

Nan Lightner 46124

I am writing to urge very careful consideration for mining operations in Minnesota. We must think Long term consequences so our children's children will not be grappling with sad and irretrievable outcomes. Good water is "gold", scarce and a necessity for the World. Please do not let your decisions jeopardize its future. Thank you. Sincerely, Nan Lightner 1758 Goodrich Avenue; St Paul, Minnesota 55105

Nan Snyder 42562

See attachment

nan stevenson 7164

I truly oppose any mining activity in the beautiful Minnesota wilderness. Yes, it creates jobs, but only in the short-term and it will pollute the watershed for hundreds of years. Not a good trade-off. We have the ability to recycle old minerals and use renewable sources for energy. I suggest we do that. I do not want to see mining in this area EVER. thank you. Nan Stevenson, M.A., M.A.R.T., C.E.A.P., B.C.C. Chaplain, U of M Amplatz Children's Hospital "If I keep a green bough in my heart, the singing bird will come." Chinese proverb "Faith is not about everything turning out OK; Faith is about being OK no matter how things turn out." Anon. "To love a person is to know the song that is in their heart, and to sing it to them when they have forgotten." Anon. "Be kinder than necessary, for everyone you meet is fighting some kind of battle, so live simply, love generously, care deeply, speak kindly." Anon.

nanakay@unitelc.com 39824

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Alfuth

17037

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nancy Alfuth 421 SW 5th Avenue Grand Rapids, MN 55744

50310

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nancy Alfuth 421 SW 5th Avenue Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy and Jim Ellis 42858

See attachment

nancy atzen 44940

I am concerned that underwater storage of the most toxic category 2/3 and 4 stockpiles will lead to groundwater contamination and potential surface contamination. Once this material is disposed of in this manner it will be impossible to mitigate any unforeseen consequences. If this disposal method is to be followed it must be done with an extremely high level of analysis of the surrounding and underlying rock, any rock fracturing, and hydrologic conditions in and near the pit. If necessary any potential toxic migration must be prevented by sealing or encapsulating the waste mass. If this isn't possible, alternative above ground disposal methods that confine these toxics would need to be evaluated before the project proceeds. Would a benzoate seal on the walls be possible or useful. Perhaps fine grained layers between the more and less toxic wastes would also protect the pond above from seepage of toxics into the surface waters. Thanks for all the hard work on this project. Nancy Atzen 600 west superior st apt 1105 duluth, mn 55802

Nancy Bottorff 38844

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Nancy Bottorff 4128 Sheridan Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-1257 (612) 929-2440

Nancy Bratrud 18343

Hello. My name is Nancy Bratrud. I'm ceding my time to Michael Koppey.

Nancy Brown 18288

My name is Nancy Brown. There is a long history of mining companies declaring bankruptcy to avoid the cleanup of their sites. I feel that if we are going to sign up for 500 or more years of pollution, I would rather take this money, the taxpayer money, that will be spent to clean up that pollution and pay the people who need jobs up north right now. They could work in industries that will promote the long term resilience of the Iron Range and will be supporting the local economy, while preventing my tax dollars and my childrens' tax dollars from going into cleaning up this mine site for hundreds of years to come. That's my statement.

Nancy Carpenter 991

Greetings, My concern is simply put. Any project that relies on several hundred years of continuous water treatment should not be given a moment's consideration. As a society, we can't even count on a company's existence for a few decades, much less 2-5 centuries. The environmental risks and costs are far too great to even come close to balancing out the jobs and boost to the northern Minnesota economy. The mining jobs will mean very little when, not if, but when the contaminated water begins to show its effects. The tourism and hospitality industries of the northland, not to mention the life in the northern wilderness, cannot cope with the inevitable environmental disaster that a mine like this would create. Human beings are not capable of designing and carrying out a flawless plan, and that is what this mine would require. My 2 cents. Nancy P Carpenter 32425 151st Ave Montgomery, MN 56069 651-387-5161 HYPERLINK "mailto:puschcarpenter@gmail-com"puschcarpenter@gmail-com HYPERLINK "mailto:nancy.carpenter@spps-org"nancy.carpenter@spps-org

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Casey

15795

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nancy Conger

41805

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nancy Conger North Branch, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Dowling

36801

Minnesota's natural spaces are too valuable to jeopardize them for the sake of mining. There are far too many risks involved, and history has proven that mining companies often disregard rules and laws created to protect the environment. The SDEIS is insufficient, and should be rejected. It does not provide important information, such as the details of the proposed water treatment systems or how the centuries of operations, maintenance, monitoring and reconstruction of water treatment facilities will be paid for. Sincerely, Nancy Dowling

Nancy Ellis

38713

Not only am I concerned about the mining because of the pollution of the lakes and rivers, but the jobs that are already there, like the Baptism River Inn, the National Forest Lodge, the rice the Indians harvest, the canoe outfitters and camp grounds and many others. Let's try to find other ways of providing jobs that some seem to be so concerned about regardless of what happens to our waters in Minnesota. I am 78 years old and my family and I care about jobs, of course, but not mining sulfide ore in the Boundary Waters watershed and the Lake Superior watershed. That is not the place for it. Nancy Ellis and James J. Ellis, 11051 Russell Ave S Bloomington, Mn. 55431 952 888 3340 On Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 4:55 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Nancy Gibson

18336

I guess I need a class in penmanship. Thank you. Good evening, everybody. My name is Nancy Gibson and I am the co-chair of the Legislative Citizens Commission on Minnesota Resources. In addition, I'm the co-founder of the International Wolf Center. But I want to make it clear that I'm not speaking on behalf of either one of those organizations. However, as a recipient of extensive knowledge from the Geological Service, via the Environmental Trust Fund, I speak with considerable concern for the proposed PolyMet project. Here is what I know: Water will be the agent that will carry any contaminants; No. 2, the proposed project has admitted to some water contamination, via the water modeling data package; No. 3, there are no guarantees that there will not be an unforeseen mishap with water. But here is what we don't know and where there are some faults with the SDEIS. The geological complexity of northeastern Minnesota lacks a high level of investigation, execution me, and testing to achieve stringent management of potential contaminants. The work today doesn't address fracking in the subsurface areas and fracking adequate levels. Three, there are no robust characterizations of those fracking at the mine and processing sites. Four, the monitoring for potential contaminant releases will be difficult or ineffective, yet needs to be examined. Five, lack of effective groundwater maps above the bedrock need to be assessed to better understand the distribution of aquifer and non-aquifer sediments. In summary, this is a (inaudible) system and must be mapped as accurately as possible. This includes the subsurface area for containment and contaminants and meaningful monitoring for it to be achieved. Therefore, I advocate for additional work to characterize those systems. And in addition, there needs to be a development of approximate containment of monitoring systems. While not a perfect science, it will give us one more tool for monitoring of contamination. I will close with what our governor said last week at the Department of Natural Resources Roundtable. The 2008 legislature (inaudible) was the ultimate testament that Minnesotans care deeply about our natural resources. We need to apply an unbiased approach to our natural resources and measure and evaluate all likely outcomes. We need as much scrutiny as possible so that people are getting their monies' worth and that we examine all possible results. Please, advocate for more science. Thank you.

47107

The sulfate standards 10mg/liter has just been re-established as sound science after a 3-year study. These standards are at the upper level limit for the healthy production of wild rice. Sulfides released from mines that interact with sediment bacteria produces high levels of sulfates thus destroying surrounding wild rice plants that need a strong root system. These valuable plants are a good source of food for wildlife and humans. Polymet needs to address the sulfate standards and how they will comply to protect the existing stands of water bodies that were previously documented stands present within a water body dating back to November 28, 1975- The SDEIS lack this compliance issue. Nancy Gibson St Louis Park

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Gibson

58100

I am co-chair of the Legislative Citizens Commission of Minnesota Resources; however I want to make clear that I do not speak for the Commission. Yet, I do speak as a member who has endorsed and supported the accelerated funding of the Minnesota Geologic Service from these lottery proceeds. As a recipient of extensive knowledge from this Geologic Service, I speak with considerable concern about the proposed Polymet project. Here is what we know: Water is the agent that will carry any contaminants. The proposed project has admitted to some water contamination via the water modeling data package. There are no guarantees that there will not be an unforeseen mishap. Here is what we don't know: 1. The geologic complexity of northeastern Minnesota lacks a high level of investigation and testing to achieve stringent management of potential contaminants. 2. The work to date doesn't address fractures in the subsurface areas and their effects to an adequate level. 3. There are no robust characterizations of those fractures at mine and processing sites. 4. The monitoring for potential contaminant releases will be difficult or ineffective yet needs to be examined. 5. Lack of effective groundwater maps above the bedrock needs to be assessed to better understand the distribution of aquifer and non-aquifer sediment types. In summa this is a complex system and must be mapped as effectively as possible. This includes the subsurface areas if containment of contaminants and meaningful monitoring are to be achieved. Therefore, I advocate for additional work to characterize these systems. In addition, there needs to be development of approximate containment and monitoring systems. While not a perfect science, it will give us one more tool of necessary information in this area so that Minnesotans have more knowledge and confidence to make these serious decisions.

58101

A critical omission of the SDEIS is the study of moose and the impact on its population dynamics. The initial Polymet project proposes to drain 93 wetlands in moose habitat. Where will those wetlands be replaced? The trade-off in wetlands may or more likely not aid our dwindling moose population. Are we willing to make that gamble? The SDEIS does not mention Minnesota's latest designation of moose as a species of special concern: a species that has been decreasing in alarming numbers. Yet/ a species that has also garnered significant state research dollars/ some of which comes from the State's Environmental Trust Fund that I co-chair. A current study with radio-collared moose will map locations that will give us an applicable estimate of wetland use in this region. Water and moose are inseparable. 1. To date, there has been a lot moose research conducted in northern Minnesota more in Royale located miles the coast Minnesota. Isle Roya has similar habitat to northeastern Minnesota with bedrock and sedimentary layering that creates ample forms of water. To maximize reserves for survival, moose rely on high quality forage summer months. Aquatic habitats are readily selected because 20% higher crude protein and times more nitrogen ca atom comparison to terrestrial plants. In a 2011 published study, it was found that moose slightly prefer submergent vegetation such as yellow pond lily, they did not discriminate amongst rhizomes, stems and flowers from the 88 species observed. Most of the activity between moose and aquatic foraging occurred on the inland western region of the Island that is rich wetlands and small ponds. This summer intake of nutrients is important for pregnancy rates the subsequent year. What we don't know??? How will sulfides vegetation needed for moose survival? copper mining affect the aquatic vegetation needed for moose survival? 2. A 1983 scientific paper published by noted researcher Rolf Peterson and P. Stephens, summarized that moose calves are born near water. It is a critical predator avoidance strategy for moose. What we don't know??? How will fewer water resources affect the calf/cow ratio? 3. In 1987, researcher Timothy Ackerman showed that the radio-collared moose suffer from heat related stress and need the wetlands and other waterways to cool their bodies. What we don't know??? Will fewer heat sink water resources cause additional stress for moose? 4. The final paper I will site is by Clifford and Witmer (2004) which describes the facial anatomy of the moose that ends with a long overhanging nose that is specifically adapted to aquatic feeding up to 16 feet below the surface. What we don't know??? Will the sulfides sink to the lower water levels affecting the nutritional value of aquatic vegetation and for how long? The interrelationship between water and moose is a gaping hole in this document a can make me if other aquatic species such as amphibians, turtles, mussels a fish have received any attention and scientific on their survival needs.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Giguere

18947

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Nancy Giguere 1471 Edmund Ave 1471 Edmund Ave St Paul, MN 55104 651-642-1378

Nancy Graham Rich

38430

Thank you for giving the people of Minnesota the opportunity to weigh in on this issue. I have been going to the BWCA off and on for many years, and I can't believe that mining as described will in any way NOT affect the BWCA area, the water and the future for that area. The small amount of jobs that would occur with the mining for the short period of time that they are mining does not seem like a good balance for the state and nation in this area. There is also NO confirmation that the people getting the jobs would be from the northern area of Minnesota at all. The jobs could go to people out of state and therefore would be of no benefit to the people of that area. Even if they set aside a billion dollars for clean-up of the area after the mining, it will no longer be the pristine area that it is now. You can't take back what you destroy in nature. We want to preserve that area for our grandchildren and beyond, so that they can learn to appreciate and enjoy what a national treasure that is there. Please listen carefully to the people opposed to this mining operation because what you do if you allow the mining to occur cannot change our environment back to what it is now clean and untouched by man. We need to be good stewards of God's environment and all he has entrusted to us. Thank you, Nancy Graham Rich 20891 Aztec St NW Anoka, MN 55303 763-753-1225

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Hauer

14806

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Nancy Homdron

57883

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Karjalahti

12111

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Nancy L Eisinger

54726

See attachment

nancy locken

41815

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, nancy locken Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Long

39584

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Long

39650

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

nancy lt rosenbower

47667

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. i am unable to decide a hierarchy of importance when it comes to issues related to the polymer mining and future mining/exploitative industries in the area. thus, i have chosen this particular area to address. over the years, my family and i have spent much time in the mountains of colorado and the deserts of utah. to see the leftovers and the unintended consequences of the silver, nickel, gold, uranium and copper mining is eye opening. there is no way that what appears to be quite a slippery company and an equally slippery plan should be allowed to further destroy our planet and its inhabitants. There has been enough done. They say there will be an excellent economic impact (jobs). well, that's great for 10- 20 years not mining. then, perhaps there will be further job security if you are in the business of cleaning up poisons and treating horrific medical conditions. maybe even a mortician. ad all of the beautiful creatures that share this magnificent jewel in space need to have advocates assuring their interests will be considered. the children, the moose, the lynx, the squirrel, the wolf, eagle, and so many, many from microscopic to giant are counting on us to stand between them and their nearly certain destruction. we have no obligation to green the pockets of these film-flam men/women. i have read some of their papers presented to groups of others representing their interests. they are not in this for the good of the many. they are in this purely for the dollars. they have spoken about the fact that there is an increasing amount of regulation on mining interests, causing the profitability to drop. they have even go so far as to explain to their peers that the next big thing would be fracking and the mining of tracking sand. due to the fact

Nancy McReady

6602

Attach are the comments from our organization Conservationists with Common Sense (CWCS). Nancy McReady CWCS President [HYPERLINK "http://www.cwcs-org/"](http://www.cwcs-org/) 218-365-5764 218-365-2922 Conservationists with Common Sense "Preserving access to and multiple use of public lands and waters"

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy McReady

18124

My name is Nancy McReady. I'm from Ely. Actually I live on Fall Lake which is in the (inaudible) 4,000 people all across the United States. Back in the 1970's environmental organizations made us a little bit more aware of pollution and environmental issues. We have the Clean Water and Air Act due to their efforts. Also in the 1970's there was much talk about wanting to mine copper-nickel. Well, that didn't happen as we didn't have strict pollution regulations. Times have changed. We have more pollution and environmental regulations to protect our water and air than we did 40 years ago. And right along with those regulations we have far better mining technology. So-called environmental groups are making the same arguments today as they did 40 years ago. "It's never been done before." "All copper-nickel mines pollute." They have become extreme preservation groups against economic development. These preservation groups refuse to acknowledge advances in mining technology instead of embracing new technology and working with PolyMet and others. They have done the same with lobbying. These are the same groups that have opposed a cell phone tower near Fall Lake (inaudible). This is all outside of the Bound Waters. "Too close to the Boundary Waters." The Boundary Waters has no buffer zone. The environmental community should be ashamed of themselves. They should be embracing new technology and working together to make this project happen. Conservation and common sense supports the SDEIS and the permitting process of the PolyMet project. We support scientific data and objective analysis of the government agencies and the elected officials when making and implementing land management and environmental policies. Public input is also important. But hopefully science will prove or disprove if PolyMet can be done safely. And that decision making isn't left up to the courts and environmental (inaudible). Enough with the delays. Let's get this project going. Thank you.

46937

Dear Ms Fay, My husband and I have lived on Fall Lake (in the Kawishiwi watershed) for nearly forty years. We care very much about the Boundary Waters and we do have concerns about the water in our lake, but the PolyMet copper/nickel mining project is not one of them. We know PolyMet is not in the same watershed as the Boundary Waters. We have followed the progress of PolyMet for over eight years. We believe the SDEIS prepared by the three agencies is a good document and addresses environmental issues thoroughly. The technology of today is far superior to that which was used in the copper mines of years ago. There are several precious metal mines that are operating today, or which have operated recently, without harm to the surrounding environment. For environmental groups to say that precious metal mining has never been done safely is not true. Flambeau Copper Mine in Wisconsin, Stillwater platinum-palladium sulfide in Montana near Yellowstone National Park, McLaughlin Gold Mine in California, Viburnum Zinc Mine in Wisconsin, the Cannon Gold Mine in Washington – all of these mines have taken great care of the environment. Some even have partnerships with environmental groups to make sure the environment is not harmed. We support the SDEIS process the PolyMet project is going through and have faith in the agencies to approve the permit to mine if the science is there to prove that PolyMet can do the mining right. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Nancy and Doug McReady P O Box 252 Ely, MN 55731

47621

Dear Ms Fay, One thing we forgot to mention in our comments on the PolyMet SDEIS is the fact that mining these strategic metals here in Minnesota, where there are strict environmental regulations, is a matter of national security. In an article from 2012, <http://www.wired-com/dangerroom/2012/08/rare-earth-elements/> it was stated that in 2009, Congress was asking the Pentagon HYPERLINK "<http://www.wired-com/dangerroom/2009/08/defense-geeks-fret-over-rare-earth-metal-supplies/>" to look for alternatives and lessen the US dependency on foreign imports after the Chinese government said HYPERLINK "<http://www.wired-com/dangerroom/2009/08/china-all-your-rare-earth-metals-belong-to-us/>" it was considering limiting exports of the minerals. China has 95% control of many of the precious metals that are needed for our national defense. The article goes on to say, "The DoD would like to find ways to produce more rare earth elements here in the States. The first proposal is to find a way to improve separation. Efficiency is not the only concern. The Pentagon wants new, environmentally "less-aggressive techniques," to separate rare earth elements from minerals. Finding new ways to do it "would improve the availability, decrease the costs of extraction, and decrease the environmental impact of the extraction," says the proposal." We believe the new technology is available and PolyMet, and Twin Metals to follow, will be able to aid the Pentagon with recovery of these precious metals and make the United State strategic metal independent. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Nancy and Doug McReady P O Box 252 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

nancy miller

39699

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet is a disaster in the making, no matter what protestations of prevention and repair PolyMet is making. The cost is too great, exchanging our beautiful natural resources for a handful of jobs for the short haul. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Nancy Miller 1201 Yale Pl Apt 611 Minneapolis, MN 55403-1956 (612) 333-5135

47483

To whom it may concern, Please stop Polymet. I am for responsible mining, and the proposed mine will further pollute our waters. I know 2 men who died from cancer within the past 9 months who lived in Aurora. In my own neighborhood near Eveleth, 5 people within a 3 block radius have died from various cancers and another 5 others who have had cancer / or tumors including myself twice, who are surviving. Please listen to us- these decisions are irreversible in our lifetime, have little economic benefit, and definitely have a heavy financial and health cost that seriously outweighs the economic benefit. Please listen to reason. Sincerely, Nancy Miller

Nancy Norr

18352

Thank you. My name is Nancy Norr. N-O-R-R. I am the director of regional development for Minnesota Power. I have a master's degree in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I spent a quarter of a century as an economic development professional in this region. Also currently my (inaudible) jobs as a Minnesotan. A state-wide coalition of labor, business and local industry, as well as units of government. And on behalf of those 55,000 labor union members, and as well as the 2500 businesses and other organizations that we represent, I want to commend the regulatory agencies for working closely together to reach this important milestone. The economic basis in this region is and always will be mining. The growth of this industry is critical to the this region and will support a way of life for generations to come. In the SDEIS is the economical impact of the NorthMet project, EIS Section 5.2.10, and refers to these impacts in other sections of the report. The report quantifies the direct, indirect and induced employment effects of the construction and operating phases of the employment effects and the mine utilizing the implant model. The University of Minnesota-Duluth Department of Labor and Bureau of Economic Research performed an analysis using prudent and reasonable assumptions and was conducted in accordance to the requirements under the law. The integrity of the model and research team that performed the work was the highest caliber. The implant model was designed in the 1970's under the auspices of the Forest Service and updated over time with the University of Minnesota. The model has been used extensively since its inception by prior businesses, as well as state and federal government entities, including the Obama Administration, the EPA and Federal Reserve Bank. Users of the model, including schools, gather regularly to share information and to work together to enhance its features and its peer reviews. Critics of the SDEIS (inaudible) in mining closure have to be factored in. I would suggest that although the permitting process has been based on a 20-year mining plan, the vast resources of the Duluth complex indicates that responsible mining can continue for centuries to come, just as iron mining has been conducted here for years. In my day-to-day work at (inaudible), I see the no-action alternative. The "no-action alternative" is a death sentence for the communities of the east Iron Range. I don't know how you quantify empty storefronts and classrooms and boarded up houses. I don't know how you quantify families moving away. This is a thorough SDEIS and we are prepared to move forward in the permitting phase. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Norr

47282

Dear Ms Fay: On behalf of your colleagues at the DNR, EMS, the US Forest Service, and Army Corps of Engineers, please accept my sincere thanks and appreciation for the highly professional handling of the information sharing on the PolyMet project. The three public events were very well managed and provided the public with incredible resources. The web site information, fact sheets and videos have also raised the bar on how projects of complex and often controversial nature should be handled. In my 25 years of experience as an economic development professional, I've never come across an opportunity as important to northeastern Minnesota's economic future as copper-nickel mining. A significant economic base for this region is and will remain mining. The growth of this industry is critical to the long term success of the region and will support a way of life for generations to come. The economic opportunity stretches from the environmental technician at the mine site in Hoyt Lakes to the engineering professionals located in downtown Duluth. PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project represents a continuation of our strong mining tradition. As the public comment period for the project's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) comes to a close, we are one step closer to bringing 360 full-time mining jobs to the Range and more than 600 spinoff jobs in other industries. These are career opportunities that our young people need to support families. Too often in Greater Minnesota we see empty storefronts and classrooms and industrial parks. Long-time residents are forced to move their families out of town to find work. This is the present, but it does not have to be the future – we can have thriving communities again. Every development – from new office buildings to housing developments to airports to the highways that bring vacationers to northern Minnesota – impacts the landscape. All businesses and industries in this region, including those that transport and process natural resources, potentially impact on the environment and human health. That is why we have multiple local, state and federal agencies tasked with ensuring each project is designed adequately to address its ability to mitigate potential environmental impacts. Our former mines are now lakes that enhance our environment and by bringing mining companies and communities together, the Laurentian Vision Partnership guides future land use after mining closure. The nay-sayers keep referring to a 20-year mine and suggest the benefits are temporary. But the vast resources of the Duluth Complex indicate responsible mining could continue for many more years – just as iron mining has existed for a century. The benefits from copper-nickel mining will be felt by generations of hard-working Minnesotans. Copper-nickel mining will provide millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support our communities and educational systems and will create a domestic source for metals essential to our quality of life. Furthermore, our state has some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country, and the environmental review process for the NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. Keeping jobs here and doing mining the right way is arguably the real definition of economic and environmental justice. It would be irresponsible to import these metals from countries that do not have strict environmental standards when Minnesota has the opportunity to mine responsibly. As a state, we have the opportunity to enter a new era of mining that will create hundreds of jobs, foster a strong economic future for Minnesota families and bring families back to this area. These families will sustain and build the future vitality of this region. We do not have to choose between economic growth and protecting our environment. We can have both. Please share my thanks with Commissioner Landwehr. Sincerely, Nancy Norr cc: Rep. Tom Huntley Sen. Roger Reinert Nancy Norr 3

Nancy O'Bryan

23130

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Please make very sure that this project will not harm the quality of Great Lakes water before you approve the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine. Sincerely, Nancy O'Bryan 8635 Silver Creek Dr Novelty, OH 44072-9694 (440) 338-5350

Nancy Olson

58034

I do not agree with Poly Met's environmental impact statement. I have seen the "deal river" with trout fishing a vegetation destroyed by copper mining, which is the Clark Fork River that flows on the Eastside of Missoula Mt. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Patrick

385

Dec 10, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nancy Pena

39555

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Nancy Pena 535 Kim Ln Owatonna, MN 55060-2743

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Pius

6178

<http://www.nmworg-org/> The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is Inadequate Economic Impacts The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. Permanent Water Pollution PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. Annually, 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater without being treated. The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The Mine Plan Requires an Absurd and Unachievable Level of Monitoring and Maintenance for Many Centuries Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 requires that the site must be maintenance-free at closure, but the PolyMet mining plan calls for at least 500 years of active water treatment. 526 acres of land, covered by more than 167 million tons of waste rock, would be covered by a plastic sheet and surrounded by a system that would supposedly collect contaminated seepage. All would require monitoring and maintenance constantly for hundreds of years to fix leaks, repair perforations, and remove deep-rooted plants. A mining pit "lake" would require pumping to prevent the toxic brew of acid and heavy metals from spilling into the nearby Partridge River, and a tailings basin pond would require

Nancy Sampson

57214

Let clean water be our legacy – not toxic pollution from mining!NO to PolyMet's 20 years of mining @ the headwaters of the St. Louis River – NO to 500 years of toxic runoff. REJECT the land exchange.Nancy Sampson2508 East 22nd StMinneapolis, MN 55406

Nancy Schuldt

48546

Good afternoon: I certainly didn't need any more conflicting information to process at this moment while I am trying to complete comments on behalf of the Fond du Lac Band, but this is very troubling to me. John's 'discovery' is also relevant to a comment I've been struggling to articulate, regarding how the ash dump is proposed to be dealt with under the proposed project; like many other issues in the SDEIS, it seems to be getting kicked down the road for future permitting discussions. But if the plant site model has been constructed to not incorporate the ash dump (which is full of toxics), when in fact it does, this is another significant potential source of contaminant loading that is not accounted for in the water modeling and water quality predictions. At literally the eleventh hour of a 90-day public comment period, we just shouldn't be trying to figure out basic model construction, source loads, and water quality impacts; it should be clear in the SDEIS. To the extent that you can provide any feedback to John's discovery or my question before 4:30 tomorrow, I would very much appreciate it. Otherwise, you might re-consider extending the comment period to allow all of us the time we need to truly understand how the models have informed environmental impact predictions. Thank you, Nancy Schuldt Water Projects Coordinator Fond du Lac Environmental Program 1720 Big Lake Road Cloquet, MN 55720 218-878-7110 ph 218-878-7168 fax

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Schultz

40896

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Nancy Gail Schultz 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 All the reasons that support the permitting of the PolyMet mine will disappear when we have destroyed the natural resources which we depend on to keep us healthy. The PolyMet SDEIS completed by the world's most polluting industry suggest that they now have a way to preform extraction of sulfide containing metals safely, this however has no credible foundation in which to support this statement. In fact, there is more data to suggest just the opposite. All the proposed methods in this SDEIS are not new, and if they were, testing them in a highly sensitive wetland and environmentally rich native wild rice ecosystem sounds like a really bad idea. The consequences of polluting our water, with its highly varied flow patterns and rates system, is too great for the short term gains of a mining economy. I am an owner of a small business that serves public entities in creating sustainable improvement solutions for their facility infrastructure. Our services rely heavy on the integrated assessment of all systems that impact the operation of a portfolio of buildings. One of our first lines of defense in creating a sustainable building is to focus first on conservation measures. Reducing the need for energy to operate a buildings greatly reduces our need to depend on unstable energy costs and expensive/environmentally destructive mechanical and electrical systems needed to keep its occupants comfortable. This is one of many ways we can reduce the need for materials that are obtained at great risks to our natural resources, such as what is being proposed by this SDEIS. Ultimately a sustainable business practice is a closed loop systems that has no waste/pollution. Being fully aware that this is an ever evolving lofty goal, it is one of that provides little down side. This proven approach is good for the economy, good for our health and good for the environment. To move us in this direction, we should not be taking risks that have irreparable damage and depend on quality control processes that must be in place forever. Following are a list of questions that summarize why I do not think the SDEIS effectively manages the risk associated with irreparable destruction of our natural resources: •Why doesn't the statement require that the 939 acres of wetland being destroyed, at the very least be replaced with wetlands that do the same job and serve the same habitat and the same streamS It doesn't deliver this hence destroying 68% of the wetlands by not having them associated with the Lake Superior Basin at all. •The SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine will directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands. It then says that as much as another 7,351 acres of wetlands could be lost due to pollution and changes to water patterns in the mina dn tailings site. Why aren't there alternatives provided in the SDEIS to avoid or minimize this wetlands loss. •When flooding occurs during the 10 and 100-year rains, why isn't there a plan or indication of impacts for how the waste area will impact the waters when this massive acres of waste storage is flooded. •PolyMet sulfide mine tailings will be stored on top of the old, already leaking, LTV tailings dump. This site is an unlined pile about two miles across set on top of peat and streamS It was built for taconite, not for sulfide mining, at a time when they wanted tailings piles to leak so they would be less unstable. There will be no liner under the new sulfide mine tailings. This tailings pile will need to be treated forever, how do you put a cost and sureties on forever. •The tailings basin is proposed to be completely unlined, there is no indication that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants, which is completely unrealistic. Further indicating the high level risk we are going to take because of these assumption that the tailings site has no potential of transporting polluti

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Schultz

40897

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Nancy Gail Schultz 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 All the reasons that support the permitting of the PolyMet mine will disappear when we have destroyed the natural resources which we depend on to keep us healthy. The PolyMet SDEIS completed by the world's most polluting industry suggest that they now have a way to preform extraction of sulfide containing metals safely, this however has no credible foundation in which to support this statement. In fact, there is more data to suggest just the opposite. All the proposed methods in this SDEIS are not new, and if they were, testing them in a highly sensitive wetland and environmentally rich native wild rice ecosystem sounds like a really bad idea. The consequences of polluting our water, with its highly varied flow patterns and rates system, is too great for the short term gains of a mining economy. I am an owner of a small business that serves public entities in creating sustainable improvement solutions for their facility infrastructure. Our services rely heavy on the integrated assessment of all systems that impact the operation of a portfolio of buildings. One of our first lines of defense in creating a sustainable building is to focus first on conservation measures. Reducing the need for energy to operate a buildings greatly reduces our need to depend on unstable energy costs and expensive/environmentally destructive mechanical and electrical systems needed to keep its occupants comfortable. This is one of many ways we can reduce the need for materials that are obtained at great risks to our natural resources, such as what is being proposed by this SDEIS. Ultimately a sustainable business practice is a closed loop systems that has no waste/pollution. Being fully aware that this is an ever evolving lofty goal, it is one of that provides little down side. This proven approach is good for the economy, good for our health and good for the environment. To move us in this direction, we should not be taking risks that have irreparable damage and depend on quality control processes that must be in place forever. Following are a list of questions that summarize why I do not think the SDEIS effectively manages the risk associated with irreparable destruction of our natural resources: •Why doesn't the statement require that the 939 acres of wetland being destroyed, at the very least be replaced with wetlands that do the same job and serve the same habitat and the same stream. It doesn't deliver this hence destroying 68% of the wetlands by not having them associated with the Lake Superior Basin at all. •The SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine will directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands. It then says that as much as another 7,351 acres of wetlands could be lost due to pollution and changes to water patterns in the mine and tailings site. Why aren't there alternatives provided in the SDEIS to avoid or minimize this wetlands loss. •When flooding occurs during the 10 and 100-year rains, why isn't there a plan or indication of impacts for how the waste area will impact the waters when this massive acres of waste storage is flooded. •PolyMet sulfide mine tailings will be stored on top of the old, already leaking, LTV tailings dump. This site is an unlined pile about two miles across set on top of peat and stream. It was built for taconite, not for sulfide mining, at a time when they wanted tailings piles to leak so they would be less unstable. There will be no liner under the new sulfide mine tailings. This tailings pile will need to be treated forever, how do you put a cost and sureties on forever. •The tailings basin is proposed to be completely unlined, there is no indication that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants, which is completely unrealistic. Further indicating the high level risk we are going to take because of these assumption that the tailings site has no potential of transp

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Schultz

49087

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Nancy Gail Schultz 9926 National Forest Lodge Rd Isabella, MN 55607 All the reasons that support the permitting of the PolyMet mine will disappear when we have destroyed the natural resources which we depend on to keep us healthy. The PolyMet SDEIS completed by the world's most polluting industry suggest that they now have a way to preform extraction of sulfide containing metals safely, this however has no credible foundation in which to support this statement. In fact, there is more data to suggest just the opposite. All the proposed methods in this SDEIS are not new, and if they were, testing them in a highly sensitive wetland and environmentally rich native wild rice ecosystem sounds like a really bad idea. The consequences of polluting our water, with its highly varied flow patterns and rates system, is too great for the short term gains of a mining economy. I am an owner of a small business that serves public entities in creating sustainable improvement solutions for their facility infrastructure. Our services rely heavy on the integrated assessment of all systems that impact the operation of a portfolio of buildings. One of our first lines of defense in creating a sustainable building is to focus first on conservation measures. Reducing the need for energy to operate a buildings greatly reduces our need to depend on unstable energy costs and expensive/environmentally destructive mechanical and electrical systems needed to keep its occupants comfortable. This is one of many ways we can reduce the need for materials that are obtained at great risks to our natural resources, such as what is being proposed by this SDEIS. Ultimately a sustainable business practice is a closed loop systems that has no waste/pollution. Being fully aware that this is an ever evolving lofty goal, it is one of that provides little down side. This proven approach is good for the economy, good for our health and good for the environment. To move us in this direction, we should not be taking risks that have irreparable damage and depend on quality control processes that must be in place forever. Following are a list of questions that summarize why I do not think the SDEIS effectively manages the risk associated with irreparable destruction of our natural resources:

- Why doesn't the statement require that the 939 acres of wetland being destroyed, at the very least be replaced with wetlands that do the same job and serve the same habitat and the same streamS It doesn't deliver this hence destroying 68% of the wetlands by not having them associated with the Lake Superior Basin at all.
- The SDEIS admits that the sulfide mine will directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands. It then says that as much as another 7,351 acres of wetlands could be lost due to pollution and changes to water patterns in the mina dn tailings site. Why aren't there alternatives provided in the SDEIS to avoid or minimize this wetlands loss.
- When flooding occurs during the 10 and 100-year rains, why isn't there a plan or indication of impacts for how the waste area will impact the waters when this massive acres of waste storage is flooded.
- PolyMet sulfide mine tailings will be stored on top of the old, already leaking, LTV tailings dump. This site is an unlined pile about two miles across set on top of peat and streamS It was built for taconite, not for sulfide mining, at a time when they wanted tailings piles to leak so they would be less unstable. There will be no liner under the new sulfide mine tailings. This tailings pile will need to be treated forever, how do you put a cost and sureties on forever.
- The tailings basin is proposed to be completely unlined, there is no indication that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants, which is completely unrealistic. Further indicating the high level risk we are going to take because of these assumption that the tailings site has no potential of transporting pollutio

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Shih-Knodel

16089

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nancy Solberg

41966

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Nancy Solberg 1211 Archibald Ct Northfield, MN 55057-2808

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nancy Songer

39187

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: It's legacy time, folks. If you approve a faulty water model, inaccurate water flow assumptions, and all the other problems inherent in the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS, you will be sentencing current and future humans (not just Minnesotans.) to a legacy of poisoning in the foundation of all life, water. Not even close to worth the risk. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nancy Songer 8010 275th Ave NE North Branch, MN 55056

Nancy Youngdahl

10790

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I am also concerned about the Moose population impact and the effect on wild rice production. Nancy Youngdahl 3712 W. 57th Street Edina, MN 55410 Sincerely, Mrs Nancy Youngdahl 3712 W 57th St Edina, MN 55410-2332

Alphabetical by sender's first name

NAOMI LITTELL

40361

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, NAOMI LITTELL 514 N 41ST ST PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104 US

Natali Kraeva

40292

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Natali Kraeva Colonial dr Tampa, FL 33613 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Natalie A Carter 42490

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Natalie A Carter 562 Maple Ave Newark, OH 43055-5936

Natalie Alexander 42469

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Natalie Alexander 707 Cantor Irvine, CA 92620-3846

Natalie Duncan 44813

Natalie Duncan 1740 Bohland Avenue St Paul, Minnesota 5516 How many years will it take to clean up the mess the PolymMet mining project is certain to create. Multiple organizations and individuals, from nonprofits to passionate environmentalists, have repeatedly warned on the cons if this project goes through. To name a few, the destruction of the habitats of Minnesota's wildlife, and the irreversible and indisputable damage to the nearby water sources. Are we really willing to pay the cost for small and short-term benefits. Some of PolyMet's stated benefits include the extraction of abundant copper-nickle and more job creation. The natural resources up north are rich, but the resources will not last forever. In fact, PolyMet has put out no information on how long the copper-nickle will last and when they will have to strike again. They also say that many jobs will be reared. In reality, it is only around 350 jobs and in the long-run these jobs are not solutions to the job crisis. The so-called benefits are flawed and outweighed by the cons.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Natalie Hoidal

47018

Hello, My name is Natalie. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota, Morris studying biology and environmental studies. I have grown up in Minnesota, and much of my family is from the iron range. In fact, my family came to Minnesota in the first place because of mining jobs. While I appreciate and respect our Northern communities and the work that sustains them, I have also studied our Northern ecosystems. I completed my senior seminar this year on sulfide cycling in wetlands, and as a part of this process I analyzed the Polymet proposal and the ecosystems surrounding the proposed mine site. As you are well aware, sulfates and sulfides are incredibly toxic under the proper conditions, primarily in wetlands. If anything were to go wrong with this project as sulfides were to leak faster or in greater quantities than expected, the surrounding habitats would be forever lost. Sulfides are directly toxic to the parenchyma tissue of aquatic plants like wild rice. However, generalist species such as cattails are better adapted to toxic environments. Polymet admits in its plan that 1600 acres of wetlands will be impaired by the process, which will lead to the destruction of current habitat, but will also allow more invasive species to take hold, which will have impacts far beyond the 1600 acres. In addition, the fact that Polymet has asked the state to reconsider the sulfide standard, which has been universally accepted in the scientific community since John Moyle's discovery of sulfide toxicity in wetlands in the 1930s and 40s, begs the question of whether or not it is truly in Polymet's best interest to follow our state's standards. In addition, while the project will inevitably create jobs, the wild rice in its proximity also supports the livelihoods and cultural identity of hundreds of individuals. If this company impacts the wild rice, will the jobs be worth it. Secondly, the EPA estimates that Americans only recycle 25% of their electronics. This means that as we stand currently, there is no need to mine these metals. We already have abundant metals in our homes and in landfills. Before mining, why don't we set up better recycling programs (which would create jobs) and prove that we actually know how to use our resources before exploiting our fragile ecosystems for more. As a young person in Minnesota, I have fought tirelessly for renewable energy, pipeline regulation, and a cleaner, healthier environment. Minnesota has some of the best environmental regulations in the world, so we're in a great place to continue that tradition and to lead the country in renewable technologies. This company has no reason to carry on that legacy. I believe that at some point, the Duluth complex will be mined. So while I'm not inherently opposed to mining, this company is not the one to do the job. Minnesota has great regulations, but Polymet does not. Their subsidiary Glencore has a horrible human rights record as well as a poor environmental record. The company has no financial incentives to invest in keeping Minnesota clean and beautiful, to employ local workers, or to keep the money generated in our communities. At a recent Enbridge hearing, a commissioner on the PUC told the company "Minnesota does not need your company, you need our state." We don't need Polymet, they need our minerals. So to settle for a company with a terrible track record that has already asked our state to reconsider our standards seems crazy. Thank you for reading so many comments and allowing Minnesotans to be a part of this process, Natalie Hoidal

Sources: 2004- Sulfate in Drinking-water: Background document for development of WHO Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality, in: Organization, W.H. (Ed.). 2011- The sulfate standard to protect wild rice: study protocol - DRAFT, in: Agency, M.P.C. (Ed.). Agency, M.P.C., 2011- The sulfate standard to protect wild rice: study protocol. DRAFT. Engstrom, D.R., 2010- A review of the NorthMet draft environmental im

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Natalie Holdal

18186

My name is Noah Shavit-Lonstein. I'm from St. Paul, Minnesota. And I would like to actually cede my time to someone not wearing a suit. And that is my friend Natalie Holdal. Hi. My name is Natalie Holdal. N-A-T-A-L-I-E, H-O-L-D-A-L. I'm a student at the University of Minnesota (inaudible). I want to thank the DNR. I think it's pretty cool that we live in a state where we can all get together in a room and talk like this. One of the things that is missing in this room is youth representation. And we anticipated that coming into this. A couple of friends and I this month came up with a youth petition. And over the last two weeks we have gotten over 500 student signatures against sulfide mining. And given that we the young people in this state inherit the consequences of this decision, I think it's pretty important to consider what we are saying. And when (inaudible) who pays for pollution, and that is going to be us. So I'm just going to give two of my personal reasons for opposing this. The first is, I admit I use a cell phone. I have a computer. There is a need for these metals. But these metals already exist. The EPA estimates that only 25 percent of our electronics are actually recycled. And so it seems a little bit wasteful that we are continuing to mine for more when we haven't figured out how to use the ones that we already have. Secondly, I am a biology student. And this last semester a seminar on sulfides cycling through wetlands. And one of the things studied -- I studied a little bit of the PolyMet proposal, but also impacts on wild rice. And the DNR obviously has more qualifications than I do as an undergrad to analyze that. But I found that wild rice is incredibly fragile. And if anything goes wrong with this proposal, the wild rice that brought people to Northern Minnesota in the first place, and that continues to sustain the livelihood and the cultures of thousands, maybe hundreds, of people, if that is destroyed, then this project is completely disastrous. And so a couple people have gotten up and said, "Minnesota has the best environmental regulations in the world. Why are we not doing it here if the alternatives are shipping it overseas?" And I would like to point out that Glencore, one of the primary investors behind this project, has a mine in Zambia where they are currently polluting the water. And so I just want to conclude by saying that these are huge risks that this project has. And I don't want to live the rest of my life dealing with those consequences, and neither do these 500 young people.

Natalie Obee

9619

I do not support the PolyMet Mining Project in northern Minnesota. The other issues notwithstanding, the potential 500-year clean up and the undetermined nature of who pays for that clean up, are reason enough to not green light this project. Minnesota and its inhabitants are justifiably proud of our natural environment; letting business interests pull mineral resources out and leave us, the taxpayers, to foot the bill in the event of an environmental problem, is absolutely and completely irresponsible. Watching our state agencies and some of the public be swayed by the lure of a paltry few hundred jobs, is pathetic in light of the potential devastation this mine could bring to Minnesota. The economic sustainability of our natural environment and the tourism dollars that that environment makes possible should take precedent over any potential, short-term gains from the mine. I am a Minnesotan, born and bred, and I do not support this project. Natalie Obee 924 Hague Avenue St Paul, MN 55104 Natalie Obee | Finance and Human Resources Director | Neighborhood Energy Connection | making energy conservation easy | HYPERLINK "<http://651-789-5711>" 651-789-5711 | 1754 University Avenue West | Saint Paul, MN 55104 | HYPERLINK "<http://www.thenec-org/>" www.TheNEC-org

Natalie Steen

39911

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Please do not allow this mine to happen. The Boundary Waters is an exceptionally rare place and this mine could have irreversible consequences on one of the most unique places in Minnesota. Sincerely, Ms Natalie Steen 700 College St Beloit, WI 53511-5509

Natasha Gindorff

38945

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Natasha Gindorff 1122 Churchill St Saint Paul, MN 55103-1008 (651) 487-9411

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Natasha Villanueva

18916

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Natasha Villanueva
Natasha Villanueva 1125 W. 28th Street Apt. 108 Minneapolis, MN 55403

Nate Schleif

58051

It is imperative that we protect our natural resources, if we don't we shall lose it! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Nathan Anderson

10885

Thank you, I have additional concerns that there has been incomplete analysis of the impact of mining using real weather pattern models that include climate change. Aquifers can be affected when climate change is accurately assessed particularly when observed under a worst case scenario basis. Please analyze the impact of mining under the conditions of flood and drought that are an unpredictable possibility in the future as a result of unprecedented climate change. Thanks again Nathan Anderson Sent from my iPad On Feb 7, 2014, at 12:03 PM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathan Anderson

15961

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Please apply the same worst case scenario basis as is adopted by the EPA for the purposes of public safety and prevention of exposure to lead. Sincerely, Mr nathan anderson 3565 Rustic Pl Saint Paul, MN 55126-3038

Nathan Bronk

18902

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Nathan Bronk 2019 E. 1st S Duluth, MN 55812 651 717 5084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathan Bronk

18903

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Nathan Bronk 2019 E. 1st S Duluth, MN 55812 651 717 5084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathan Bronk

18904

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Nathan Bronk 2019 E. 1st S Duluth, MN 55812 651 717 5084

Nathan Carroll

38771

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Nathan Carroll 5129 Abbott Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55410-2144 (612) 850-3551

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathan Fritz

40864

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nathan Fritz 919 Birch St Niles, MI 49120-3118 (351) 025-1464

Nathan Indresano

11025

Feb 6, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, While yes, I am jumping on a generalized note, I hope you take the time to read this message. I write you as a 20 year old college kid who, like most my generation, is being brought down apathy, brought on by a bleak future. When we think about our future, we not only have to fear high unemployment (a familiar economic problem), but we are faced with changing ecosystems that humanity will struggle to adapt to. A quick look around will show that we are already struggling to cope. Polynesian nations are planning evacuations. Places around the globe are regularly experiencing weather events that previously might not of occurred in a life time. Cancer rates and pollution related disease are ever rising. Many of my generation envision a dystopian future of great hardship. By preventing this sulfide mine from going ahead, you are helping make sure that we are actively pursuing a disastrous future. Better yet, when you make the right decision in the end, make sure to capitalize on the victory. Use the political steam to push Minnesota to a sustainable future. Help make a future that inspire the next generation not push it to hopelessness. Sincerely, Mr Nathan Indresano 1104 23rd Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-2629

Nathan Keller

38824

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please do not allow the PolyMet mine. Think about the future generations that this decision will affect. The Earth is one of a kind do not destroy its valuable resources by allowing the PolyMet mine. Think about the future our kids, our grand kids, their grand kids. Their are other ways to create jobs and make money don't do it while destroying something we will not be able to recreate. Sincerely, Mr Nathan Keller 299 14th Ave SE Apt 104 Saint Cloud, MN 56304-1128 (612) 986-8607

Nathan Lovas

42042

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nathan Lovas Eden Prairie, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathan Mielke

1777

Dec 9, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Nathan Peters

9538

Dear Commissioner Fay, I am writing to oppose the proposed PolyMet project. First, the SDEIS must be revisited and updated. New water modeling is absolutely necessary. Data from the 1980's is insufficient and useless for making accurate analyses and predictions about future water flows and pollution escaping from the mine site and rubble stockpiles. Perhaps we will have technology and means to extract these metals safely someday, but we are not there yet. Our freshwater and groundwater are far more precious than 20 years of mining. The complex ecosystems of Northern Minnesota have suffered enough from previous mines that already leak and pollute our water. This type of mining has never been done safely or well. 500 years of monitoring and water treatment are ridiculous burdens for the state to take on. The head of the parent company that owns PolyMet is Tony Hayward, the former head of BP. He is the chairman of CompactGTL. He was at the helm when BP committed the largest crime against the Earth and against humanity as its Deepwater Horizon rig burst into flames and spewed oil for months. In short, PolyMet cannot be trusted. Your own scientists have said that major parts of the SDEIS need to be re-done. Tell PolyMet "No." Tell them to go away. There are already enough resources for everyone. We do not need to mine more minerals from the Earth. We need to work on our distribution of wealth and resources. We do not need to poison and permanently pollute the precious waters and groundwaters of Northern Minnesota. At a minimum, please require accurate modeling with useful and relevant data. Please require PolyMet to set aside billions of dollars in advance for the hundreds of years of remediation. Please require PolyMet to be more careful when mining and operating. Thank you for safeguarding Minnesota's precious resources. Respectfully submitted, Nathan Peters 2616 Blaisdell Ave #4 Minneapolis, MN 55408 J.D. expected May 2015 University of St Thomas School of Law

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nathaniel Stauber

15758

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Neal M & Linda S Adams

26504

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. National Forest lands belong to all the people of this country. They are vital to the preservation of the natural heritage of the United States which is the birthright of all our citizens, present and future. Far too much damage has already been done to the land and resources of this nation in the name of corporate profit. Whether the threat is fracking, the Keystone XL pipeline, or the Pebble Mine in Alaska, concerned citizens are ready to take a stand and say that enough is enough. We are prepared to speak out for wildlife, wild lands and all other aspects of our environment. No sulfide mine in the Superior National Forest - now or ever. Sincerely, Neal M and Linda S Adams 6 Hollow Oak Ln Brookfield, CT 06804-2511 (203) 775-2870

Ned Bouril

9787

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the entire experiment in the long-term, to ensure that the permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota, is otherwise never realized. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ned Bouril Ned Bouril 3618 Xenia Ave N Street 2 Crystal, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

18594

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the entire experiment in the long-term, to ensure that the permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota, is otherwise never realized. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ned Bouril Ned Bouril 3618 Xenia Ave N Street 2 Crystal, MN 55422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

39710

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. To reiterate the spirit of many comments from previous public forums, the basic tenets of the current PolyMet Mine project and its inadequate SDEIS proposal beg credulity on an epic scale. Even if every proposed detail of every phase of this project were to be flawlessly implemented for even the first 100 years of the proposed 500, there cannot possibly be any reasonable belief that "we" could predict that the subsequent 400+ years of sulfide mining pollution remediation would continue without issues as planned. For example, in the SDEIS, the lack of any substantive financial assurances designated for any toxic seepage which may escape the mine site boundaries or its intended storage facilities should be enough of a red flag to halt and abort this excursion into the absurd. Settings aside the environmental, scientific, and public health aspects, just the logistics of this proposal alone are incredulous, as it has all of the earmarks of a classic "cut and run", in this case most likely realized by some form of an "unanticipated" bankruptcy, leaving not PolyMet, but the State's citizens to pick up the pieces financially. And on a geo-political level, is it not possible that the bulk of the extraction profits will not only be leaving MN but most likely the USA as well, via the mufti-national PolyMet parent investor Glencore and its partner Xtrata. And after trading 20 years of temporary employment for 500 years of toxic remediation, who, ultimately will benefit from this arrangement. And to those who piously declare that it is our own techno-centric culture which is the primary force driving the need for further exploration and extraction of these minerals so necessary to make our electronic gadgets (gizmos) run well, I would ask them to review current metal recycling technologies and their ensuing economies as implemented in many industrialized countries as well as revisit the phenomenon of commodity stock piling and the boom and bust cycles created by international commodity price fluxuations. Even a cursory examination of these latter issues may unveil what is really motivating multinational corporations such as PolyMet and Glencore. Globally, the world of the "extraction industries" has for decades been awash in technical mishaps, catastrophic failures, and the willingness to violate multiple federal, state, provincial, and local safety/health codes and laws, often resulting in the permanent devastation of pristine lands and/or natural resources and the toxification and displacement of local populations. Since the proposed PolyMet mining techniques have never been successfully implemented anywhere else globally, why would the MNDNR be willing to approve this pristine watershed to be ground zero for what is clearly an ill-conceived and unproven "experiment" in post-peak mineral extraction technologies. It is a shame that the Polymet engineers and the various governmental authorities providing oversight didn't first locate rich veins of logic and common sense as well as the minute percentages of target minerals they sought when first engaged in their exploratory drilling. I would ask you deny approval of this particular mine as planned in the SDEIS

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

39713

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the many problems with the draft mine plan, I believe that this mine should not be built as described. To reiterate the spirit of many comments from previous public forums, the basic tenets of the current PolyMet Mine project and its inadequate SDEIS proposal beg credulity on an epic scale. Even if every proposed detail of every phase of this project were to be flawlessly implemented for even the first 100 years of the proposed 500, there cannot possibly be any reasonable belief that "we" could predict that the subsequent 400+ years of sulfide mining pollution remediation would continue without issues as planned. For example, in the SDEIS, the lack of any substantive financial assurances designated for any toxic seepage which may escape the mine site boundaries or its intended storage facilities should be enough of a red flag to halt and abort this excursion into the absurd. Settings aside the environmental, scientific, and public health aspects, just the logistics of this proposal alone are incredulous, as it has all of the earmarks of a classic "cut and run", in this case most likely realized by some form of an "unanticipated" bankruptcy, leaving not PolyMet, but the State's citizens to pick up the pieces financially. And on a geo-political level, is it not possible that the bulk of the extraction profits will not only be leaving MN but most likely the USA as well, via the multi-national PolyMet parent investor Glencore and its partner Xtrata. And after trading 20 years of temporary employment for 500 years of toxic remediation, who, ultimately will benefit from this arrangement. And to those who piously declare that it is our own techno-centric culture which is the primary force driving the need for further exploration and extraction of these minerals so necessary to make our electronic gadgets (gizmos) run well, I would ask them to review current metal recycling technologies and their ensuing economies as implemented in many industrialized countries as well as revisit the phenomenon of commodity stock piling and the boom and bust cycles created by international commodity price fluctuations. Even a cursory examination of these latter issues may unveil what is really motivating multinational corporations such as PolyMet and Glencore. Globally, the world of the "extraction industries" has for decades been awash in technical mishaps, catastrophic failures, and the willingness to violate multiple federal, state, provincial, and local safety/health codes and laws, often resulting in the permanent devastation of pristine lands and/or natural resources and the toxification and displacement of local populations. Since the proposed PolyMet mining techniques have never been successfully implemented anywhere else globally, why would the MNDNR be willing to approve this pristine watershed to be ground zero for what is clearly an ill-conceived and unproven "experiment" in post-peak mineral extraction technologies. It is a shame that the Polymet engineers and the various governmental authorities providing oversight didn't first locate rich veins of logic and common sense as well as the

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

48872

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. To reiterate the spirit of many comments from previous public forums, the basic tenets of the current PolyMet Mine project and its inadequate SDEIS proposal beg credulity on an epic scale. Even if every proposed detail of every phase of this project were to be flawlessly implemented for even the first 100 years of the proposed 500, there cannot possibly be any reasonable belief that "we" could predict that the subsequent 400+ years of sulfide mining pollution remediation would continue without issues as planned. For example, in the SDEIS, the lack of any substantive financial assurances designated for any toxic seepage which may escape the mine site boundaries or its intended storage facilities should be enough of a red flag to halt and abort this excursion into the absurd. Settings aside the environmental, scientific, and public health aspects, just the logistics of this proposal alone are incredulous, as it has all of the earmarks of a classic "cut and run", in this case most likely realized by some form of an "unanticipated" bankruptcy, leaving not PolyMet, but the State's citizens to pick up the pieces financially. And on a geo-political level, is it not possible that the bulk of the extraction profits will not only be leaving MN but most likely the USA as well, via the mufti-national PolyMet parent investor Glencore and its partner Xtrata. And after trading 20 years of temporary employment for 500 years of toxic remediation, who, ultimately will benefit from this arrangement. And to those who piously declare that it is our own techno-centric culture which is the primary force driving the need for further exploration and extraction of these minerals so necessary to make our electronic gadgets (gizmos) run well, I would ask them to review current metal recycling technologies and their ensuing economies as implemented in many industrialized countries as well as revisit the phenomenon of commodity stock piling and the boom and bust cycles created by international commodity price fluxuations. Even a cursory examination of these latter issues may unveil what is really motivating multinational corporations such as PolyMet and Glencore. Globally, the world of the "extraction industries" has for decades been awash in technical mishaps, catastrophic failures, and the willingness to violate multiple federal, state, provincial, and local safety/health codes and laws, often resulting in the permanent devastation of pristine lands and/or natural resources and the toxification and displacement of local populations. Since the proposed PolyMet mining techniques have never been successfully implemented anywhere else globally, why would the MNDNR be willing to approve this pristine watershed to be ground zero for what is clearly an ill-conceived and unproven "experiment" in post-peak mineral extraction technologies. It is a shame that the Polymet engineers and the various governmental authorities providing oversight didn't first locate rich veins of logic and common sense as well as the minute percentages of target minerals they sought when first engaged in their exploratory drilling. I would ask you deny approval of this particular mine as planned in the SD

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

48875

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the many problems with the draft mine plan, I believe that this mine should not be built as described. To reiterate the spirit of many comments from previous public forums, the basic tenets of the current PolyMet Mine project and its inadequate SDEIS proposal beg credulity on an epic scale. Even if every proposed detail of every phase of this project were to be flawlessly implemented for even the first 100 years of the proposed 500, there cannot possibly be any reasonable belief that "we" could predict that the subsequent 400+ years of sulfide mining pollution remediation would continue without issues as planned. For example, in the SDEIS, the lack of any substantive financial assurances designated for any toxic seepage which may escape the mine site boundaries or its intended storage facilities should be enough of a red flag to halt and abort this excursion into the absurd. Settings aside the environmental, scientific, and public health aspects, just the logistics of this proposal alone are incredulous, as it has all of the earmarks of a classic "cut and run", in this case most likely realized by some form of an "unanticipated" bankruptcy, leaving not PolyMet, but the State's citizens to pick up the pieces financially. And on a geo-political level, is it not possible that the bulk of the extraction profits will not only be leaving MN but most likely the USA as well, via the multi-national PolyMet parent investor Glencore and its partner Xtrata. And after trading 20 years of temporary employment for 500 years of toxic remediation, who, ultimately will benefit from this arrangement. And to those who piously declare that it is our own techno-centric culture which is the primary force driving the need for further exploration and extraction of these minerals so necessary to make our electronic gadgets (gizmos) run well, I would ask them to review current metal recycling technologies and their ensuing economies as implemented in many industrialized countries as well as revisit the phenomenon of commodity stock piling and the boom and bust cycles created by international commodity price fluctuations. Even a cursory examination of these latter issues may unveil what is really motivating multinational corporations such as PolyMet and Glencore. Globally, the world of the "extraction industries" has for decades been awash in technical mishaps, catastrophic failures, and the willingness to violate multiple federal, state, provincial, and local safety/health codes and laws, often resulting in the permanent devastation of pristine lands and/or natural resources and the toxification and displacement of local populations. Since the proposed PolyMet mining techniques have never been successfully implemented anywhere else globally, why would the MNDNR be willing to approve this pristine watershed to be ground zero for what is clearly an ill-conceived and unproven "experiment" in post-peak mineral extraction technologies. It is a shame that the Polymet engineers and the various governmental authorities providing oversight didn't first locate rich veins of logic and common sense as well as

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ned Bouril

50669

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the entire experiment in the long-term, to ensure that the permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota, is otherwise never realized. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ned Bouril Ned Bouril 3618 Xenia Ave N Street 2 Crystal, MN 55422

Ned Gatzke

31952

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. There is no evidence anywhere that sulfide host rock mining can be accomplished in an environmentally responsible manner. The minimum standard for Wisconsin metallic mineral mining in sulfide ore bodies is evidence of no pollution in ten years of operation and after ten years of abandonment. No permit applicant has been able to show evidence of either of these standards anywhere in North America. Mining pollution does not go away and compromises environmental quality for short term profits that do not benefit local communities. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ned Gatzke 10498 Jancing Ave Sparta, WI 54656-4465 (608) 269-2033

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nedra Nicholls

12203

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Neil Billington

23599

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have concerns about the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are All Connected. Therefore, We are All AFFECTED. We're not only talking about the dangerous effects of Sulfide mining and Acid Mine Drainage in Minnesota, we are also talking about the affects it will have on ALL Other Surrounding and Connecting Areas, like Michigan and Canada. WHY would anyone want to destroy the very thing that sustains life. WATER is Priceless and should guards and protected. This Decision should not be based upon Profits to a handful of greedy evildoers. This Decision is a lot bigger and needs to be carefully considered. As it will surely painfully Destroy Our Planet and seal the faith of death to generations to come. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural beauty and resources as well as ALL walks of Life. After all, we all know there will always be some sort of "Human Error" to factor in AND IT's Not Worth the Risk. Facilitating PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is NOT in the Best Interest of the Public or our Planet. Do Not Allow this Dark and Destructive Force to Overcome Us. STAND STRONG Thank you. Neil and Cherie Billington Sincerely, Neil Billington 4031 Gleason Rd Waterford, MI 48329-1209

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Neil Gardner

40614

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Repair the errors and omissions. This is the precedent for perhaps many more . Take the time to do it right again. For as long as it takes. Plenty of poor stewardship worldwide as examples done wrong by same few multinational companies. Careful , thanks , Neil Gardner Sincerely, Neil Gardner 8069 Mark Lake Rd Side Lake, MN 55781-7401 (218) 254-3702

Neil Huppert

21972

Good afternoon. What a great opportunity the Polymet project is Minnesota. We could use some economic prosperity in on the Range. Lots of infrastructure to build and permanent, good paying jobs will be had. I'm behind the project 100%. Let's mine Minnesota. Neil Huppert 3048 Cuneen Ct Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

Neil R Gardner

54548

Sulfide mining has never worked without polluting. Why would we do this—particularly by a national treasure like the BWCA? The PolyMet pollution study is inadequate at best. No-no-no. Short term gains, long term disaster.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

NEIL STECKER

39291

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. A friend of mine, an electrician, died from IT HAS BEEN ABATED ABUSED AND DISCUSSED AND LAWYER UP BOTH SIDES, going out of their way, they wait for the patient to DIE. AND DEVIDE HIS ASSETS AND AWARDS. Then there are no wittiness to the crime. PLEASE, Don't do it. Sincerely yours, NEIL STECKER 49739 153RD PLACE ISLAND LAKE TAMARACK, MN 55787

Alphabetical by sender's first name

NEIL STECKER

39329

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nell Bartzén

44523

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit [HYPERLINK "x-apple-data-detectors://0"500 Lafayette Road, Box 25](#) [HYPERLINK "x-apple-data-detectors://1"St Paul, MN 55155-4025](#) Miss Fay and Esteemed Colleagues, I am a wannabe techie from the millennial generation. I live my day with an expectation of instant gratification. I text my mom for an address while I'm at the postoffice. I call Jimmy Johns and in 3 mins I'm chowing down and watching the latest movie on Netflix. If it's an afternoon kayaking the river to a brewery tour I'm making reservations, checking the forecast, and getting directions to the kayak spot, while sending snapchat invites to all my pals. Then of course you look for the app that will do all of that for you. And if it's not possible with current technology – create an app for it. Create it being the real lesson of my generation. You do not have to accept the status quo, you can change it to suit your well-being, think of a better way, create a way to make it right. This is also the principal that needs to be considered for the NorthMet Open-pit copper, nickel and PGE mine project – commonly referred to as the sulfide mine. Is the technology there to reap the benefits of Minnesota's expansive mineral deposits while protecting the diverse but unique land of northern Minnesota. Based on the SDEIS, the answer remains no. On first reviewing the document and factsheet, my instant-gratification-mind thought, "not too shabby." With the proposal we will be gaining millions of dollars for the education system, we'll actually gain national forest property, and PolyMet promises to clean up – sounds like a win, for an instant. But the glaring statistic that is tainting the appearance of the "win" is that we are risking our land based on 90% models and predictions. The Water Quantity Fact Sheet of the NorthMet SDEIS states that, "Polymet would install and operate a system to capture at least 90 percent of the groundwater seepage at the proposed tailings basin and the permanent waste rock stockpile." Section 5-2-2-39 of the SDEIS states that, "the estimate total discharge rate of the flowpath groundwater into the Embarrass River is 292 gallons per minute." I acknowledge that I am not a statistician however: 292 gallons per minute for the 20 year duration of the proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange is equal to 3,069,540,000 gallons of flowpath groundwater into the Embarrass River. All fine and good, but as the models PolyMet is using to support their environment protective strategy are based on 90% assurance. This leaves 10% up to chance. 10% is equal to 306,954,000 gallons of water that the proposed models are leaving up crossed fingers and high hopes. 306,954,000 gallons just of the flowpath groundwater into the Embarrass River, this doesn't even include the rate into the tributaries. 10% of groundwater seepage that the company is saying they have no means, or no interest, in capturing, and that coming from a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before. Pardon the jargon of my generation, but WTF. Why the first. Where is an example of a large-scale surface open-pit sulfide mining project that has operated effectively, protected the natural surroundings, and not left tax payers with the clean-up burden for unknown centuries to come. Please, let's not make Minnesota the guineau pig in this project. Let's wait for a proposal that can uphold the instant ideal of my generation. When the mine closes, after 20 years of operation, that should be the end of it. If the minerals are worth enough to the Swiss-based Glencore company and Canada's PolyMet, they should create the technology that allows instant purification of byproducts to a environmentally stable state. If the company is about to put billions of dollars on the table to harvest 1% of what's in Minnesota's treasured northland, they should be willing to put a little mor

Nels Ojard

7185

To Whom it May Concern: As a local citizen, business owner, and engineering professional, I am keenly aware of the opportunities, sensitivities, concerns and benefits that are being debated by the impacted communities. After careful review of the Supplemental Draft EIS report, I am writing to demonstrate my support for Polymet's Northmet project. Minnesota is a state with a strong tradition of responsible environmental protection and responsible resource development. These two values are not mutually exclusive, but have a demonstrated history of integrated success over 100-years. The regulatory structure, compliance management, and strong values of the people of this State give society the opportunity to develop a much needed resource to responsibly serve the needs of local, national, and international Society. Specific to the Northmet Supplemental Draft EIS and non-ferrous mining in general, the State of Minnesota, after much thought and debate, implemented regulatory standards for these activities within our borders. The Federal government has regulatory standards that further measure impacts and compliance for these activities. These regulations and the best available science and planning processes are the tools Society uses to measure the impacts and benefits. As an Engineering Professional, and citizen of this region, involved in the study and planning of resource projects around the world and the Northmet project locally, it is my belief that the science of the study and its reflection on the natural environment and communities of the area reflect the best available science, engineering, and impact/benefit analysis available to the process. The people involved in the process are not just experts in their fields, but have a further personal interest in ensuring the development of these resources are done to protect the interest of their families, communities, and the environment that sustains us. Polymet's Northmet project is an example of successful development balanced with sound planning and environmental sustainability. To that end, I strongly support the projects Draft Supplemental EIS. Sincerely, Nels J. Ojard 4976 Pike Lake Place Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

nelson myers

40398

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, nelson myers 2802 george st harrisburg, PA 17109 US

Nenagh O'Leary

54199

The boundary waters are a beautiful area for family's and camp companies can go to enjoy the outdoors, it's a place to make memories, why build a mine and effect family bonding, to effect the earth negatively. Basically what I'm asking to do is not allow this mine to be built.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nettie Monroe

39894

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

New Progressive Alliance

3384

Attached is the comment of the New Progressive Alliance concerning PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If there are any questions, please let us know. Sincerely, Ed Griffith New Progressive Alliance

Newood Gilk

7167

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Woody Gilk Newood Gilk 698 West 5th Street Grand Marais, MN 55604 218-461-0465

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nic Kramer

44374

Being a Minnesota native, I have an inherent love for the beauty and nature Minnesota has to offer. Planning to mine is a terrible idea for a number of reasons. One main reason is the risk you are putting towards harming the boundary waters, which are a huge aesthetic haven for both Minnesotans and people visiting Minnesota. The boundary waters are no doubt the crown jewel of the state of Minnesota. Now, apart from this being a horrible idea ecologically, it is also a horrible idea economically. This would only provide about a hundred jobs for about twenty years, then what is to happen after that. Also, you say you will monitor the mine for about 200 - 500 years, where will this money come from. There's no possible way to predict the price of monitoring 100 years from now, so there's no possible guarantee you can give that you will have the money to do so. Please, do not begin the mining process in this beautiful state of Minnesota. Sincerely, Nic Kramer (Prior Lake High School, Senior)

Nicholas Banovetz

47254

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Thank you for providing this important opportunity to comment on Polymet. I have significant concerns about Polymet and copper-knickle/sulfide mining. My connection is quite strong. While my address on this form is St Paul, my family is from Ely, MN, and Silver Bay, MN. My grandpa is the former president of the Reserve Mining Company; he and my great-grandfathers mined in NE Minnesota. I know mining well and understand the "need" in the Arrowhead. However, I also understand that sulfide mining is drastically different than taconite mining, and that our waters are in jeopardy. And my family understands this, too. My grandpa passed away last summer and now my family is trying to figure out what to do with the cabin that he and my grandma own, which my great-great-grandfather built in the 1920s. I have spent a considerable amount of my life and disposable income on the cabin and in Babbitt and Ely; I've even lived at the cabin for periods of time over the years. My family treasures this place I can't underscore this enough. We really want to keep it in the family, but most of my extended family is so afraid to own property on Birch Lake because of the sulfide mining. And now the cabin is on the market with the hopes that we can cash out before the cabin is worth nothing or very little. Already we hear from our realtor, Wendy Johnson, that buyers are turning to other areas because they're reading the news about the pending mine. I've seen very little in the news about the affect sulfide mining could have on area real estate. While my example is anecdotal, I believe it speaks volumes. My fiancé and I have been toying around with buying the cabin ourselves. We could pull this off, but we're in our ear

54545

My great great grandfather built my family's cabin on Birch Lake outside of Babbitt. I have spent a solid chunk of my life on Birch Lake. From a nostalgic/family history AND real estate perspective, is the state confident that our cabin/Birch Lake are safe? How? I'm very concerned.

Nicholas Bowlin

54543

Ms. Fay, I'm writing because I think the BWCA is special and that the Poly Met mine poses a serious threat to the wilderness of Northern Minnesota. It is largely untouched by humans, and there are few places like that left. I encourage you to do whatever you can to block the Poly Met Mine.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicholas Eltgroth

15903

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nicholas Eltgroth 36399 Burr Oak Blvd Cohasset, MN 55721

43321

Stop Polymet now. The pollution they will generate will destroy our water and the surrounding land. Please read the studies about ground water leakage and how it will destroy our drinking water. Sincerely, Nicholas Eltgroth, Cohasset, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicholas James Stephan

9569

Dear NorthMet, ****This specific email will only address your reclamation process.**** I understand that your company has proposed a copper-nickel mine in northeast Minnesota. As a lifelong resident to the State of Minnesota and an Environmental Science undergraduate, I **STRONG OPPOSE** the construction of your mine and any additional facilities. It is well known that there are serious environmental hazards associated with mining operations (eg, acid mine drainage). I noticed the proposed mine site is situated among, and completely surrounded by, a number of lakes, streams and other tributaries. Could you please explain how "capturing and treating affected water using mechanical and/or non-mechanical methods for as long as needed" will truly protect surface waters located near the site, and how far off site will monitoring take place. Also, could you please define "as long as needed." It is imperative that there is a legal definition for "as long as needed." In the unfortunate event that your company is granted a permit, citizens must be able to hold your company accountable for contaminating surface waters and potential sources of ground water. We as citizens must fully understand the criteria NorthMet will follow when determining the adequacy of your treatment techniques. Additional questions: 1- What type of vegetation will be planted in the reclamation areas and will it all be vegetation native to Minnesota. 2-How effective or what is the efficiency of the "covers" that will be used to protect water seepage from getting into the rock stockpiles, tailings basin, and hydrometallurgical residue facility. 3- What is a hydrometallurgical residue facility. 4- How will storm water be managed to prevent erosion and pollution flowing off site. 5- What kinds of pollution, toxins or other harmful chemicals could potentially become released into the environment (please supply list). 6- What will be done with the demolished buildings. 7- Regarding the destruction of wetlands, what is the approximate size in hectares that your company intends to destroy. 8- How does your company intend to "establish new wetlands." 9- According to your financial assurance plan, you estimate that roughly \$200 million will adequately compensate environmental contamination and the destruction of numerous ecosystems How did your company determine \$200 million would be adequate. What method did your company use to place a price on nature. 10- Define "environmentally acceptable condition." 11- Define "free of hazards" (because it is obvious that the site will not be truly clear of hazards regarding environmental pollutants). 12- Will you be mining in an aquifer or groundwater. 13- How will the water be captured for treatment. 14- What additional methods will your company employ to minimize hydrological impacts. 15- Regarding erosion, in what quantities or volumes of sediment does your company anticipate could potentially contaminate surface water. Sincerely, Nicholas James Stephan 209 Center Street Mankato, MN 56001

Nicholas Lamon

42642

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicholas Larkins

38707

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nicholas Legg

44013

Dear Environmental Committee, I urge you to decide against copper-nickel mining in northeastern Minnesota. I cherish the woods and waters of the northeastern Minnesota, a connection I know is shared by many around the world. But protecting some of our most prized landscapes is not only about those who know its value, it is about protecting the resource for those who have yet to discover it. As a user of products that require copper and nickel, and as a geologist who has worked on copper mines, I understand that metal extraction must occur. But it is also important that we consider the costs of extraction and realize that our demand must be met pragmatically. Certain landscapes, like those of northeast Minnesota, are too sensitive to the negative side effects of sulfide mines. The risks are just too great. This decision comes down to values, as well as numbers. At face value, the numbers alone demonstrate the disparity in costs and benefits of proposed mining. The enormous amount of money proposed to be held for future cleanup alone demonstrates the environmental risks. When compared to the relatively few jobs created, it is clear Minnesotans collectively stand to lose much more than they will gain from mining. You have a difficult and momentous decision ahead of you. Your decision will set a precedent for sulfide mines proposed in northern Minnesota's future. Therefore, the burden of proof that mining will cause no lasting harm must be greatest now. The negative effects of deciding to allow sulfide mine will only compound into the future as more mines are developed. Thanks for your careful consideration, and for your work in protecting Minnesota's land, air, and water. Sincerely, Nicholas T Legg 5258 N Commercial Avenue Portland, Oregon 97217 [HYPERLINK "mailto:ntlegg@gmail-com"ntlegg@gmail-com](mailto:ntlegg@gmail-com)
[HYPERLINK "tel:763-350-3052"763-350-3052](tel:763-350-3052) (mobile)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicholas Loch 6102

Dear DNR, I am opposed to this project. Though I understand the short term benefits for the economy and the jobs this project would provide, the long term effects will have a negative impact on the environment, and these negative effects far outweigh the positive ones. The beautiful natural resources of Northern Minnesota, including the BWCA and other protected forests are the most valuable resource for the Northern Minnesota region. The perennial tourist dollars these natural wonders bring must not be put in jeopardy. A benevolent denial of any requests to mine the area is urgently needed. Copper mining unleashes hazardous materials for hundreds or thousands of years and will pose a direct threat to the natural wonders, the tourism, and the economic viability of the region. No short term get rich scheme is worth those negative consequences. If people need jobs, then lets find a way to get them jobs preserving the environment, rather than destroying it. Why destroy the area for some precious metals under the ground. Once the precious metal is gone we will have a cesspool that poisons the surrounding area, and no techniques for being careful or mitigating the leaching of hazardous material will be successful enough to prevent that from happening. PolyMet either has false hope or is lying if they think they can prevent this. Citizens have a legitimate need for jobs, but those needs do not justify the destruction of the natural area that provides plenty of jobs and economic benefit for the local area already. Do you really think this company will be around to pay the bills for cleanup 200 years from now. Does the Hudson Bay Company or the Dutch West Indies company still pay for their mistakes or wrongdoings. NO. Please DENY the PolyMet/NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange..

***** Also, I don't know what the mission statement or motto for the DNR is, but I think it is weird that it seems the DNR is always working hand in hand with people or organizations that threaten to destroy the natural resources of our great state. The first objective of the DNR should be preservation. The DNR should not be the facilitator that provides access to destroy everything, or kill everything. Stop holding hands with these people. I don't care what economic benefits you think this will bring, and you're lying to yourself or lying to the public if you think this mining project is worth hundreds of years ruin.

***** Thank You, Nicholas Loch Minnesota Resident 7328 Fremont Avenue S Richfield, MN 55423 [HYPERLINK](#)

"mailto:nloch@umn-edu"nloch@umn-edu

Nicholas Olson 47352

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am a great advocate for Minnesota and all that it has to offer. In fact, I think it is a hidden gem. After years of travel and residing in other places, I am happy to call Minnesota my home again and the place I have chosen to raise a family. It brings me great concern to think that the Minnesota and the BWCA is going to be threatened by a short sighted mining project that uses job creation as its major selling point to our state. I can think of a lot of other places in which job creation would have a greater overall impact to our state and at the same time directly improve our environment. As the father of two small children, I want to make sure that Minnesota's waters, especially those of the BWCA are kept pristine and clean for their enjoyment and exploration. Let's consider the gift we have been given by the leaders of this state before us and pay this gift of clean water and wilderness forwaRd On a related note, this is also a racial justice issue. The direct impact on wild rice should be enough to stop this project immediately. Let's not continue our legacy of racial injustice by destroying a sacred food source of our Ojibwa community. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Nicholas Olson 61369 223rd St Litchfield, MN 55355-5801 (320) 693-5502

Nicholas Parker 21723

Nicholas Parker and the whole Parker family, We have been waiting a long time for this moment. Minnesota is a land of untapped resources. I'm so excited to see this project grow. Nicholas Parker 2711 Idaho Road Naperville IL, 60564 Sent from my iPhone

Nicholas Rowse 47831

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicholas Skrowaczewski

38744

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nicholas W Illegible

42623

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nick Balcom Raleigh

18183

My name is Nick Balcom Raleigh. N-I-C-K, B-A-L-C-O-M, R-A-L-E-I-G-H. I'm a futurist facilitator. I'm the founder of Future Space, an organization that promotes futuring literacy among people. This is the largest group I've ever facilitated any sort of exercise with. But I'm going to invite you to participate in a exercise that I've made for this specific moment. A specific intersection of possible futures. There are many. There are some that are dire. There are some that are beautiful. They all exit right now in this moment. So if you are willing to come along with me for this ride in two minutes, I invite you to close your eyes and follow along. I would like you to imagine what is happening 12 months from now in your life. What are you doing? Who are you with? Where do you live? Who is around you? Now I want you to imagine five years from now. What are you doing for work? Who is around with you now? What is PolyMet like to work for, if that's what you're imagining? How pristine are these environments, if that's what you're imagine now? I would like to fast forward a little bit. A little faster. You are now elderly, if you are not now. It's 2030. What is happening now? Are you retired? Do you have grandchildren? Do you have people that you care about in your life? What is the environment like? What is the weather like? What is the climate like? Do you have any technology and devices around you? Do you have electricity? I want you to imagine these things for a moment. Now I'm going to fast forward us even further to a scarier year. The year 2100. It's only scary because we're not there. I want you to imagine who is there. Who are these future people? You may know some of their relatives. You may know some of them. Some infants might live that long. What do you imagine that they are doing? What messes are they cleaning up? What work are they doing? What governments do they have? Do they vote? Do they cybernetically connect with each? How do you imagine this world to be? Now fast forward again to 2514. These are the decedents of these people that you imagined earlier. What do they do?

Nick Bougalis

10073

Our environmental standards are the strictest in the world. Polymet has spent millions to ensure that all of the standards will be exceeded. The project is necessary for our regional economy. Myself and my company wholeheartedly support the project. - Nick Bougalis Construction Inc. (218) 969-7424 / HYPERLINK "<http://www.BougalisConstructionInc-com>"[www.BougalisConstructionInc-com http://www.bougalisconstructioninc-com/logo-bci-color-150px.png](http://www.bougalisconstructioninc-com/logo-bci-color-150px.png)

Nick Boyd

3959

Hi DNR. Thanks for taking comments from the public. I'm glad it is an important part of the review process. My comment is as follows: Based on a 2010 survey of US miners' salaries, providing 360 jobs over 20 years would yield a total of about \$275,000,000 in pay. The cost of cleanup to taxpayers of similar sulfide mines across the United States in several cases has surpassed 225 million dollars. The ecotourism that this region benefits from could also be negatively affected in the long run. With all these points considered, is the allure of the monetary benefits of sulfide mining still validated. Nick Boyd 4900 Otter Lake Rd White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nick Lavelly

38823

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Nick Loch

19969

To Whom it May Concern, I would like to add to the public record my opposition to the PolyMet copper-nickel mine in Northern Minnesota. This whole thing is ridiculous and short sighted. The investors will benefit the moSt The locals that work on the job may benefit for a little while, however, in the long run this project will have a disastrous impact on the natural wonders that are the most important economic resource for Northern Minnesota. No mitigation of the negative effects from copper-nickel mining will be enough to prevent this. Just leave it alone. I don't care if the negative effects last 20, 200, or 2,000 years. The idea is to keep untouched pristine areas that way. We aren't fighting WWII here. We aren't trying to win a war with taconite mining that will build tanks. Business prospectors in Europe and the US are trying to exploit the land for raw materials with no "true" care for the negative effects that will come from it. My faith in the DNR actually protecting anything is non-existent. How many hunters, cronies and businessmen have weaseled their way into your ranks. Just stop. Stop man from destroying everything. Nicholas Loch 7328 Fremont Avenue S Richfield, MN 55423

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nick Rowse

47703

10704 Prescott Ct. Burnsville, MN 55337 Ms Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 March 13, 2014 Dear Ms Fay: This letter is to comment on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I have several major concerns about the proposed mining project and land exchange that were not fully analyzed and discussed in the SDEIS. A major concern is the proposed land exchange of 6,650 acres of federal land with up to 6,722 acres of privately owned land of a combined equal value, located within the 1854 Ceded Territory in Minnesota. As was stated in the Executive Summary, the US Forest Service (USFS) does not believe that the mineral reservation gives PolyMet Mining, Inc. (PolyMet) a right to surface mine National Forest Service (NFS) land to access the minerals. Allowing private surface mining would be inconsistent with USFS legal mandates for acquiring and managing these lands. This legal issue must be resolved prior to the project being authorized by the USFS. The inconsistency as stated by the USFS is not acceptable without resolution. PolyMet intends to exercise private mineral rights that were reserved when lands for the Superior National Forest lands were conveyed to the United States and now PolyMet is proposing to develop a surface mine. The USFS has taken the position that the mineral rights that were reserved do not include the right to surface mine as proposed by PolyMet. Also of concern, is the approval by the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board (IRRRB), of a \$4 million loan to PolyMet for the acquisition of both a 5,272-acre tract of land and a 32-acre tract of land, both of which would be used for a proposed land exchange with the USFS to allow surface mining of non-ferrous materials near Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. As the IRRRB is under control of the Minnesota Legislature, it is inconsistent with the both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) rules and Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) rules that significant monetary resources have been put towards the development of this proposed project by PolyMet prior to a Record of Decision by the USFS and the US Army Corps of Engineers; along with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. The information regarding financial assurances for the proposed project are inadequate for the purposes of making any decisions regarding mine operations and closure in the SDEIS. Simply stating that the engineering and design planning required to calculate a detailed financial assurance analysis was not available in the SDEIS and would be done during the permitting stage makes a huge assumption about the ability of PolyMet to mitigate land and water pollution should the project get approved. The preliminary cost estimates for mine close do not appear to be based on actual data and the time frames used (up to 20 years) are conjecture. In the Economic Assessment of the Underground Mining Option, a 2012 report was quoted as concluding that underground mining would not be economically feasible. This conclusion seemed only to be based on metal prices and similar operations elsewhere. No information was provided in the SDEIS that valued the impacts to recreation on USFS lands both at the project site and within the nearby federally designated wilderness area (ie the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness). As opportunities for quiet and primitive recreation becomes less available, the economic analysis must include these values. Canada lynx, which are currently listed as federally threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), were documented in 2010 by the USFS and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) within the proposed mine site. Only the USFS was mentioned by the SDEIS. In 2013, the USFWS proposed the northern long-eared bat for listing as endang

Nick Voss

16254

Hello, I don't appreciate that the Polymet website puts default words into my message. I wanted to comment that the Polymet website's tone and phrasing, to me, complicates the issue. As it's currently posted, Polymet is not appearing to display a cooperation with the DNR, EPA, or MPCA, at least it's not apparent enough. I feel this way because the site's terminology doesn't directly reflect theirs. I shouldn't have to scrounge around the website in a confused state to find concrete ways they're following up on environmental standards. Instead, there are phrases like "major milestone reached" that seem to carry a sense of authority but come out of thin air. I want to see, right up front on the Polymet website, concrete, set dollar amounts of how much money they're putting down upfront to protect Minnesota's environment. This should be coupled with a set number of years they'll stay committed after the mining project concludes. Something else that would be beneficial would be a statement of their in-depth ecological understanding of the area. However this understanding mustn't simply come from a Polymet expert, but should be documented to be in cooperation with the DNR, the EPA and the MPCA. Again, having all of this more easily accessible on the main page would be the best case scenario, and much more respectable as the decision-making process moves forward. Because this level of concrete assurance is needed, I feel that if pressure is placed to get it posted on the website, it will have added incentive to be a reality behind the scenes as well. As for the DNR, please don't proceed with the mining project until such concrete details are pinned, with liability and accountability to back them up. Lastly, I'm not sure as to the origin of Polymet, but with Twin Metals LLC being a Canadian and Chilean company, I would respect a completely US-based, Minnesotan company to carry out such projects. Thank you for your time. Nick

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nick Wharton 45237

The proposed copper-nickel mine is short sighted thinking and I oppose its development. The risk to water quality is too high no matter how much metal is in the ground. That metal will be used for some electronic gadget for someone today and generations of people after will be left with the pollution from its extraction. What's the rush anyway. Copper does not spoil if left in the ground. Maybe someday a truly safe way to extract it will be developed. At the moment, the technology that the mining companies use has proven to make its shareholders rich and the local people and environment poorer afterwards. The jobs it creates will come and go as all the others have and they will lie to the workers about their safety and their families safety. The people who do the work will be taken advantage of and the people giving the orders will profit heavily. That is not what Minnesota represents and that is not what I want my tax dollars supporting. Again, I oppose this mine and any other copper-nickel mine that might be proposed. Nick Wharton PO box 1403 Grand Marais, MN 55604 Sent from my iPhone

Nicklas Sandstrom 41942

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nicklas Sandstrom Chanhassen, Minnesota

Nickolas Felten 40201

Hello, I like many other Minnesotans want to voice my humble opinion about the PolyMet Sulfide Mine proposal. Yes, the mine will provide more jobs. However, I believe this is a very short sighted view. After all, cleaning up the poisoned waters of Norther MN will provide jobs too. I simply wish to say that I am wholeheartedly against the proposal allowing PolyMet to open new mines. I believe that such mining activities will put a great Minnesotan treasure, known as the Boundary Waters, in great jeopardy. Once ruined, these freshwater ecosystems cannot be brought back quickly and easily, if ever. Please consider the long term effects that PolyMet will have before allowing them to mine and then regretting the decision for generations to come. Thank you. Nickolas Felten 995 Jefferson Commons Circle, St Paul, MN.

Nickolas Kelley 54865

See attachment

Nicktae Marroquin 54871

See attachment

Nicole Hall 54185

I am a senior at Como Park Senior high in St. Paul and we had a speaker in our AP Environmental class about the mine they are thinking about putting in and I don't think it is a good idea. The Boundary Waters is a beautiful place that has many tourists and it brings people from all around. The mine might make the waters dirty and not as beautiful.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicole Hamilton

16331

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nicole Hamilton stanley rd Bloomington, MN 55437

49936

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nicole Hamilton stanley rd Bloomington, MN 55437

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicole Hendrickson 19822

To Whom It May Concern, I'm concerned about the wild rice and the fact that that area has a lot of water ways. I respectfully ask please, please, do not move forward with the Polymet mine. Thank you, Nicole Hendrickson 5722 Bemidji Ave #b Bemidji, MN 56601 Phone: 612-913-6603

Nicole Johnson 19924

Polymet could potentially ruin the forests of the animals that inhabit in this area, we are already really low in moose numbers and with this proposed mining it could really effect numbers more. There are also health effects that will increase in this area in which we have a clean environment; this will cause the tree huggers of this area which is a high number to not want to be here anymore. I am not a tree hugger by any means but I don't want to be breathing in harmful chemicals. We will be breathing in increased mercury emissions, have exposure to asbestos-like mineral fibers, lead, and arsenic from copper mining. I feel it would not be best to do this in Northeastern Minnesota, I love living here and enjoying the outdoors and I do not want this experience ruined. Thank you for your time, Nicole A Johnson 1718 8th Avenue Two Harbors, MN 55616 Nicole Johnson Technical Services Analyst 1 (218)726-2238 [HYPERLINK "mailto:johnsonn@stlouiscountymn-gov"](mailto:johnsonn@stlouiscountymn-gov)johnsonn@stlouiscountymn-gov

Nicole Lindberg 9709

I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet environmental impact statement, which, in my view, is inadequate and demonstrates unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet 4 fundamental clean water principles (principles the mining industry previously agreed to). 1) The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality significantly under-represent pollution risks and used inaccurate conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site, demonstrating an unreliability in accurately predicting future water conditions. 2) The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. As recent history demonstrates, accidents happen, and having a plan in place is a small start at safeguarding our natural resources. 3) The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. Millions of tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. Not to mention the pit "lake" and the lengthy network of pipelines that would need to be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years. 4) The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about who will pay for and be responsible for it. It can be assumed, that it will end up being the taxpayer, as it is hard to imagine how the company could be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from liability. Please protect the longterm livability of our State, and not be blinded by short-term jobs. Truly, Nicole Lindberg 5729 Oliver Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55419 612-929-2188 (cell) 612-207-8489 [HYPERLINK "mailto:nicole.lindberg@comcaStnet"](mailto:nicole.lindberg@comcaStnet)nicole.lindberg@comcaStnet

Nicole Nordman 54198

I strongly disagree with you letting them start mining. This is a beautiful place and if you mine here you'll be taking away the beauty. Many people enjoy the boundary waters; mining here will make this place somewhere nobody wants to go. This is a popular place by mining here you'll make this place somewhere people will not want to be around. We drew lines on a map saying that we wouldn't mine here, that we'd keep this place clean. We can find other places to mined but we may not find another place as beautiful and as pure as the boundry waters. The effects of mining will destroy the river and the economy around there. You'll be digging really deep for something we don't need all that bad. I'd rather have beautiful landscape. We need to think about more then just money, we need to be thinking about what we're doing to our economy. Please take this into consideration. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nicole Ogborn 44594

Hello, I am a young adult in the great state of Minnesota, and I personally feel that the Polymet copper-nickel mine is not a good fit for our state. We are constantly releasing a large amount of harmful toxins into the atmosphere, and adding another mine would do exactly what we're trying to prevent. Although positions for the unemployed are important, and mines as well, I feel as though there are already enough mines in the area. Is there an absolute need for this mine, or can we try to procrastinate our somewhat clean air for just a tad longer. As a high school student, this subject is extremely important to me, and I greatly appreciate your time and consideration. Prior Lake Student, Nicole Ogborn

Nicole Sippola 57351

Nicole Sippola. I am against the PolyMet mine proposal despite their promises that they will be funding the cleanup. I find it difficult to trust that they will be there for the next 500 plus years, funding cleanup that may or may not be complete inside that amount of time. The proposal clearly states that our water will be contaminated for at least that long, too, if not longer. Reading through the 200-page proposal, there are areas of pollution where it clearly states the status is unknown or there has been, "no action to date." Is this something that we are willing to leave our descendants with? Our world is in need of care. By adding to the pollution with our planet, we will be the ones responsible for the destruction of our planet. As a Minnesota native, I have grown up enjoying the outdoors, swimming in our many lakes and streams, as many others have done. I want to be able to share this love for the environment we live in with my children and grandchildren and I want to see this passed down for many generations to come. To think that these precious resources are at risk of being lost in exchange for 20 years' worth of jobs and only 25 percent of them promised to local Minnesotans is heartbreaking to me. While I understand that times are tough right now for many people, the fears that I have heard expressed that without the mine, these towns will become ghost towns, will be inevitable if this mine is built. With the amount of pollution that it will cause in the water and the wetlands of these communities, it will be more devastating for years to come. Can we, as a community, rise up against the pollution of our water and of our wetlands and stand up for something that cannot stand up for itself? I encourage the DNR to rethink the destruction that this mine would cause. Please do not let it happen. That's all.

Nicole Swensen 44604

Hello, my name is Nicole Swensen, I am a senior in high school. I believe that mining the area near the boundary waters would be a very bad idea. That area needs to be preserved. If we mine that area, we only get twenty years out of it and have 200-500 years of cleaning it up. Tell me if I'm wrong but doesn't that sound crazy. A beautiful Minnesotan area will be turned into a mine that can possibly pollute the boundary waters, a beautiful place where people can visit. Let's keep the mine away from the boundary waters because it is not needed. Let's preserve Minnesota's beauty instead of killing it. Sent from my iPhone

Nijah Williams 54215

Dear DNR, please do not go through with Mineing the Boundry Waters is a big part of the community Many people like to go there to get away from there everyday lives. There are many different wildlife and if this goes through they will have no where to go Also mineing will cause a lot of pollution in the environment as shown in other places So we the students of como park senior ask that you do not do this kind of mining and not pollut our water with sufferic acid.

Nikki Crow 18120

My name is a Nikki Crow. N-I-K-K-I, C-R-O-W. I bet you think I'm here to talk about wild rice. Nope. What is missing from the SDEIS is a socioeconomic impact (inaudible). I'm talking about the rise in sex trafficking and with that an increase the need for increased policing and education of police when called to help prostituted victims and victims of sexual violence and for sexual assault nurse examiners to be available, including housing for victims will be necessary. This is a quote from (inaudible). It is generally believed that human trafficking is a human rights abuse which fundamentally (inaudible). The reality today is sex trafficking is a mining issue and an environmental issue. How would PolyMet work to protect the vulnerable population of the communities they will be moving in? How will they help fund the organizations that work to help victims of trafficking and rape? How will they help to educate employees? The SDEIS is not complete until these impacts are addressed.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nikki Crowe 42932

Hello Lisa, Please see attached for the Polymet public comment. Miigwech, Nikki Nikki M Crowe 13 Moons Program Coordinator FDLTC Extension Program 1720 Big Lake Road Cloquet, MN 55720 218-878-7148 office 218-341-5863 cell

Nikki Heikke 41806

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nikki Heikke Brooklyn Center, Minnesota

Nikolas Bayuk 38118

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Minnesotans have a history of solid and safe mining practices and there is no reason to think this project would be any different. Polymet has passed the strong regulations set by all of thier regulators and this should go straight to approval to start work. The Iron Range needs these jobs, the surrounding area's will benefit from the revinue, and the country will benefit from the resources. Thank you for your consideration, Nikolas Bayuk Nikolus Bayuk 12 E Faribault St Duluth, Minnesota 55803 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

nino ritchi 40373

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, nino ritchi musketrue 54e maastricht, ot 6218TW NL

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nissa Manley

42053

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Nissa Manley Plymouth, Minnesota

Nissa Sandley

38914

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Nissa Sandley 2719 S 8th St Minneapolis, MN 55454-1412 (612) 386-9299

No Name Provided

57879

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

57886

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Noah Filla

54338

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MNDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St. Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: I am writing concerning the EIS mining project. I am 13 years old and in the 8th grade. I have read the documentation on your site and do not think the project is a good idea. On the surface, the plan sounds great. It first appears that many new jobs would be created and that everything possible would be done to protect the environment. However, upon reading the material, there is no solid documentation of how long the clean up after the project would last, exactly what it would entail, and what if there are more issues than are predetermined? I think my biggest concern is your plan to borrow water from Colby Lake if there is a shortage. As stated in your facts document, shortfall in water requirements would be made up by withdrawing raw water from Colby Lake using an existing pump station and pipeline. What happens if there is a problem with the existing pump and pipeline? What happens if they break? How do you then make up the water shortage? What other source do you have as a back-up? I understand the computer models showed it the water requirements would effect the area, but there is no way this can be guaranteed. Colby Lake, as stated in the fact's document has many tributary streams. This project could have negative effects on all of them if there are any problems. My other big concern is how this project will effect the wetlands. At a minimum if damage, Polymet, is required to replace only 913 acres near, but not on the project site. Also, the document doesn't cover how the wildlife of the wetlands is affected. It only covers the seepage, waste rock, overburden stockpiles. In summary, it seems to only cover the fragmentation of the wetlands, not how it could actually hurt the wildlife of those wetlands. In summary, I am for a project that will create jobs because I understand there is a great need for jobs in this state and all other states. However, I am not for destroying the environment without more documentation on how it will affect water quantity and quality. My other concern is how the wildlife in the area will be affected. Overall, I am not for this project. I don't think there are enough solid facts to show that the environment will be unaffected or noticeably unaffected. Thank you in advance for considering my opinion on this project. Sincerely, Noah Filla

Noah Shavit-Lonstein

58149

I think it is absurd to destroy five centuries of water for 360 jobs (or less) that will disappear quickly. As our state auditor has said, we cannot afford this mine.

noelle olson

42446

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. No no no. no If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms noelle olson 2016 Yorkshire Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-2588

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Noelle Reed

40185

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nora Nell Hamburge

17127

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nora Nell Hamburge 1752 Montreal Ave St Paul, MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nora Nell Hamburge

40424

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nora Nell Hamburge

50394

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nora Nell Hamburge 1752 Montreal Ave St Paul, MN 55116

Nora Smyth

16938

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nora Smyth 2077 Highland pkwy StPaul, MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Nora Smyth

50231

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Nora Smyth 2077 Highland pkwy StPaul, MN 55116

Nora Snyder

58069

Stop the mining - save the water! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

norbert heimann

47174

To State Officials working on the Polymet Mine Proposal, The minerals that Polymet proposes to mine are not going anywhere. The minerals most likely will not become less valuable. Elements of the proposal and the environmental safeguards involve monitoring waste and waste water for decades, perhaps centuries. The overall costs to monitor and/or treat waste products is not and cannot be realistically estimated. The history of open pit mining operations and its aftereffects is extremely dismal. I am strongly against the Polymet Mining Proposal in its current configuration. Sincerely, Norbert Heimann

Alphabetical by sender's first name

NOREEN SHAUGHNESSY

41657

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Norm Herron

21540

Please see the attached document.

42728

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Norm Herron

43059

February 7, 2014 Administrator U.S.D.A. Forest Service Region 9626 East Wisconsin Ave. Milwaukee, WI 53202 RE: This letter was submitted to the Minnesota DNR Dear Administrator: I am writing to convey my questions and concerns related to the Polymet Sulfide Mine proposal presented to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to extract copper, nickel and other metals in northern Minnesota. I. Can the DNR be assured that any leakage of toxic chemicals into all land and waters adjacent to the mine site be monitored by either a third party or the DNR to be cleaned as soon as detected? 2. Will Polymet be responsible for the cost of cleaning up all toxic discharges indefinitely? 3. Will the residents of Minnesota have first priority for the employment related to the construction and extraction process? 4. Will the DNR be assured that the natural attraction of the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness and adjacent lakes and rivers be protected from any degradation? 5. Will the DNR be assured that tourism will not be adversely affected by the mining? 6. Will the DNR be assured that the wild rice areas will be protected from toxic chemicals? As a resident of Minnesota I am placing my trust in the DNR to have in its best interest the protection of our land, waters and fauna of Minnesota. Personally, I do not support sulfide mining in an area so rich in clean waters. I understand the need for mineral exploration to meet the global demand for copper, but I am wary of mining in a fragile and vulnerable area such as northern Minnesota. Sincerely, Norm Herron 2617 E. Fifth St. Duluth, MN 55812-1536

Norm Voorhees

18337

Hello. My name is Norm Vorhees. The last named is spelled "V," as in Victor, O-O-R-H-E-E-S. I am a born and raised Duluth resident. I am also a representative for Ironworkers Local 512. I have been an ironworker for 27 years. It has enabled me to earn a decent living, provide for my family, put my daughters through college. I am also a representative for Ironworkers Local 512 for the last 11 years. And being involved in that aspect, it has allowed me to be actively recruiting ironworkers and giving young people in northern Minnesota the opportunity that I had to earn a decent living, building in Minnesota. I have been to several meetings regarding PolyMet. I toured the facility two times; at the old LVT site. It is a brown field. It is open and sitting there. PolyMet to me seems that they are proposing to do something responsibly from everything that I have been able to learn. And we have got the regulatory agencies here to make sure that that happens. If you look at pictures from the turn of the century, late 1800s, of Duluth, it looks nothing like it does now. To me, it looks like rape and pillage. And over the years we have evolved and have been able to utilize our resources, create good jobs, create living-wage jobs, and respect the environment and be able to have the best quality of life in the country. I have had to travel around the United States when there was no work here and I have seen how things are done in other parts of the country and I think Minnesota is the best place that you can live in the United States. If you look at what happens in other parts of the world, there is -- there is no regulatory structures in place, like China, Brazil. These precious metals are needed for our society right now. Hopefully, with the great learning institutions that we have in Minnesota and the young people going through them, we may be able to trend away from them, but right now we can't. We are all using them. Even everybody that is opposed to this mine. You know, it is your cell phones, your cars that you drove to get here, your ride in a canoe in the Boundary Waters. So, I stand in support of this project. And thank you.

47021

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Norm Voorhees 1321-104th Ave W Duluth, MN 55808 Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Norma Holmstrom

16146

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Norman Berghuis

18287

Norman Berghuis, Lakeville, Minnesota. 250 years ago what there was of this country and nation was about a thousand miles from here. At that time, and thousands of years before that, what is now Minnesota, and thousands of miles around us, was ruled by Native American nations or no humans at all. Now PolyMet is a company that is owned and controlled by foreign corporations and was formed only for the purpose of the toxic sulfide mine. Only 20 years after they begin mining, the copper and nickel will be depleted; however, the pollution will continue for 500 years. It will need to be contained and cleaned up somehow, but it appears that nobody really knows how. Now, in 20 years, when mining has ended and there are no more profits from this mine, anybody that believes that this foreign company called PolyMet will still be around probably also believes in Big Foot, the Lochness Monster and Santa Clause. The PolyMet sulfide mine is a very bad project for Minnesota.

42791

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Norman Petrik

40445

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

North American Water Office

42903

Omitted the attachment file that accompanies the comment. Here it is. Begin forwarded message: From: Lea Foushee <HYPERLINK "mailto:lfoushee@nawo-org"lfoushee@nawo-org> Subject: NAWO Comment on Polymet Date: March 12, 2014 11:44:10 AM CDT To: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Cc: George Crocker <HYPERLINK "mailto:gwillc@nawo-org" gwillc@nawo-org>

Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness

42985

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney, Attached please find comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the NorthMet project, along with a cover letter, submitted on behalf of Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness. A hard copy of this submission will be sent by US mail today, with a compact disc containing all exhibits. Please include Marc Fink and Rebecca Rom as well as myself on any future announcements or correspondence regarding this matter. Contact information is included within the submission; in addition I am copying Mr Fink and Ms Rom on this email for your convenience. Thank you for your attention to the concerns expressed in these comments. Sincerely, Jane Reyner

52179

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Northern Organizations 42997

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney, Attached please find comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the NorthMet project, submitted on behalf of the organizations Save Our Sky Blue Waters, Save Lake Superior Association, Center for Biological Diversity, Friends of the Cloquet Valley State Forest, and the Sierra Club. Also attached is a cover document that includes statements from each organization. Finally, I am also attaching an Expert Statement from Steve Ring. A hard copy of this submission will be sent by US mail today, with a compact disc containing all exhibits. Please include all signatories on the cover letters on your mailing and email list for this project. The signatories are all copied on this email for your convenience. Thank you for your attention to the concerns raised in these comments. I would also particularly like to thank Ms Fay for her patience and help through this process. Sincerely, Jane Reyer

52184

open file to view

Novelett Jensen 39590

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Say NO to Polymet and say YES to a beautiful, healthy Minnesota for our generation and generations to come, PLEASE. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Novelett Jensen 3012 Dupont Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55411-1346

Nurmi Family 5

Hello, Like dozens of people I talk to daily up here, I am appalled at the cost incurred by Polymet for a permit to provide jobs. Mining is what we have up here. I do not voice my opinion for how people, cities, or government abuse the land for highways or whatever in other areas. I could care less if \$apolis sank in the ground. THEY CAN HANDLE THEIR AFFAIRS, just let us handle ours. By the way, I am not impressed with that ungodly mess they have in the cities; however, it is not my right to object. Naturally, I do care about our environment up here in God's Country. I know of no one whom wants to see a Sudsbury. However, I believe it is the responsibility of our state DNR to give out or deny permits in a timely manner. That is why they get paid (salary) with our tax dollars. There should be no place for special interest groups or even guys like me. Until Polymet refuses to follow their guidelines or does something criminal, give them the permit and let's at least attempt to bring life back up here on the 'Iron Range'. I do not believe in vigilante like groups trying to impose their might. If the DNR does not believe Copper/Nickel Mining has more benefits than downs, pay Polymet back for the costs incurred and stop the whole thing. We have so many examples of cost vs benefit. Police speed and hurt people. Good or bad, we need them and live with it. Politicians can hardly ever get a large majority to agree with them. They sell out and trade favors for votes. We put up with them. Lots of examples out there. Maybe it is time to try it and see with safe guards in place. Thank you, Lyndon Nurmi 8992 Posimoke Drive Britt, Mn 55710 218-749-4033 Posimoke@accessmn-com
nursnews 7056

To the DNR – Please do not let Polymet or any other mining entity exploit one of the finite and few semi-pristine wilderness environments left in the country. Please consider what can and likely will go wrong in the plan to “contain” contaminated water for hundreds of years. The environmental impact of this proposal on the lakes, the air, the sound and the sights in the Ely area will be devastating. Please let rational minds who care about future generations prevail. Once this direction is set, there is no turning back time only you and your legacy of shortsightedness and devastation. We believe in you, DNR. Do the right thing. Barbara Schlaefer 612-618-6797 5404 Park Place Edina, MN 55424

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Oliver Garrison 39326

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I'm also of the belief that the short-term economic gain produced by mining will be lost many times over with long-term scarring of the countryside that we as Minnesotans hold to such high regard Sincerely, Mr Oliver Garrison 622 4th St SE Apt 301 Minneapolis, MN 55414-1836

Olivia (Vivi) Grieco 57172

My name is Vivi, I'm a high school student in Minneapolis, and I am passionate about developing economic equity in an environmentally sustainable way. It is vital that we think beyond the next 20 years and think about clean water in our state for our children and grandchildren. Olivia (Vivi) Grieco 3046 15th Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55407

Olivia Jane Riggins 57195

Allowing the Polymet mine to be built would mean taking huge, unjust risks. Not only is it incredibly short-sighted to believe that PolyMet will continue the necessary cleanup, but in any case, the PolyMet mine would be a threat to future generations and current American Indian groups. Olivia Jane Riggins 900 Water St S Northfield, MN 55057

Olivia Ridge 42557

See attachment

Oona Malle-Barlow 57191

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Opel McCarthy

58124

This world is not simply made of resources for humans to exploit at will. Our primary support system – wry of thriving as human beings – is the sun, the earth, the water, and the plants and animals that live within its system. The Polymet sulfide mining project would critically damage three of then from systems which we depend upon to survive. How much long term damage are we willing to inflict to our national support structure for a short term monetary given? PolyMet’s own studies report that sulfide mining will create “acid mine drainage,” leaking mercury, arsenic, lead and sulfuric acid into Minnesota waters. The decision that we make now will not only seriously impact the lives and wellbeing of ourselves and generations to come, but allow set a precedent for the way we treat our natural home into the future. In a time of perceived [ILLEGIBLE] when many voices demand that we strip the gift and beauty from our world in the name of limitless consumption we believe its still possible to choose to conserve and recycle rather than export and deplete. We implore you to see how the damage of sulfide mining for outweighs the benefits. Please make the courageous decision to reject PolyMet proposed sulfide mining and protect the irreplaceable gift we have been entrusted with as Minnesotans. Thank you for making the decision based upon all of our perspectives.

Oren Olson

46698

I support PolyMet mining for several reasons. Minnesota needs good paying jobs. We have plenty of minimum wage jobs. the sdeis has been a very long and involved process. I trust the state and federal agencies have figured out a way to mine safely. If so I can see no downside to this project. Minnesota can not afford to let this opportunity slip by. Thank you, Oren G. Olson 8205 Demenge Rd Cloquet Mn. 55720

Oscar Diaz

57186

I hear the boundary water is a great place to go. Please save so I can go someday.Oscar Diaz5365 5th StreetFridley, Anoka

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Osha Karow

17006

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ove Kahn

44519

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. This cannot be accepted merely for a short term economic gain. In fact, no economic gain can compensate for the vastly negative outcomes of this mine. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come and would substantially damage the quality of life for those that live in the region. These concerns must be paramount, and the proposal must be rejected. Sincerely yours, Ove Kahn Ove Kahn 1747 Columbus Ave Duluth, MN 55803

Owen

11262

polymet mine should only get the go ahead if all lands currently proposed are given for the federal lands and under the condition that all federal lands revert back to federal ownership after the 20 year period and after polymet does land reclamation. also giving lands that already exist does not make up for destroying an equivalent amount of land, so polymet should have to pay an additional fee of 3,000 an acre to the dnr to make up for the destruction of habitat that will occur

Owner

46038

Dear Lisa, My husband Jerry and I want to convey our opposition to the Polymet mining proposal that is currently under review by the DNR. We have concluded after studying the issue at length, and in depth, that the risks in a human endeavor such as this is not worth the irreparable harm to our beloved Minnesota environment. Given the imperfect nature of all human projects, it is not IF but WHEN problems arise. Short-term gains will go mainly to the multinational corporations that champion this project, but the resultant problems will accrue to ordinary Minnesotans. PolyMet has never operated a mine, functioning as a front group for the Swiss investor Glencore. It's main selling point seems to be jobs, but the best, and most, of these will go to professionals from around the globe. We realize the DNR is tasked with conflicting goals, but we ask that you have the courage to speak for the powerless, for the ecosystems that cannot speak for themselves. Powerful corporations have a loud voice, and a very large footprint, and repeatedly show that they can get their way. But not now, please. Thank you for reading this, and for taking our views seriously. Jerry and Laura Raedeke PO Box 89 Nisswa, MN 56468 218-963-3877

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Owners Computer

10227

Sirs, It has come to my attention that the project for mining heavy metals is a hazard to our health by negatively affecting the increase in pollutants in our environment. The metals themselves are toxic and the process that claims them with sulfuric acid is bad. Other sites around this country and other country's demonstrates the destruction that ensues. Not only is there the fallout on contaminates from this, but it just adds to the other 5,000 toxins in our environment and this is why there is an approximately 30% increase in cancers and immune disorders which are growing annually. The accumulative affect from all the toxins is horrible beyond belief and I fail to approve of the surge in mining or drilling to increase profits when it is costing every individual in the country his life. I am against this project. Judith Long 4627 Otsego St Duluth, MN 55804

P May

45536

Dear DNR PolyMet Mine Review Committee, This is a terrible idea. I'm sorry to be so blunt, but there's really no other way to say it. Poisoning our beautiful land for short-term gain is a really, really terrible idea. Sulfide mining brings with it a risk of acid mine drainage. This risk is particularly high in areas with lots of water, such as Superior National Forest. This pollution can last for anywhere from 2,500 to 10,000 years. This mine will only create around 360 jobs. But you know all this already, don't you. I won't insult your intelligence by presuming otherwise. You know all of this, and yet you're still willing to give this plan the go-ahead. I am not privy to your motives, but looking at it as a Minnesotan, an environmentalist, and a young person about to enter the workforce. This whole plan borders on insanity. Twenty years of work, and then what. Poisoned waters and devastated land. A future significantly darker than it was before. You know children, surely. Young people. Think about them for a second. They're the ones who are going to have to live with your decision, one way or another. I plan to go into environmental work when I graduate from college. The other day a friend of mine who is in the same field looked at me and laughed bitterly. "Why do we do this to ourselves." she asked. We're young. We're supposed to feel hopeful about the future, but we aren't. We're cynical. We've seen too many good people—people like you—make the wrong choices over and over again. Just this once, give us a reason to believe in the people in power. Please don't poison us. Thank you for your time, Phoebe Ward

Pa Yao Vue

54234

Dear Ms. Fay, I'm a student from Humboldt High School. I'm very concern with polymet's environmental impact statement. The map in the environmental impact statement is wrong. They can't just redraw a map. Take a look at the map again. The polymet people left out 100 miles of the swamp. Governor Dayton needs to make the MN DNR do its job correctly. Use the correct map and measure the percolation of the water. They have to prove that the mine will NOT pollute the boundary water. I don't want the boundary water to be polluted for the next 500 years or so. Sincerely, Pa Yoa Vue 1498 Jackson St, #B St. Paul, MN 55117

Palmira Brummett

40741

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, As a US citizen I am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have spent wonderful days in the Boundary Waters and have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Please keep in mind that wetlands once destroyed take generations and more to redeem, if they are redeemable at all. As a nation, we cannot afford to poison the protected lands and waters that we have left for the personal gain of a few. Please reconsider - do not facilitate the poisoning of our people, our birds, and our animals. Sincerely, Palmira Brummett, 198 Slater Ave, Providence RI 02906 Sincerely, Dr Palmira Brummett 198 Slater Ave Providence, RI 02906-5812 (865) 556-2426

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam Backstrom

4272

30 December, 2013 I would like to comment in support of the SDEIS for the proposed NorthMet mine. This has been studied and evaluated by several agencies of the State of Minnesota and the Federal Government. The proposal for a mine, as laid out in the SDEIS, meets the standards that are set by all the agencies involved. The following are my reasons for supporting the project: First: The land exchange will be a good one for both Minnesota and the USFS. It will reclaim and add to state wetlands in exchange for the wetlands taken over by the mine. It results in a net gain in wetland acreage. Second: The effect on water resources in the mine area, and in the Lake Superior basin has been thoroughly reviewed by the agencies involved, and has been deemed to be satisfactory. The proposed mine meets or exceeds the standards set in Minnesota state law and federal initiatives. Third: The mine will meet air quality standards, as laid out in the SDEIS. It will not affect air quality in the BWCAW. It will also meet applicable noise standards. Fourth: It is a logical re-use of a brownfield site in the plant location and in parts of the mine site, as well as existing rail lines. Fifth: Approval of the proposed mine will create many direct jobs in the eastern end of the Iron Range, and will contribute many dollars in tax revenue to the State of Minnesota, the Federal government and to the local communities. In addition, indirect jobs will be created and the unemployment rate in Northeastern Minnesota will decline. Sixth: There will be up-front monetary guarantees for the monitoring of water, air, wetlands, etc after the mine closes. The mine closure plan is sufficient to maintain all the water quality standards that are now in place. I would like to encourage the US Corps of Engineers, USFS, and the DNR to publish a final EIS in a timely manner. I also want to urge the Commissioner of the DNR to declare the EIS adequate, and everyone involved to move the permitting process forward. Yours truly,
Pamela S. Backstrom Mailing address: 115 S. 14-1/2 Ave W. Virginia, MN 55792 Phone 218-780-6227 Email pam@ideadrilling-com Home address: 17 W. 3rd Ave N. Aurora, MN 55705

Pam Barker

21562

Mar 5, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Stop mining that will endanger our environment. Sincerely, Pam Barker 7084 Bluebush Rd Monroe, MI 48162-9124

Pam Curtis

40458

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Pam Curtis 5315 Clark Rd Conesus, NY 14435 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam Fischer, RN

34976

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Have you EVER been to the Boundary Waters of upper Minnesota. They are wild and beautiful and CLEAN. They are full of waters that flow to Lake Superior and many of the other lakes in this area, to streams, to wetlands. It is one of the few places barely touched by noise pollution, one of the few places left on the N. American continent that is pristine, where people can go to reconnect with Mother Earth, where the animals, plants, fish and other creatures are able to live in their natural states. THIS IS NOT A PLACE TO PUT EVEN ONE OPEN PIT SULFUR MINE. Sulfur mines pollute EVERYTHING. They send toxins into the waters, the air and the land. They put the entire area at risk of dying, they put people who live anywhere in the area or who come to enjoy the wilderness at risk of becoming ill or dying. There are so many other ways economic growth can be created and managed, WHY do people in power keep thinking in terms of the dark ages.. We have the threat of radiation drifting to our shores from the melt down at Fukushima. We have massive droughts in the west turning grasslands, farms, meadows and prairie pastures into desert sands. We have dirty tar sands oil leaks and accidents all over the country polluting our rivers and lands, ruining peoples' homes and making them sick. We have well waters contaminated by gas frac mining in the north east and coal sludge making the waters of W. Virginia unfit to drink. The western borders of WI are being polluted by sand mining, spewing silica sand particles into the air and into people homes where breathing in even a small amount causes a deadly illness called silicosis. YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO BE MANAGING THIS COUNTRY AND PROTECTING OUR RESOURCES IN THE BEST INTEREST OF ALL OF US and yet, every time I turn around I read about one more precious resource, one more of the few remaining clean and wild forests, mountains or wetlands areas being sold out from under our feet to outside interests who will keep the profits and leave us with the cost of cleaning up the environmental and human health catastrophes. I am 60 years old. I have lived through times of intense political upheaval. I have fought over and over again to protect our communities from social, economic, health and environmental dangers. But never in all those years have I been so afraid of losing my country, my home, my health because greed is turning this beautiful majestic country into a wasteland of trash, waste and devastation. STOP IT before this country we are so proud of, which has been a shining jewel in the universe, is nothing more than a sludge pit. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Pam Fischer, RN 1344 Russell St Green Bay, WI 54304-3132

Pam Frink

17511

To Whom it May Concern, I believe the SDEIS is not sufficient and should not be approved for various reasons. The primary reason as it does not provide details as how up to 500 years of operating, maintenance and monitoring will occur and be paid for water treatment facilities. There has not been a financial institution that has lasted even 100 years let alone 500 years. Many mining projects have resulted in the largest and most costly environmental clean-ups in the nation. What will happen if Polymet and its backers decide they want to abandon this project in say 50 years. What guarantee is there that someone will continue to monitor and treat polluted waters for the remaining 450 years. Another reason I feel the SDEIS should not be approved is the inaccurate water flow model that was used in the impact statement. This error causes many of the assumptions about future mercury levels to be questioned. This data must be corrected and resubmitted for further study by the public. Mercury is a very hazardous element to humans and wildlife. I did not see where any study was made of an underground mine instead of an open pit mine was considered. Underground mines greatly reduce the impact on wildlife, forests and wetland losses. I believe an underground mine would be less destructive than the proposed open pit mine. Considering wetland losses, only some (912-5 acres) of the wetland affected is covered by the SDEIS. What about the more than ten square miles of other wetlands that are indirectly impacted by the toxic minerals and water use by this open pit mine. Bogs and swamps are very difficult to restore or rebuild. Once lost, there is a great likelihood that cannot be restored. The SDEIS does not address these issues. Finally, there are several endangered or threatened and special concern species of plants and animals on the mine site that will be affected by this mine. The area has been classified as a 'High Biodiversity Significance' area by the Minnesota Biological Survey and the SDEIS considers the impacts to be insignificant which I find impossible to believe. How can they claim over a dozen species of plants or animals as insignificant. The SDEIS needs to address this issue as well. In conclusion, I feel the SDEIS does not adequately address the above issues regarding environmental impacts and must be rejected. Sincerely, Pam Larson Frink 2228 Reiling Rd White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam Larson Nippolt

7181

Hello Ms Fay - I am writing to express my alarm over the possibility that the proposed PolyMet mining project will be approved in Northeastern Minnesota. I am opposed to the proposal for one simple reason - I believe that the water sources in Minnesota, and the surrounding watershed, are being put at extreme risk. I believe that water is such a basic, life sustaining resource that we cannot move ahead with the water storage/reverse osmosis plan in good conscience. There is no precedence for this being an effective approach and the long term maintenance suggested (500 years) is preposterous. Water is essential to life and we are risking the lives of our children, our children's children and generations to come by not stewarding our water source properly. I am very sympathetic to the economic plight of those in the surrounding communities who are hoping for additional jobs, but I feel strongly that the stewardship of our greatest life sustaining resource - water - has to take priority over the possibility of a generation of improved economic and employment viability of the current population. I don't believe that these individuals and PolyMet advocates have the right to take such risky actions involving the resource of so many and for so long and the proposal should be denied. Please note my comments as strongly opposed to the PolyMet proposal. Sincerely, Pamela Larson Nippolt 369 Winslow Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55107

Pam Leland

16707

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pam Leland 1783 Randolph Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam Leland

51032

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pam Leland 1783 Randolph Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Pam Lynn

40478

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Pam Lynn 9 Longwood Lake Road Oak Ridge, NJ 07438 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam McLaughlin

34221

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I have canoed in the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, that whole area is so beautiful and absolutely irreplaceable. And the contamination of one area of these waterways will affect the whole region, not just that specific area in Minnesota. We have got to start thinking of the larger picture when we make decisions and let the good of all living things for generations to come, guide our decisions, and not the desire for short term money gain. PLEASE think about the good of ALL living things when you make your decisions. Thank you. Sincerely, Pam McLaughlin 14 Merrill Crest Dr Madison, WI 53705-2704 (608) 231-1666

Pam Videen

43320

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Pam Videen 4305 Parkview Court Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam` Dorris

40366

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pam` Dorris

40414

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pamela Arnold

39439

Dear Ms Fay: I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. We have experienced an EIS here is Scandia. Our experience showed us that mining companies, and other applicants, have a tremendous advantage over the environment. Many issues that face the environment fall outside the requirements, and therefor do not get adequately addressed. An alternative use for the proposed mining site has not been considered, including economic and environmental projects for an alternative use. The "NO BUILD" alternative should be given its due position among the considerations. The long term consequences of any undisclosed potential for error, contamination to ground water, ambient air pollution, dredging peat bogs cannot be measured against the very few proposed economic benefits to the local economy. A comprehensive EIS should include a state-wide economic and environmental overlay, with an alternative scenario for comparison. If there were a proposal to build a business that added natural resource benefits, jobs and a sustainable model for long-term environmental improvements, we would feel much better about a decision to approve or deny the SDEIS. As it stands, the SDEIS truly benefits the applicant. It does not fulfill our expectations for a complete picture including alternatives. Because the consequences could be so costly to the environment region-wide, the SDEIS should be challenged, and if no revisions are offered to support an alternative, it should be rejected in perpetuity. Frankly, the situation is heart breaking. There is NO SUSTAINABLE Sulfide Mining. John Cherry, who works now for PolyMet, has worked for many mining companies. He is a hired man, working to get approvals that meet other state and local authority conditions for mining operations. We are simply out gunned against these huge interests. All we have is hope that the DNR and State of Minnesota will have the courage to reject this proposal, against local enthusiasm for it. And, using it's lobbying effort, find an economic alternative for this region, which clearly needs an economic booSt We must protect some of our waters, and wild areas. This seems to be an opportunity for creativity. But it will require courage, and smarts. Thank you. Sincerely, Pamela Arnold 16560 220th St N Scandia, MN 55073-9434

Pamela Deck

7223

wow, that was about 6 months ago.. but yes., I am still concerned . On Wed, Jan 22, 2014 at 7:25 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Pamela M and Frederick J and Alexandr

54691

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pamela Miller

40286

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Pamela Miller 6230 Thomas Ct Tolar, TX 76476 US

40347

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Pamela Miller 39362 San Thomas ct Murrieta, CA 92562 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pamela Skaar

31784

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept my comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. If approved, it will impact wetlands across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Since acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred, I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the Arrowhead Region's natural resources and public health. Approving sulfide mining will present risks to water quality and harm to wildlife, including the threatened lynx and declining moose populations. Water supply systems, personal and public, may be impacted, requiring more expense to process to meet regulatory standards. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Pamela Skaar 2046 Helena St Madison, WI 53704-5520 (608) 241-5332

Pamela Thinesen

14735

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I, like most people, am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Pamela Thinesen 6165 Green Valley Rd Ramsey, MN 55303-3272 (651) 779-3476

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pamela Thinesen

39064

---Original Message--- From: pamela.thinesen@century-edu [mailto:pamela.thinesen@century-edu] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:03 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Pamela Thinesen 6165 Green Valley Rd Anoka, MN 55303-3272

Pamela Voigt

15616

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According to the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. We truly value the protection of all creature. Sincerely, Ms Pamela Voigt 13287 37th St Clear Lake, MN 55319-9228

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat 38315

Dear Ms Fay, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from overtopping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from liability. PLEASE

Pat Combs 43472

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Pat Combs Mpls Mpls, MN 55455

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Fillmore

41067

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Let's Prioritize our Resources with emphasis on Healthy Lives. Human's cannot live without clean water and air, and our immune system tend to break down as chemicals are added. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely pat fillmore
lindsay court St Cloud, MN 56301 320 2590542

41082

Let's Prioritize our Resources with emphasis on Healthy Lives. Humans can not live and be healthy without clean water and air. Pat Fillmore 16 Lindsay Ct. St Cloud, Mn 56301

Pat Lukensmeyer

26065

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Please remember: President Lyndon B. Johnson, on signing the Wilderness Act of 1964 - "If future generations are to remember us with gratitude rather than contempt, we must leave them something more than the miracles of technology. We must leave them a glimpse of the world as it was in the beginning, not just after we got through with it." Sincerely, Pat Lukensmeyer 3849 E Broadway Blvd Tucson, AZ 85716-5407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Makowski

16047

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pat Makowski 5245 Neal Ave N. Stillwater, MN 55082

49908

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pat Makowski 5245 Neal Ave N. Stillwater, MN 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Mullen

18374

I'm Pat Mullen. I'm a lifelong resident of the Duluth area. Living in Northern Minnesota being an avid runner I can't think of a better place to live and work. I'm employed by Minnesota Power as vice president of marketing, corporate communications, and energy supply. And Minnesota Power, like any electric utility, is heavily regulated by various government agencies. Even the basic price of what we charge for our product must be studied by regulators and brought before public hearing, and then testified to. I know that sometimes it takes a lot of input to reach a sound decision, and that's fine. So please let this work that way through this review process. There are many issues to examine around the state's copper-nickel mine. And our government representatives certainly gave the PolyMet proposal due diligence over the many years of reviews, studies, and meetings. For the over 2,000 pages prepared by the various agencies, I say thank you for looking at the PolyMet Mine from all angles. I have a great deal of confidence in the processes, the outcome of this study. And I do support PolyMet. More specifically, my comments this evening pertains to the adequacy of the review in terms of water quality, containment, and treatment. I know that has been an important aspect of this process and has created much concern. Minnesota Power also has the largest mining and natural resource based customers in paper, pulp, and energy that have extensive expertise in meeting rigorous federal and state standards and technology and project design as used in chapter 3 or further described in other portions of the report are very similar to those utilized successfully by different industries. In addition to the well-trained and experienced staff employed and available to the company for future needs, PolyMet will be operating in a region with extensive and environmental testing, consulting support with equipment maintenance services. Industrial processes, once operational, are extensively monitored and recorded hourly, daily, and often times continuously. In my opinion the checks and balances designed by the PolyMet proposal design will stand the test of time. Also, Minnesota has some of the most rigorous environmental standards in the nation. And a process that ensures a very thorough review of all the facts. The companies and the people who work for and support the industry have the know-how and the determination to meet our state's environmental standards even as we produce the metals, the forest products, and the energy we consume and demand every single day. Finally, it is my belief that our nation needs to be more engaged in actively mining precious metals that are needed for today's technology. The United States lags in mining the very resources that we have an abundant supply of in the Duluth complex on the Iron Range. This study confirms that Minnesota can be a leader in the responsible mining of these metals. I support this study and I support PolyMet Mining and I thank you for the opportunity to share my comments with you tonight.

Pat Nudd

39887

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Pat Nudd
2365 Lake George Dr NW Cedar, MN 55011-4216

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Rogowski

47794

Dear Mr Periman, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from overtopping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from li

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Rogowski

49120

Dear Mr Dabney, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from overtopping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from lia

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Stevesand

9405

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pat Stevesand 13109 Walnut Cir 13109 Walnut Cir Burnsville, MN 55337

18782

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Pat Stevesand 13109 Walnut Cir 13109 Walnut Cir Burnsville, MN 55337

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Stevesand

19072

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Pat Stevesand 13109 Walnut Cir 13109 Walnut Cir Burnsville, MN 55337 952-895-0433

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Stevesand

39437

---Original Message--- From: ptstvsnd@comcaStnet [mailto:ptstvsnd@comcaStnet] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:44 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Pat Stevesand 13109 Walnut Cir Burnsville, MN 55337-3885

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat Stevesand

39442

---Original Message--- From: ptstvsnd@comcaStnet [mailto:ptstvsnd@comcaStnet] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:44 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Pat Stevesand 13109 Walnut Cir Burnsville, MN 55337-3885

Alphabetical by sender's first name

pat thomas

17055

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, pat thomas 6219 E. Superior St Duluth, MN 55804

50326

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, pat thomas 6219 E. Superior St Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pat.Burow 12076

So, you really want to take a chance that our groundwater and surface water will be polluted because of sulfide mining in one of our most pristine areas in Minnesota and an area that attracts people from all over the world. It is difficult to fathom .. I am concerned, not only for the quality of water to be preserved, but also for the towns, most particularly Ely. Have you visited Wiliston, North Dakota or Dickenson, North Dakota. You would see towns that have changed, and not for the good. So, ask yourselves if 350 jobs lasting for 20 years is worth it. And, ask yourselves if destroying wilderness areas and water quality for years to come is worth it. It is time to say STOP to those who are greedy for money and have little concern for quality of environment that should be available for generations to come. Pat Burow Mendota Heights, MN

Patrice Hundstad 39879

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patrice Hundstad 1319 Warren St Mankato, MN 56001-4948

Patricia B Olson 54746

See attachment

Patricia B Penschorn 54821

See attachment

54822

See attachment

Patricia Bacon 30188

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, There was a time when Lake Superior was once the standard for clean water in Michigan. It is still one of the cleaner bodies of water we have left. At a time when CA, NV and many other areas are experiencing droughts and water pollution, why would there even be any consideration to allow such a polluting industry to put this risk and probable inevitability of contamination of such a priceless gift as Lake Superior and the entire Great Lakes ecosystem over the welfare of 20% of the population of the USA.. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Patricia Bacon 1100 Cottage Row Hancock, MI 49930-1125

Alphabetical by sender's first name

patricia benson

15997

On behalf of the moose, and in light of the dubious projections of the positive economic impact of mining for the region, I am finally chiming in. NO to PolyMet. Yes, it is complex analysis of the benefits vs. harmful consequences. But it is a simple proposition: Short-term (20 years) thinking vs. long-term action on behalf of future generations, human and non-human, the future of the watershed, the future of Mother Earth. Respectfully, Pat Benson Patricia Benson [HYPERLINK "mailto:pjbenson@frontiernet-net"](mailto:pjbenson@frontiernet-net) pjbenson@frontiernet-net 651-433-4126 (c) 651-303-9280 14281 St Croix Trl. N. Stillwater, MN 55082 “Few are the giants of the soul who actually feel that the human race is their family circle.” Freya Stark, explorer and writer (1893-1993)

Patricia Buck

18919

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) to 180 days. 90 days simply is not long enough to read and comment on the document. Please listen to the people who live here.– there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal “Major Differences of Opinion” call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Patricia Buck Patricia Buck 8215 Kelsey Whiteface Road Kelsey, MN 55724

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Donnelly

40157

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I am also concerned that besides all the possible pollution, we will be paying for hundreds of years of cleanup when the use for copper may be replaced with another product in a few years, just like has happened to so many other products that we used to use. Minnesotans have worked hard to preserve our natural resources and I don't want to see ll that work undone for a few hundred jobs. When the internet reaches this area there will no longer be a need for unhealthy mining jobs. Thank you for voting this issue down. Patricia Donnelly 9141 3rd Ave So. Bloomington, MN 55420 Sincerely, Miss Patricia Donnelly 9141 3rd Ave S Bloomington, MN 55420-3739 (952) 884-4915

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Feld

16189

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Patricia Fletcher

54120

I do not support PolyMet Mining. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

patricia flynn

45541

After going to a number of open sessions, both pro and con, and reading and hearing much info about what PolyMet would do to our wonderful state of MN, I could write a dissertation on why not to allow such a project to happen.. It sounds to me that PolyMet would come to Northern MN for approximately 20 years and put their profits from our minerals in a Swiss bank, and walk away, leaving behind up to approximately 500 years of destruction to our northern area. Why would anyone with good common sense allow such a thing to happen. It sounds to me like another major mistake our DNR Commissioner is willing to approve without listening to the constituents of MN. Look at the statistics in this case and then follow the feedback of what the majority Minnesota's population is giving you. **DO NOT APPROVE THIS MINING PROJECT.** Thank you. Darryl J. Schwerzler 7524 E. Borman Ct. Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

Alphabetical by sender's first name

patricia flynn 45595

I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed NorthMet Mining Project. Twenty years of mining and 200 jobs at the mine aren't worth the devastation that will occur, at sometime, in the pristine area of MN where the mine will be located. The people who live in the area and want this aren't thinking about the future of their children and grandchildren, not alone all the other people who vacation and enjoy this beautiful area of MN. The wild rice paddies and the Native Americans are another reason not to proceed. This is sacred ground to them and they have been there longer than the white man, and will be there long after NorthMet leaves its mark. There are no guarantees that something unforeseen won't happen. NorthMet can file bankruptcy and be out of the picture and leave the potential clean up for all of us to pay for. Some things in this world are worth more than money, and this area of MN is one of them. The people who live in the area need to do what I had to do; go to school and get retrained in a different career. Thank you. Patricia A. Flynn 7524 E. Borman Ct. Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

Patricia Gunderson 7121

Hi, - The SDEIS is inadequate; it does not provide any reassurance that this mining will not result in irreparable harm to the watery environment in our Arrowhead. PolyMet issues as noted in the SDEIS: The PolyMet SDEIS describes significant environmental issues associated with this proposed mine. Please don not move forward with this plan unless there are assurances no harm will come to our water. Thank you. Patricia Gunderson 390 Harriet Ave Shoreview MN 55126

Patricia Hammel 44970

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am a Wisconsin resident and am very concerned about the effects of sulfide mining on the Lake Superior watershed and Lake Superior itself. Lake Superior is an exceptional freshwater resource of global importance for which we are responsible. The likelihood that the Polymet mine will result in sulfuric mine drainage, methylmercury pollution and asbestiform discharges into Lake Superior tributaries is an unacceptable risk. Polymet's prior environmental analysis was unacceptable to the EPA. The current SDEIS is also inadequate as it is based on unrealistic groundwater/hydrology models and assumptions about the capacity and integrity of tailings ponds. Mining is the primary source of mercury pollution in the Lake Superior region. The United States has both signed and ratified the Minimata Convention on mercury pollution pledging to limit new emissions of mercury and to clean up existing mercury sources. Allowing Polymet to obtain a mining permit without stringent safeguards to prevent mercury emissions violates our commitment to the Minimata convention. Last but not least the possible presence of asbestiform minerals in the mine area compels us to consider the health of the mine workers and local communities who, based on past experience, will bear the brunt of the release of asbestiform particles into the environment of the mine. Indigenous people living near the mine will be most heavily impacted because they live on their traditional lands and rely on wild rice and fish for food and cultural survival. Require that the SDEIS address these concerns, or deny Polymet's permit application. Sincerely Patricia Hammel 1424 Jenifer Street Madison, WI 53703 608 258-1441

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Harlan-Marks

20062

From: hmfamily@aol-com [mailto:hmfamily@aol-com] Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 4:05 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Concern re: proposed Poly Met mining in northeastern MN Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed PolyMet Mining open-pit mines on 67,000 acres of Superior National Forest. If permitted, these mines would leave behind sulfide-bearing waste rock that could result in sulfuric acid mine drainage and would require treatment of polluted water for hundreds of years. I seriously doubt that the mining can be done without toxic pollutants poisoning our fish, killing our wild rice and contaminating our ground water. My concerns are based on the following: 1- The newest DEIS provides no assurance that this mining can be done without irreparable harm to the watery environment in our Arrowhead. 2- There is no example in the world of a copper/nickel sulfide mine in a water-rich environment that has not resulted in contamination of surface and/or ground water with sulfates and toxic heavy metals. 3- When sulfide ore comes in contact with air and water it produces sulfuric acid, which kills all flora and leaches heavy metals from the soil, including mercury and arsenic. 4- Claims that sulfide mines have operated without violating water standards are based on mines located in deserts or mines that were exempted from ordinary water quality standards. 5- This kind of mine has never been tried in Minnesota; iron mines do not produce sulfide waste. 6- Mining companies routinely declare bankruptcy as the mine is exhausted, leaving the taxpayers to pick up the tab for attempts to clean up the environment. 7- PolyMet is a junior mining company headquartered in Vancouver, Canada. It has never operated a mine before and is backed financially by the Swiss company Glencore Xstrata. Glencore has a record of massive tax evasion in third world countries. Additionally, Glencore has suffered dozens of fatalities and been subject to six-figure fines for environmental breaches – 2008-2010- 8-Sulfide mining threatens our remaining stands of natural wild rice in the St Louis River. The sulfate standard for wild rice is 10 mg/liter, a standard the waste water from the mine could not meet. 9- The mine will impact over 4000 acres of prime wildlife habitat and impair wildlife movement through the area. 10-Processing the ore would increase Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions significantly. It is imperative that our state make decisions which ensure the health of our environment for generations to come. The risks of damage which may be caused by the open pit mines are formidable. Please deny the request for Sulfide Mining by PolyMet. Our State must depend on wise stewardship to protect the environment and ensure that projects which may yield short-term gain will not result in long-term, irreversible damage to our forests, our land, our waterways, and our environment. Sincerely, Patricia Harlan-Marks

Patricia Hauser

7362

Patricia Hauser 5805 Minnetonka Drive Shorewood, MN 55331-2945 Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 January 22, 2014 Dear EIS Project Manager, Lisa Fay, I believe any sulfide mining must be done without polluting our environment. The current Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement regarding PolyMet is inadequate. It provides no reassurance that this mining will not cause irreparable damage to our Minnesota waters for hundreds of years. What are people thinking. Is it about 20 years of jobs (the projected time PolyMet Inc. wants to mine) versus up to 500 years of treating the polluted water caused by the mining process. Our country isn't even as old as it will take to clean up the poisoned water. And what about the birds, insects, animals and plants that use the water, where is the wildlife considered in this equation. As I understand it, leaking polluted water will get into the tributaries of the St Louis River (thus threatening the wild rice) and eventually into Lake Superior. What about our fish and other aquatic life. What about the people who make a living on tourism and fishing connected to Lake Superior. What about their jobs. What about the fact that Lake Superior needs to be protected and treasured. Do we really want dead zones there like we have in the Mississippi River. Do we really want to jeopardize that Great Lake for a measly 20 years of mining. Another thing, PolyMet is headquartered in Canada and has never operated a mine before. So there's no track record or mining experience. But it is financed by the Swiss company, Glencore, which has been implicated in past environmental disasters, labor violations and human right abuses around the world. Great, yet another rogue multinational company willing to trash our environment and walk away. In summary, the SDEIS should be sent back for improvements until PolyMet Inc. proves it can definitely be operated safely without any environmental damage. Sincerely, Patricia Hauser 5805 Minnetonka Dr Shorewood, MN 55331

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Johnson

52277

To Whom it May Concern, I am not in favor of giving Polymet approval to open the copper nickel mine. The mining industry does not have a good track record in taking care of environmental concerns. I am concerned about air and water pollution and what happens in the future after the fresh water and clean air are so damaged and that it is unsafe to use. What happens when some unexpected event occurs to further contaminate the environment and the money Polymet originally sets aside runs out. Will Polymet be around to clean up the mess. In my opinion the company will be long gone and the state, which means the taxpayers, will be left to try to "fix" the mess left behind by the mining company. I understand the local citizens would like to see the employment opportunities come to their communities and that those jobs would enhance the local economies but the long term cost is just too high. I would like to see some other industry locate in northern Minnesota that could provide jobs for the residents there. Please do not allow Polymet to open the copper nickel mine. Clean air and water are essential. Please don't take chances with our most precious resources. Thank you for considering my request Patricia Johnson 13940 71st Ave N Maple Grove, MN 55311 Sent from my iPad

Patricia L. Feld

16183

thanks for your quick response. I know it's a robo-response, but getting it lets me know that the DNR is listening. if PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS is not around in 500 years, who will be cleaning up for that generation of Minnesotans. Patricia L. Feld On Thursday, February 20, 2014 1:00 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Patricia Loverink

39712

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patricia Loverink 403 19th St NE Austin, MN 55912-4147

Patricia Makowski

39589

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patricia Makowski 5245 Neal Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082-2112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Markert

16791

As someone whose family has lived in the northern counties of Minnesota over the years, and seen the landscape ruined by the mines return somewhat to its former self, I am newly concerned at the environmental proposal for copper and nickel mining in this delicate region. Here are my questions with regard to the SDEIS: Are you sure that five hundred years is a proper window within which to return a forest to itself. Who would pay for the clean up once this company is no longer in business. How would you ensure the accountability of any owner of the property for such a long period. How can you be sure that the ground water will not accelerate the flow of run off of contaminated water into rivers and lakes. It is clear that the region has been depressed and looking for ways to make money. However, it does not make sense for the region to bring in a business that returns to old and polluting methods of mining. Sincerely, ?- Patricia Markert Aakre [HYPERLINK "mailto:pmarkert@fastmail.fm"pmarkert@fastmail.fm](mailto:pmarkert@fastmail.fm)

Patricia McDonald

41761

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Patricia McDonald 2348 Summerfield Rd Winter Park, FL 32792-5009

Patricia McNabb

14562

Thanks, Pat McNabb From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [<mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us>] Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2014 7:47 PM To: Patricia McNabb Subject: RE: Protect our Water from the Proposed PolyMet Mine Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Patricia Moore

10927

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Patricia Moore 914 Greeley St S Stillwater, MN 55082-5969 (612) 386-7190

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Mulcahy

39893

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Patricia Mulcahy 18507 Beaver Trl Minnetonka, MN 55345-3109

patricia mundy

17151

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, patricia mundy 803 smetana rd Apt 1 hopkins, MN 55343

Alphabetical by sender's first name

patricia mundy

50418

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, patricia mundy 803 smetana rd Apt 1 hopkins, MN 55343

Patricia Nelson

40014

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. In summary, I am concerned about the environmental impact the sulfide mining will have during the mining years as well as down the line. It is too much of an unknown when it's affecting the Minnesota environment. We can, and should, live without sulfide mining in Minnesota. Thanks you. Patricia Nelson The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patricia Nelson 5457 44th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-2203

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Noble-Olson

39554

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Patricia Penshor

48156

See attachment

Patricia Phillips

40819

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Patricia Phillips 487 Wolcott Ave Kent, OH 44240-2355 (330) 678-6962

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Richard-Amato

16738

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patricia Richard-Amato 4004 London Rd Apt. 1111 Duluth, MN 55804

43117

Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity to express my environmental concerns about the proposed PolyMet copper mine. I am not a scientist myself, but I know what having a relatively unpolluted environment means to me and to my family, friends, and neighbors here on the shores of Lake Superior. We have only one EARTH and one Lake Superior. Why not protect them. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan is riddled with many issues and concerns: 1- Sulfate discharges in our wetlands could bring the levels of mercury in our fish up to dangerous levels. 2- One in 10 babies born in our area already has unsafe levels of mercury in its blood (please see the report by the Minnesota Health Department). 3- Hoyt Lakes itself could have its drinking water made unsafe to due to the mine waste piles proposed by PolyMet. 4- Huge areas of habitat for our wildlife would be threatened. 5- A full study of health effects on humans from mercury and asbestos-like fibers from rock at the mine site has not been done. Much of it could eventually leach into Lake Superior and into many of our rivers and streamS 6- We don't know what the cost of treatment of polluted water will be and for how many hundreds of years. I am very much against moving forward with the plan proposed for the PolyMet mine. There are too many unanswered questions and the risks are far too great, not only for us, but for future generations. Sincerely yours, Patricia A. Richard-Amato 4004 London Rd Apt. 1111 Duluth, MN 55804 (218) 625-8340 HYPERLINK "mailto:prichardamato@gmail-com"prichardamato@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Richard-Amato

50098

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patricia Richard-Amato 4004 London Rd Apt. 1111 Duluth, MN 55804

Patricia Rossetti

57225

We need to protect our forest and wildlife and Minnesota's precious water. We need to protect our lakes and rivers. We allow companies to disrupt our natural habitats. What is going to happen to our future generation. I say stop the sulfide mining. Patricia Rossetti 2015 Stanford Ave Duluth, MN 55811

Patricia S Anderson

57933

What could you be thinking!!! NO, NO, NO, Think of the total waste of Sudbury, Ontario. This pristine wilderness is worth far more unspoilt. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Patricia Sannes

48177

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Patricia Sannes 729 Washington Avenue Crookston, MN 56716

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Shepard

39600

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patricia Stock

40301

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Patricia Stock 27001 Oakwood Drive Olmsted Falls, OH 44138 US

Patricia Walter

33041

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, and harm to wildlife. PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Patricia Walter 12101 Dodd Blvd Rosemount, MN 55068-3255 (612) 483-3101

33071

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, and harm to wildlife. PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Patricia Walter 12101 Dodd Blvd Rosemount, MN 55068-3255 (612) 483-3101

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick & Brenda Alcorn

39603

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Patrick and Brenda Alcorn PO Box 236 Red Lake Falls, MN 56750-0236 (218) 253-2094

Patrick Anderson

15727

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Anderson

40102

From: anderick1@gmail-com [anderick1@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:43 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR)
Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. In addition, there is no factual basis for the cost per year figures (\$3-9 to \$6 M) put forth by Polymet. This is a fundamental flaw since it deprives the public an opportunity to adequately and appropriately review the accuracy of those figures. This flaw along with the ambiguous calculations for length of water treatment make it impossible to determine adequate financial assurances. While financial assurances will also be part of the permitting process, the factual basis for those calculations should be determined during the EIS phase. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Patrick Anderson 267 Peninsula Rd Minneapolis, MN 55441-4179

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Anderson

40103

From: anderick1@gmail-com [anderick1@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:43 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR)
Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. In addition, there is no factual basis for the cost per year figures (\$3-9 to \$6 M) put forth by Polymet. This is a fundamental flaw since it deprives the public an opportunity to adequately and appropriately review the accuracy of those figures. This flaw along with the ambiguous calculations for length of water treatment make it impossible to determine adequate financial assurances. While financial assurances will also be part of the permitting process, the factual basis for those calculations should be determined during the EIS phase. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Patrick Anderson 267 Peninsula Rd Minneapolis, MN 55441-4179

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Brezonik

16258

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Patrick Byron

39917

DNR and related staff, As a Minnesotan and frequent user of the BWCA, I have GRAVE concerns regarding the proposed PolyMet project. With a brother and sister-in-law having first hand knowledge of the mining related issues in the state of Montana and the HORRORS of corporate irresponsibility regarding water quality, I am unequivocally OPPOSED to this project. Even with promised jobs and development, the remote chance of tainting waters in the BWCA is too much of a risk to take. I have concerns about the data that exists on this project as well, in short, worst case scenarios have NOT been addressed. I have real fears that beyond the destruction of the environment, the people of Minnesota will be left with a clean-up bill and/or legal issues that would NOT be in the best interest of our state. This is NOT a project that serves the interests of ALL Minnesotans. Patrick Byron 157 West Third Street # 104 Winona, MN 55987 <https://mail.google-com/mail/u/0/images/cleardot.gif>

39955

DNR and related staff, As a Minnesotan and frequent user of the BWCA, I have GRAVE concerns regarding the proposed PolyMet project. With a brother and sister-in-law having first hand knowledge of the mining related issues in the state of Montana and the HORRORS of corporate irresponsibility regarding water quality, I am unequivocally OPPOSED to this project. Even with promised jobs and development, the remote chance of tainting waters in the BWCA is too much of a risk to take. I have concerns about the data that exists on this project as well, in short, worst case scenarios have NOT been addressed. I have real fears that beyond the destruction of the environment, the people of Minnesota will be left with a clean-up bill and/or legal issues that would NOT be in the best interest of our state. This is NOT a project that serves the interests of ALL Minnesotans. Patrick Byron [HYPERLINK "mailto:pabyron@gmail-com"](mailto:pabyron@gmail-com)pabyron@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Chase 30098

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. To create and leave a cleanup mess for the next ten generations is not right - simply not right. It is one thing to say we didn't know the side effects of asbestos or PCPs, but here we do know and there no way we can justify it. We have to say, "Not here, Not today, we have made too many mistakes. Lets leave it for future generations to decide." Sincerely, Patrick Chase 291 Rice Creek Ter NE Fridley, MN 55432-4329 (763) 572-8762

37629

I am against it on three grounds. First, the mining operation is to last twenty plus years and the reclamation period is hundreds of years. The persons involved in signing off will be long gone, legal issues of blame and cost will be in the courts for years. In twenty years there will be another pressing need for those jobs. Second, in a similar ecosystem has copper mining not polluted the surrounding environment. Third, the recent experience of the DNR handling the clear violation of Lutzen Ski Resort pulling water from a trout stream demonstrates the DNR's conflict between preserving nature and economic realities. The DNR chose jobs over preserving the natural environment. We are at that same pivotal point. We have a budget surplus, use part of that money to retrain the workforce in Northeast Minnesota. Or use some of the money to improve the infrastructure in that part of the state. It is a political tradeoff letting future generations make their choice when times are more stressful. With an unemployment rate of 6 %, we are not in position to gamble our resources for a few jobs today. I do go to the BWCA every year for it is a unique place. Patrick Chase 291 Rice Creek Terrace Fridley, Minn. 55432 Sent from my iPad

Patrick Connolly 54672

See attachment

Patrick Cutshall 22054

We all use copper, nickel, etc every day. So if it is not mined in Minnesota's Iron Range it will be mined somewhere else. I have confidence in the state of Minnesota and Polymet that it will be mined in the right way for both job creation and the environment. If it is not mined here but somewhere else not only will those good paying jobs and the taxes go somewhere but the environment would actually be more polluted. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Pat Cutshall 116 Northfield Street, Duluth MN, 55803

Patrick Dehart 15755

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Doss-Smith

20067

--Original Message-- From: pdossmith@live-com [mailto:pdossmith@live-com] Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 2:43 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: PolyMet proposes a complex mechanical system of pumps, pipelines, and filters that it says will capture and hold back the water pollution from getting into our rivers. PolyMet assumes the proposed expensive and complicated water treatment system will continue to operate effectively for long, long after the mining has stopped. It should be expected that mechanical systems like pumps, filters and pipes will eventually fail. In a 2007 report, an organization called Earthworks analyzed the records of 14 modern copper mines in five states found that 100% of these mines experienced pipeline spills or other accidental releases. 92% had failures of water collection and treatment systems that resulted in releases of contaminated mine seepage that significantly impacted water quality. But PolyMet's SDEIS lacks contingency plans for predictable failures in the proposed piping, pumping, and filtration equipment. By assuming that a complicated water treatment system will function indefinitely without fail, the SDEIS has failed to take the hard look required at the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. Please send the SDEIS and PolyMet back to the drawing board with directions to include contingency plans for predictable failures in the water pumping and treatment system, and the power supply to run that system. In addition, the SDEIS proposes to dump tailings from the mining process on top of the former LTV Steel's tailings basin, which was built in the 1950s on top of three streams, was designed to leak. In fact, the existing tailings basin is already leaking millions of gallons of untreated water, yet the chemical composition of that large volume of leaking water has not been tested and characterized. The failure to test and account for known leaks of untreated tailings basin water from the existing LTV Steel tailings basin is another major problem with the SDEIS. Moreover, the tailings basin and the dam holding it back from flowing downstream are recognized to be unstable. If the tailings basin dam were to fail, vast quantities of contaminated tailings, sulfates, and heavy metals would be released into the headwaters of the St Louis River. In other mines, such tailings basin failures have sent a flood of millions of cubic yards of toxic debris as much as hundreds of miles downstream. The failure of the SDEIS to fully consider the potential for . and the consequences of . a tailings dam failure is a deadly flaw in the SDEIS. Sincerely, Patrick Doss-Smith 3959 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-3043

39060

---Original Message--- From: pdossmith@live-com [mailto:pdossmith@live-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:23 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Patrick Doss-Smith 3959 27th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-3043

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Drescich 15757

See attachment

Patrick Gibbons 44064

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. The Boundary Waters are a treasure not only for Minnesota but for the rest of the world, and anything that damages the environment in this area is a bad idea. Also, while the employment opportunities arising from sulfide mining may be attractive in the short-term, in the long term the damage done would far outweigh these advantages and destroy the natural beauty that the local tourism industry depends on. -PG Sincerely, Mr Patrick Gibbons PO Box 626 Collegeville, MN 56321-0626

Patrick Knight 42851

See attachment

Patrick M Radzak 42714

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Mulloy

43991

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for generations and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Environmental hazards are present during every step of the open-pit mining process. Hardrock mining exposes rock that has lain unexposed for geological eras. When crushed, these rocks expose radioactive elements, asbestos-like minerals, and metallic dust. During separation, residual rock slurries, which are mixtures of pulverized rock and liquid, are produced as tailings, toxic and radioactive elements from these liquids can leak into bedrock if not properly contained. The Polymet Draft Plan is in large part science fiction, based on assumptions long into the future that are unverifiable. The facility will require environmental stewardship long into the future - long past the projected 500 years of water treatment discussed in the EIS. No corporation has lasted that long and few governments have. According to Earthworks, 40 existing hardrock mines will annually generate 17 to 27 billion gallons of polluted water forever. The Polymet project will annually generate an estimated 93 to 256 million gallons of wastewater per year in perpetuity. In general, despite all precautions, these mines do not have a good track record. A review of the historical record suggests that catastrophic failure is the normal state of affairs and that in the end, the tax payers usually end up holding the bag. Some examples: Butte, Montana's Berkeley Pit mine is now one of the nation's largest superfund sites. Midnight Mine, operating from 1955 to 1988 is still a superfund site with remediation to continue far into the future. At 10 a.m. on February 10, 2011, disaster struck the Çöllolar coalfield in central Turkey, near the city of Elbistan. The northeastern wall of an open-pit mine collapsed, sending about 50 million tons of material into the mine. The debris buried and killed ten workers. Maine's Callahan Mine Site, now a superfund site, is the only open pit mine built in an estuary system. The mine operated from 1968 to 1972 and a recent Dartmouth College study indicates that dangerous concentrations of toxic metals continue to seep into the estuary from the mine site. New Mexico's Chevron Questa Mine, operated as an open pit from 1965 to 1983, produced over 328 million tons of acid generating rock waste stored in nine piles located around the pit and producing over 100 million tons of tailing stored in tailing ponds on the site. South Dakota's recently closed Gilt Edge Mine has already cost tax payers over \$30 million in cleanup costs and acidic mine wastes laced with heavy metals continue to threaten ground and surface water. A waste water treatment plant has been treating wastes from a capped waste rock pile but the entire site is toxic. California's Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine site initially was mined for sulfur from 1865 to 1871- Mercury ore was mined intermittently by underground methods from 1873 to 1905- The site was intermittently open pit mined from 1915 to 1957- It is now a Superfund site. Colorado's Summitville Mine operated as an open pit mine from 1984 through 1991 and became a Superfund Site in 1994- Toxic releases from the site killed most aquatic life along a 17 mile stretch of the Alamosa River in 1991 with additional kills recorded in 1992- The company declared bankruptcy in 1992 and walks away. To date, tax payers have spent \$150 billion in clean up costs. February 2, 2014 Duke Energy's tailings pond failed sending 82,000 tons of toxic coal ash and 27 million gallons of contaminated water flowing into the North Carolina's Dan river. 9:30 pm on April 11, 2013 165 million tons of rock s

Patrick Murn

10698

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: With all due respect to the state of Minnesota and the right of it's people to use the state resources it possesses, please reject the permit requests for copper sulphide mining by PolyMet and all applicant mining companies. Copper-sulphide mining is way too contaminating to be considered in such a pristine and rare wilderness natural resource. I grew up in the area and my parents and grandparents lived in Ely. There is just no way in good conscious I can recommend this type of mining in such a delicate and vulnerable ecosystem. Please don't destroy this wonderful national treasure by approving permits for such an environmental devastating type of hard rock mining. Although we need and use the precious metals and we also need the jobs in the region, the environmental destruction that historically and inevitably happens every time this type of mining is performed is not worth the environmental cost. Please vote with your logical thinking and your heart. We all know that it has and will destroy these precious lands and waters. With all due respect, do not be manipulated into thinking otherwise. Sincerely and successfully,
Patrick G. Murn
Patrick Murn 14017 Romberg shores Ely, MN 55731 320 260 1130

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Murn

14906

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Murn

14908

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Murn

14910

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Murn

14912

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

patrick Needham

39574

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. if our state were a person, he would need dialysis after this mining. dialysis is not cheap. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr patrick Needham 4132 19th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-3422

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patrick Witherow

43692

Destruction of the BWCAW due to manmade toxic sulfide would be an unforgivable crime against nature and Minnesota. Think about the jobs and tourism lost to the Ely area if the BWCAW becomes polluted, or worse. The past article in the Star newspaper that Ely is dying because of the lack of jobs has been strongly refuted by most of the residents who also feel a great loss will ensue if this mining goes through. Just look at the radioactive waste that is currently contaminating North Dakota and you get an idea of how the Ely area will look after the miners are gone. I've been told that there has never been a copper mining operation anywhere that has not resulted in a disaster to the environment. Can't we find another alternative. Some "clean" industry to start up there instead. I've also been told that PolyMet is owned by a Swedish company that has destroyed thousands of acres of Swedish landscape with their mining efforts. And you want to trust a foreign company with the health of the Minnesota environment. I say nay, please say nay. Live in the Light Patrick Witherow pwithero@comcaStnet <http://www.patwitherowimages-com>

Patti Donaldson

16939

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patti Donaldson 36413 370 Street Richville, MN 56576

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patti Donaldson

50232

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Patti Donaldson 36413 370 Street Richville, MN 56576

52240

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Patti Donaldson 36413 370th Street Richville, MN 56576

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patti Eckert

41713

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Patti Isaacs

9851

While we cannot ignore the need for employment in the region, I don't see how a twenty year supply of copper and nickel—and profit for a single company—balances five centuries of pollution of Minnesota's most precious resource, water. This mine should not be approved, but the state needs to explore other more sustainable ways to bring jobs to northeastern Minnesota. Patricia Isaacs 13720 Paragon Ave N. Stillwater, MN 55082

Patti Packer

42852

See attachment

patty bracey

43492

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, patty bracey 16600 Lehn U-Trail Brandon, MN 56315, MN 56315

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patty Flynn

10722

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patty Flynn 7524 Borman Ct Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

18403

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patty Flynn 7524 Borman Ct Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patty Flynn

50522

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Patty Flynn 7524 Borman Ct Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076

Patty Lange

44858

Hello, It has been brought to my attention that the maps outlining the drainage area around the proposed mine in the environmental study for the Polymet mine are incorrect. The maps include incorrect outlines of the One Hundred Mile Swamp which is downhill from the mine site and will collect acid and heavy metal laced run off from the mine. While the true One Hundred Mile Swamp is over 10 miles long and drains out of its east end to the BWCA, PolyMet environmental impact statement maps draw a much smaller swamp less than 6 miles long that cuts off the eastern portion of the swamp, creating the illusion that the mine and BWCA are not connected. The fact that the incorrect maps outline the swamp with a dashed teal line on satellite maps with green backgrounds makes it extremely difficult to see. This discrepancy between the environmental impact statement maps and US government maps makes this environmental impact study inadequate. These maps are wrong and the environmental impact statement is inadequate until the maps have been corrected. Thank you for your time, Best Regards, Patricia Lange 2063 Ames Ave Saint Paul, Mn 55119 Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patty Mac

43471

I do not want to see copper mining in Minnesota. No matter what the company says they cannot predict the future. Despite their best laid plans; what would happen if a truck with sulfuric acid overturned near the water. What about the weather. Horrible tornadoes. Another winter like this one (or two or three). What about fires. What about human error. Remember Fukushima. That nuclear disaster wasn't supposed to happen And what about something more recent and closer to home-the water crisis in Charleston, West Virginia-that wasn't supposed to happen either, but who is paying for it now - in dollars, health and stress. Freedom Industries has filed chapter 11, so they will be minimizing their payouts-so it's not them; the weight of the crisis falls on the citizens, as it will when something happens at a copper mine in northern Minnesota. Glencore, the company that it looks like will be heavily involved or end up with a large share of the mine, has a horrible track record If any of the things that happened at their Mapani mine happen here it would be devastating-environmental problems, health hazards, death of miners. And that mine is just a small part of the trail of environmental hazards, human hardship and financial costs it leaves in the local communities it does "business" in. Not too mention the big gaping hole the mining leaves in the earth-have you seen the pictures of current copper mines. They are horrid. Our water and natural environment are two of our greatest resources-in fact fresh water could be THE greatest resource-do we really want to risk our long term future for a short term benefit. If it's jobs you are trying to bring to that area of the state-there has got to be a better way. There are new (and green) technologies being developed all of the time-invest your time, effort and money into one of these technologies that can benefit all groups, now and in the future. Patty McDonald 2150 Mailand Road St Paul, MN 55119 651-739-5006

Patty Moses and Tom Haller

43017

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit Dear Ms Fay: Attached is my comment on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. Thank you for your serious consideration of comments from myself and the public at large. Patricia A. Moses 478 Bayview Dr Roseville, MN 55113

Patty Murn

36627

Dear Ms Fey, Do you really want this legacy. Opening up the first future Superfund site in Minnesota. Why. Polymet has told you that the water will be polluted for 200-500 years. What kind of a statement is that. And what kind of a steward of natural resources would qualify it with consideration. Mark Twain said that a mine was a liar standing next to a hole. He was right. Polymet has never operated a mine before, and is backed financially by the Swiss company Glencore. Glencore has a significant financial stake in the company, and has an exclusive agreement to sell the mine's metals on the global commodities market. While PolyMet doesn't have a track record to consider, Glencore does. The company was founded by Marc Rich, the financier embroiled in scandal and pardoned by President Bill Clinton. The company has been implicated in environmental disasters, labor violations, and human rights abuses around the world. Certainly you've heard the plight of the neighbors of the fracking in the Dakotas. It's horrible and once the mining company moves in you cannot control them at all. What about the St Lawrence river, the wild ricing that will disappear, and the pollution of Lake Superior. The Great Lakes comprise 1/5 of the worlds fresh water. It is unbelievable. Why have a comment period of the comments are ignored. Your children and grandchildren won't have a wilderness to go to. You're probably too young to remember the Joni Mitchell song "Paved paradise put in a parking lot." Please take a minute to watch this video. <http://www.youtube-com/watch.v=3V3im2h89F8> Sincerely, Patty Murn

Patty O'keefe

47692

Mar 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. First of all, why in the world are we doing this when only 25% of copper nickel products are recycled. Second, it's time for commissioners at the DNR to stop acting like politicians in making decisions with short term gains in mind. There's no reason why we should be risking polluting water at a time when climate change is causing the largest amount of global water scarcity since the existence of humans. The decision does define who you all are as individuals and what kind of legacy you will leave Give it some real thought. Sincerely, Patty O'Keefe, Age: 24 8113 Virginia Circle North, St Louis Park, MN, 55426 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patty O'keefe 8113 Virginia Cir N St Louis Park, MN 55426-2443 (952) 221-3977

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Patty O'keefe

48480

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. First of all, why in the world are we doing this when only 25% of copper nickel products are recycled. Second, it's time for commissioners at the DNR to stop acting like politicians in making decisions with short term gains in mind. There's no reason why we should be risking polluting water at a time when climate change is causing the largest amount of global water scarcity since the existence of humans. The decision does define who you all are as individuals and what kind of legacy you will leave Give it some real thought. Sincerely, Patty O'Keefe, Age: 24 8113 Virginia Circle North, St Louis Park, MN, 55426 The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Patty O'keefe 8113 Virginia Cir N St Louis Park, MN 55426-2443 (952) 221-3977

Paul J. Wotzka

43312

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources The DNR is performing its duties in the SDEIS as a trustee for the water resources of the State. The groundwater, rivers, streams and wetlands are public assets and as trustees of those assets, The DNR must not deplete or destroy them. They must perform their duties as trustees of our waters for the people of Minnesota - not Polymet's. When I read about the DNR's role in the draining of White Bear Lake or the crash of the walleye population in Mille Lacs or the decimation of the moose in NE MN, I believe that the DNR has regulated itself to a role of firefighter - trying to saving what they can before its gone. The people of Minnesota expect more from the DNR and their tax dollars especially when it comes to protecting the most pristine water we have left. The SDEIS for the Polymet project is inadequate, incomplete, and based on many false and misleading assumptions and therefore must be rejected. Please note the specific issues below: The following are the main issues with the PolyMet SDEIS concerning environmental impacts to wetlands and watersheds: The main reason given for establishment of the Superior National Forest and the purchase of Federal lands through the Weeks Act was to protect the headwaters of the St Louis River. The proposed land exchange and destruction of wetlands in these headwaters is a violation of the intended purpose of these Federal lands. The land exchange sets a bad precedent and it is unknown how many additional land exchanges may be needed for future mine proposals. Allowing the loss of so much forest and wetland cover in these headwaters and the potential impacts to their hydrology and water quality are counter-productive to the MN DNR's mission of long-term protection of the state's surface and groundwater resources. Too much wetland and stream area will be destroyed or impacted by this project to be considered an environmentally responsible mine. The ecological quality of the stream and wetland complex that would be impacted by this project is very high and deserves the highest level of wetland mitigation. The proposed mitigation does not compensate for the loss of wetland functions and values in these headwaters. The potential toxic effects of sulfur and heavy metals upon wetland vegetation from fugitive dust and precipitation are not adequately considered or evaluated. It is not accurate to use the natural range of variation of stream levels as a way to measure potential impacts to riparian wetlands from long-term water level changes caused by mining. The failure of state agency regulation of iron and taconite mines to correct current pollution issues does not give us confidence that future problems with sulfide mines will be adequately addressed. The SDEIS gives inadequate consideration to the "No Action Alternative" of the land exchange. The No Action Alternative must be reconsidered because: The mining proposal as currently outlined in the SDEIS fails to meet multiple environmental regulations which would lead to destruction of the land and pollution of the waters for many centuries It fails to protect the rights of the tribes as guaranteed in the Treaty of 1854 There is inadequate review of human health impacts at the mine, in surrounding communities, and in the watersheds below the mine There is inadequate review of cumulative impacts resulting from all previous and existing mines, and for all proposed mines that could be permitted over the next 10-15 years in this watershed The economic analysis was biased by only modeling the benefits, with inadequate analysis of the practical projects costs The intent of Congress in acquiring the lands within the Superior National Forest under the Weeks Law were to protect the waters and promote the growth of forests, in perpetuity The exchange only marginally improves the conflict in the severed estates, and fails to fully resolve this confl

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul and Liz Buettner

9803

To Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Dear Ms Fay, I find the SDEIS overall to be impressive in scope and detail. I have done my best to digest the contents of the full SDEIS, as it has been made available by the MNDNR. In this process I have been able to identify my own primary concerns. Thank you for the opportunity to share them in the following comments. I will focus on two sorts of issues: "A" (comments 1-4), relating to the science and logic of the SDEIS's proposal; and "B" (comments 5-9), considering issues of more philosophical and moral character, since this proposal raises primary questions of economic value, quality of life, and environmental justice in northeastern Minnesota. A. ISSUES PRIMARILY OF SCIENCE AND LOGIC. 1- The SDEIS states, "It is uncertain how long the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be long term; actual treatment requirements would be based on measured, rather than modeled, NorthMet Project water quality performance, as determined through monitoring requirements. PolyMet would be held accountable to maintenance and monitoring required under permit and would not be released until all conditions have been met." This statement does not make sense. Although the predictive model referenced in the SDEIS makes use of simulations in which water treatment may be required for 200 and 500 years at the proposed mine and plant sites, supporters of the proposed actions have been quick to point out that these are only modeled predictions, and that no one really expects that water treatment will be needed for that long. Yet SDEIS also states that no one does or can know how long water treatment will be needed, except to say that it is expected to be a long time. Polymet has been created as a corporation solely for the purpose of designing, operating, and, in approximately 20 years, shutting down this specific mining project. Based on previous histories of such ventures, no one can reasonably expect that Polymet will even exist "long term." Yet the SDEIS states that Polymet will be held accountable for post-closure maintenance and monitoring "until all conditions have been met." If it cannot be assumed that Polymet will exist to conduct long term maintenance and monitoring which Polymet does acknowledge will need to occur, then who, or what corporate or public entity, will be responsible for seeing this necessary activity through to an acceptable conclusion. It seems that Polymet must somehow be held accountable for this promise prior to the granting of any permits for its proposed action. Yet, exactly how can Polymet be held accountable prior to permitting for activities which are proposed to take place only upon and following closure of the mining project. It would seem that financial assurance instruments should provide such a structure of accountability. But who can accurately estimate how much financial assurance needs to be provided to underwrite post-closure maintenance and monitoring that is projected to be necessary for an indefinite period of time. If we do not and cannot know these things, how can we then have any assurance that anyone at all will be held accountable to mitigate and restore potentially damaged lands, wildlife, resources, and communities, quite possibly several generations, or even centuries, into the future. Such a claim is logically nonsensical. This question must be resolved in a sensible and understandable way prior to the granting of any permits for Polymet's proposed action. 2- The SDEIS states, "The level of engineering design and planning required to calculate detailed financial assurance amounts is typically made available during the permitting process and was not available at the time that this SDEIS was prepared." Polymet is therefore suggesting that concerns about financial assurance should be addressed during, and not prior to, the permitting process. I strongly disagree. It is only reasonable to require that Polymet provide ade

Paul Arhur Fleming

54531

As stated by Ted Kennedy: When will the greed end? Apparently never. As a 5th and 6th grade teacher I took my students to the Environmental Learning Center at Isabella and then Wolf Ridge MN each year. Instructing them in regards to conservation and protecting natural resources. This sulfide mining activity does irreparable damage to the water, wildlife and people living in the vicinity and outreaching areas. Hasn't anyone considered our children and grandchildren. Maybe not or they just don't care. It always comes down to the bottom line. Making wealthy people wealthier, and besides they won't have to live here. We do. Stand firm. Stay the course. Reject this proposal.

Paul Aslanian

46159

Dear DNR, For many substantial reasons I am OPPOSED to Polymet Acid Rock Mining in MN. Paul J Aslanian 1673 Princeton Ave St Paul, MN 55105 Thanks- PJA - Paul J. Aslanian Professor Emeritus, Economics Macalester College St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Bauer 43586

I have reviewed the NorthMet SDEIS and was impressed by its thoroughness and professionalism. I have full confidence that the Minnesota DNR, the US Army Corp of Engineers, the US Forest Service and all other involved agencies can, and will, provide the needed oversight and regulation to allow safe, successful mining of the NorthMet Mining Project. We need the minerals. We need the jobs. And, we need the project to be done correctly. I am disturbed by the misreporting and misrepresentation put forth by the anti-mining interests. I want to see the project go forward, to be permitted, and to begin operations. Thank you. Paul S. Bauer 2479 Dunlap St N Roseville, MN 55113 612-719-7671

Paul Benwell 4514

I am a follower of the Polymet story and have been for a number of years .Management is very capable of moving this project forward .I have reviewed the SDEIS and am confident that everything has been addressed to the best of everyone's ability and that the permitting process should take place Thank you for your time Regards Paul Benwell 514-233-1036 Market Awareness and Introductions

4535

I have followed Polymet Mining for a few years and after visiting the site and listening to and questioning management I am very confident in their ability to move forward in a safe and secure manner. Thank you Paul Benwell and Associates 514-233-1036 Market Awareness and Introductions

Paul Danicic 40665

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity I appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described for the following reasons. A) Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mecha

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Davies 52236

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Paul Davies 3110 E Chattaroy Rd #24 Chattaroy, WA 99003

Paul Densmore 42442

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Paul Densmore 3435 Colfax Ave S Apt 102 Minneapolis, MN 55408-4043 (678) 381-3341

Paul Doffing 45180

My name is: Paul Doffing 13100 Pleasant Pl Burnsville, MN 55337 Comment: The SDEIS needs to be corrected and added to in order to address issues of mapping and lack of financial assurance. The Environmental Impact Statement is deficient in that it inaccurately portrays the effects of the mine/ watershed on the 100 Miles Swamp Area. According to US Government maps, the One Hundred Mile Swamp downhill from the mine is 10-4 miles long and drains to both the Saint Louis and Rainy Lake (BWCA) watersheds but SDEIS maps show a shorter 5-5 mile long swamp that is missing the portion of the swamp that drains to the BWCA. Omitting the portion of the swamp that drains to the BWCA supports PolyMet's conclusion that seepage of mine waste water to the BWCA watershed will not occur. Marking of important map features in such an obscure way may be seen as evidence of intent to avoid connecting an environmentally risky mine with the fragile and iconic BWCA wilderness. We, the community members of Minnesota, demand a longer public review period for the environmental impacts of PolyMet's proposed sulfide mine, and are more assured than ever before of the detrimental effects it would have on the Boundary Waters wilderness and the nearby waters of our beloved state. Polymet cannot control the contaminants it will release in this mining project. We are unwilling to allow mining that will effect not only the health and livelihood of nearby citizens of out state, but also may damage our fragile and iconic wilderness areas. Maximizing profits at the cost of human health and the environment is a short sighted, self serving choice. If Polymet cannot give financial and scientific assurance that our environment will not be damaged by their mine, they should not be allowed to mine. Period. They cannot give this assurance. Paul Doffing mobile: 612-709-6722

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Erdmann

41883

Ms Lisa Fay Project Manager, PolyMet SDEIS MN DNR – Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear Ms Fay: My name is Paul Erdmann; I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Conservation. I have worked for many years to protect our environment, restore ecosystems, provide habitat for wildlife, and educate the public on environmental issues. I am deeply concerned about the proposed PolyMet mine. I have reviewed the NorthMet SDEIS, the Executive Summaries, and many of the factsheets. In general, my comment to you on this proposal could be summed up as “not here, not now.” The SDEIS does not adequately address many of the environmental ramifications that would occur if the mine is approved, in a critical area of our country’s National Forest—the headwaters of a watershed that many people are working to address environmental damage that has already taken place. I have chosen to focus my comments on the proposed wetland impacts and destruction that would occur or have the potential to occur if the project is approved. Although this SDEIS is vastly improved compared to the original DEIS, more work has to be done to ensure that our critical wetland resources are protected. The SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. Taking these points into consideration, I would propose that the SDEIS be revised or amended to include the following: 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Our state has destroyed how many wetlands before we discovered the error of our ways. Our state continues to destroy and drain wetlands at an alarming rate. That we would now allow the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history is unconscionable and unacceptable. Even if PolyMet “mitigates” or “replaces” wetlands that are destroyed or damaged by this proposed mining activity at a ratio of 1 acre wetland loss to 1-5 acres of wetland “creation,” studies and experience have shown that these newly created wetlands have only a portion of the biological and water quality value of the natural wetlands. The state of Minnesota, federal agencies, and local government units that regulate these activities do not have adequate staff, funding, or time to ensure that these mitigation wetlands provide as much value as the natural wetlands that took thousands of years to evolve. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS.

Paul F. Tanghe

11242

Sir or Ma’am- I am writing to oppose the proposed copper-nickel mine. I am a Minnesota resident and a political scientist specializing in the study of environmental agreements and common pool resource problems Any potential benefits of this project, which will be largely captured by the PolyMet corporation, simply do not justify potential environmental impacts whose cost will be born by the residents of Minnesota as well as the surrounding US and Canadian regions. Please do not allow this regulatory capture by the narrow interests of PolyMet. Thank you. Yours Paul Paul F. Tanghe PhD Student Sié Fellow Josef Korbel School of International Studies University of Denver paul.tanghe@du-edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Finsness 35444

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I have seen the effects of sulfide mining at the Ray Mine near Kelvin, Arizona. Before mining companies fully appreciated the hazard they were creating there, rainfall resulted in sulphuric acid flow into Mineral Creek and the Gila River. As a commodity, the price of copper fluctuates widely. There is no guarantee that the PolyMet mine will be open for its projected twenty year life-span. The taxpayers of Minnesota will be required to protect the watershed for 500 years for a mine project that may not be viable for more than 5 years. Again, look to Arizona for the effect of fluctuating copper prices on the viability of copper mines controlled by foreign owners. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Paul Finsness 734 Larpenteur Ave E Saint Paul, MN 55117-2528

58093

Why isn't this meeting interpreted for the hearing impaired?

Paul Forsman 18077

Hello. I'm Paul Forsman from Ely. I just wanted to make a couple of comments. I saw the land-exchange data, but I see from real estate, I'm a little bit involved, I think the corp service has done a great job are for us. And other things I wanted to say, we've talked about wetlands, here. I worked 30 years at the Minnesota mine here, close to Virginia, and when I was there, they came over this Gilbert Pit, six miles away, and the government, in their infinite wisdom, they said, we can't cross the swamps that made the headwaters in the Pipe River. We have to cross the river closer to where it's -- where we can cross it with one bridge and not go across, put a quarter-mile extra in the distance to the mine were all in rock do, but at least we didn't disturb those headwaters for that river and everybody knows that we don't want to disturb those mosquito-breeding grounds, you know. We want as many mosquitos to breed as we can, you know, it's good for Minnesota. But the thing is, is that in that infinite wisdom for 25 years each haul truck that gobbles 100 gallons of fuel a day -- an hour, is going a half a mile farther than it had to, creating a greater carbon index than ever needed to be, so when you're thinking about, you know, the mining company has to pay for it, think of the environmental big picture. I think that's very important. I mean, maybe it's still the right decision, but you know, I kind of question it when you have to burn so much are carbon for that. The other thing I wanted to say is that when I worked at the mine, they were, you know, digging the big pit, getting the road and had their dumps and stuff, and I always thought to myself, you got all this big equipment running around. Can't we put a little forethought into maybe when we're digging these pits, maybe we can put the dumps above it, maybe design a ski hill in the future or a trout fishing pond, something that this land could be when the mines are gone, into something that would be beneficial for the local economy? Put those kind of thoughts into your process of the -- of the EIS and not just what's mine, where they going to put it. Let's look at big picture in the long run and see if we can do this very right and be better than we've ever been before. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Forsman 57339

My name is Paul Forsman. F-O-R-S-M-A-N. This would be directed at the DNR or the Army Corp of Engineers, I'm not sure who does the organizing of it. I worked at Arcelor Mittal Mining Company. When we came over to the Gilbert pit, the DNR, or whoever it is that signs this stuff, there was wetlands of the beginning of the headwaters of the Pike River that were going to get affected by it and the wildlife, and then the floodwaters of the Pike River. The government decided that if the mining company moved a quarter mile down the road, they could cross the river and not the wetlands, where the wetlands drained into the river, and that they could cross the river. It was a quarter-mile out of the way from a direct route to the new mine pit. So, to protect those wetlands, they went a quarter-mile out of their way to -- and they crossed at where it was actually a river, so it didn't affect the wetlands. I thought the government did the wrong thing in this way: They saved the wetlands, the swamp that is combined to make the headwaters of the Pike River, but they caused each haul truck to drive a quarter-mile further. And what is the -- and greatly saved the wetland. Everybody likes someplace for the mosquitoes to breed. But they made each haul or each truck drive a quarter-mile or a half-mile farther per roundtrip. And those trucks burn a ton of fuel. And was the thinking right to save the ponds that make the headwaters? Did that justify wasting all of that extra carbon fuel to -- to satisfy the environment? I don't -- I don't think that that was well thought out. I think that the environment was better off serviced if they just put culverts in over the ponds that they were crossing and maybe went the straight route. But grant it, you know, everybody says, "Oh, save the wetlands," and it is okay for to save the wetlands, and, "The mining company is going to pay, it doesn't matter," but you are going to have to think about the big picture though. All of the extra carbon that was burned to satisfy a wetland that really wouldn't have been more affected anyways. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

Paul Freese 54788

See attachment

Paul G Jorgensen 54522

1.How is this mine going to benefit me? Lower taxes?2.Are the citizens of Minnesota going to pay for cleanup after Polymet has left the state?3.When there is an accident, how is it going to be taken care of?4.Do the benefits outweigh the risks?

Paul Harcey 39625

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Paul Harcey 1703 Griffing Park Rd Buffalo, MN 55313-2028 (612) 860-2032

Paul Harman 23436

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The month I turned 15, I traveled hundreds of miles from another state to northern Minnesota to canoe in the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area. My group and I spent a week canoeing on the lakes there, and getting our drinking water straight from them. Thirty-five years later, I consider my time in the Boundary Waters to be one of the highlights of my life. Do not let ANY company or organization pollute the land, water, or air of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area. Paul Harman Sincerely, Paul Harman 331 Bellford Ct Cranberry Township, PA 16066-4403

Alphabetical by sender's first name

paul helbach

39315

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely paul helbach p o 152 brule 152, WI 54820 715 372 5027

Paul Hunter

38829

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Paul Hunter 2301 5th St NE # 2 Minneapolis, MN 55418-3503

Paul Jarvis

41996

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Paul Jarvis Rosemount, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Jerome

40384

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Paul Jerome 5027 Strain Ct El Paso, TX 79924 US

Paul Johnson

46930

Paul Johnson 4351 Sheridan Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412 I have studied the mine proposal and have decided that it is a poor deal for Minnesota for the following reasons: 1- The Canadian company and their Swiss financiers have a poor environmental record 2- Recreational land is highly valued in Minnesota. Because of high natural runoff in the area the risk of major pollution would be high. If it happened I believe it is unlikely that any cleanup funds would be adequate to repair the damage. 3- After the mine closes the site may well have to be monitored for generations until the threat of pollution will have passed. Please take my concerns into account when deciding whether to approve the mine. Sincerely, Paul Johnson

Paul Laasko

3787

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. My family living in the Ely area over the years depended on the water and forest not just for recreation but for food on their table. When this area is disposed of for short term profit, that wonderful resource resource will be gone as well as the money. The enormous cost of (a doubtful) restoration and restitution will be borne by children not yet born for many generations. Please keep them in mind. Thank you. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Paul Laasko 4832 10th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1163 (612) 824-1284

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Laasko

51857

Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. My family living in the Ely area over the years depended on the water and forest not just for recreation but for food on their table. When this area is disposed of for short term profit, that wonderful resource resource will be gone as well as the money. The enormous cost of (a doubtful) restoration and restitution will be borne by children not yet born for many generations. Please keep them in mind. Thank you. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Paul Laasko 4832 10th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1163 (612) 824-1284

Paul Love

39690

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Paul Magee

42011

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. We should never authorize a project that will require several generations of monitoring and clean-up. We owe our children and grandchildren not to mortgage their futures. Sincerely, Mr Paul Magee 764 Lincoln Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-3347

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Martz 13948

I am writing today in opposition to the PolyMet mine. Many many many people, including my father-in-law and my sister-in-law, use enjoy the Boundary Waters. I do not believe for one second that the mining company will be around for the 200 years they say the waste water will need to be treated. Please do not threaten one of the upper midwest's great natural treasures. Sincerely, Paul Martz 2408 Chestnut St Harrisburg, PA 17104

Paul Nasvik 42898

To whom it may concern, Please accept my attached letter for inclusion to the public record against the Polymet Sulfide Mine Application. - Paul Nasvik 320 River Rd, Hudson, WI 54016

Paul Neimann 46135

Dear DNR, Putting the boundary waters, The Superior National Forest, Lake Superior, the St Louis River and other lands at risk for acid pollution as a result of mining copper is a poor decision and should not be taken. As a former resident of Pennsylvania, counsel for one of the largest coal companies in this country and as a person who has visited the coalfields of Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Kentucky I am familiar with the environmental damage caused by the acid derived from mining which for all practical purposes is permanent. The harm from copper mining will be no different. It is difficult to understand why we would put at risk our unique natural environment to create wealth for foreign corporations who will soon leave the state leaving the citizens with a permanent and ongoing mess to clean up. Every effort should be made to support a business environment which will create jobs, but not at the expense of our priceless natural inheritance. Thank You Paul Neimann [HYPERLINK "mailto:Paulneimann@yahoo-com"](mailto:Paulneimann@yahoo-com) 2720 Glenhurst Ave S. Minneapolis, Mn. 55416 952 926 4254 [HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"](http://www.avast-com/) This email is free from viruses and malware because [HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"](http://www.avast-com/)avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Paul Nelson 38830

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, As a Minnesotan, I regularly travel to the Boundary Waters and northern Minnesota for camping, fishing, and outdoor activities. It would be a terribly short-sighted plan to risk one of the only truly natural environments that Minnesota has left for the sake of a few hundred jobs. If PolyMet's proposal was more reasonable, I could see how this would be a difficult decision. However, knowing that 500 years of water treatment will be needed makes their proposal almost laughable. 500 years ago Columbus had just sailed to America, the Renaissance was still taking place, and Shakespeare hadn't even been born yet. To think of potentially ruining an environment, or at least making it a place that requires constant clean-up, for the next 500 years so that a business can make a profit is not a responsible use of our state's resources. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. Not only is the PolyMet mine a bad idea, but it would establish a dangerous precedent of allowing new mining interests into Minnesota nature. I want better than that for the future of Minnesota. Sincerely, Mr Paul Nelson 2004 Edgerton St Maplewood, MN 55117-2112

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Nelson

41962

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Paul Nelson 1531 Madison St NE Minneapolis, MN 55413-1426 (612) 781-8054

43520

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. To whom it may concern, which in my opinion is the entire state of Minnesota and its future citizens. I have carefully examined the available evidence both for and against the Polymet proposal for a copper sulfide mine in Northeastern Minnesota. It is my opinion that at this time this project should absolutely not go forwaRd We as a state are not in a good position to trust that Polymet and its associates will be able to provide us with the environmental and financial assurances that we absolutely need to have before a permit to Mine is granted. One question that has been asked over and over and has gone unanswered is "Please give us an example of this type of mining that has not contaminated the watershed." No one has been able to show an example. Saying that this will be the first copper sulfide mine that won't contaminate the watershed and pollute the air is unacceptable. We have never mined copper in Minnesota and based on the fact that there is currently a global surplus of copper and nickel right now tells me that the risk isn't worth the rewaRd Particularly when it comes to who will actually capitalize the most on this project if it were to go forwaRd There is little in this for the state of Minnesota or its workforce. I know people on the range need jobs but this will not change the economy on the range based on the number of jobs it would create. This is also not a typical range project so it is very likely that many of the jobs created wouldn't be filled by locals. It is well known that Polymet has never operated a mine before but their largest shareholder Glencore has with a very bad history of contaminating the communities that it has mined. I think that they will not be able to guarantee 200-500 years of financing for monitoring and treating the water at both the plant and mine sites. The only thing I would consider guaranteed by them as that they will maximize profits for their shareholders, which is the primary mission of any for profit corporation. Jobs will be kept at an absolute minimum. I have yet to see an economic impact statement that wasn't created by the company itself in a best case scena

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Nelson

44763

To whom it may concern, which in my opinion is the entire state of Minnesota and its future citizens. I have carefully examined the available evidence both for and against the Polymet proposal for a copper sulfide mine in Northeastern Minnesota. It is my opinion that at this time this project should absolutely not go forward. We as a state are not in a good position to trust that Polymet and its associates will be able to provide us with the environmental and financial assurances that we absolutely need to have before a permit to Mine is granted. One question that has been asked over and over and has gone unanswered is "Please give us an example of this type of mining that has not contaminated the watershed." No one has been able to show an example. Saying that this will be the first copper sulfide mine that won't contaminate the watershed and pollute the air is unacceptable. We have never mined copper in Minnesota and based on the fact that there is currently a global surplus of copper and nickel right now tells me that the risk isn't worth the reward. Particularly when it comes to who will actually capitalize the most on this project if it were to go forward. There is little in this for the state of Minnesota or its workforce. I know people on the range need jobs but this will not change the economy on the range based on the number of jobs it would create. This is also not a typical range project so it is very likely that many of the jobs created wouldn't be filled by locals. It is well known that Polymet has never operated a mine before but their largest shareholder Glencore has with a very bad history of contaminating the communities that it has mined. I think that they will not be able to guarantee 200-500 years of financing for monitoring and treating the water at both the plant and mine sites. The only thing I would consider guaranteed by them is that they will maximize profits for their shareholders, which is the primary mission of any for profit corporation. Jobs will be kept at an absolute minimum. I have yet to see an economic impact statement that wasn't created by the company itself in a best case scenario sensibility. There seem to be a great number of questions that have to be answered before a permit to mine is granted. These questions remain unanswered up to this point and therefore a permit should not be issued. If you can expect technology to change significantly in the years to come than let's wait until technology is advanced enough to do this safely. Copper will undoubtedly be worth more in the future and perhaps we can get a US company to do this so it's better for all of us in terms of economics as well as environmental and public health. These are the most obvious problems within the current SDEIS. "The PolyMet mine plan is riddled with problems that must be fixed: PolyMet would require hundreds of years of expensive treatment of polluted water. PolyMet would destroy thousands of acres of habitat used by threatened moose and lynx. PolyMet's mine plan lacks analysis of human health impacts from mercury and asbestos-like fibers. PolyMet's studies contain inaccurate water data that need to be corrected. There are many more problems with PolyMet's mine plan. All we want is to make sure that any sulfide mines opened in Northern Minnesota are safe, clean, and don't leave taxpayers with a bill. If we don't get this right the first time, the next 17 generations of Minnesotans will have to live with the consequences." The world keeps getting smaller and I think most of us Minnesotans feel that this is in our backyards. I'll ask again to find an example of this type of mining that hasn't contaminated the watershed. It's a simple question that no one has been able to provide an answer to. The risk must not outweigh the reward. Right now it's not worth it. We need absolute guarantees that they will finance and clean up the mess that this WILL create. In the not too distant future good, clean water will

Paul Neslund

9715

I would like to state my support for the mining project Polymet is attempting to get started. I grew up in the area, my Father worked as a machinist at the Erie location, I wish I would have had the same opportunity to stay in the area. The beauty of the area was compromised 150 years ago by open pit mining, but the area has recovered and is still some of the best the state has to offer. If Iron ore had not been allowed the outcome of two world wars would have been in question. The lessons learned through open pit mining in the past is only going to achieve success without hurting the environment. The jobs created, and the product produced are both critical to the area and to the world. The people of the area should have the most influence, not the Metro area, not the State politicians, or Politicians in general. Let the local people decide, not the environmentalist who don't live in the area. Thank you, Paul D. Neslund 16787 100th St Oak Park, MN. 56357

Alphabetical by sender's first name

PAUL PUTTLITZ

41634

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Paul R Iversen

54799

See attachment

Paul Roth

7046

Dear Sirs/Madams, I am against the proposed PolyMet mine near Babbitt. Preserving and protecting Minnesota's natural environment is more important than the profits of a mining company. Clearly, no one knows what will need to be done, and how many hundreds of years it will need to be done, to keep the witch's brew of effluent from poisoning water, soil, and air. It's as if the mining company proposes to dump radioactive waste on the ground and hopes the state will let them figure out later exactly how to contain it. The mining company will cease to exist long before the site loses toxicity and the ability to ruin the environment. The state of Minnesota will be left with an environmental train wreck, and the citizens of the state will have no choice but to pay for containment and remediation. Please do not allow this project to happen. Sincerely, Paul Roth 3985 Balsam Lane N. Plymouth, MN 55441

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Sanford

22073

Greetings, I support proceeding with the environmental impact study approval for Polymet. From what I see they have gone above and beyond expectations by making superb efforts to control risk of environmental danger. The sooner we get the Polymet project going the sooner we are not dependent on foreign powers for our badly needed copper used in clean energy production. Thank you Paul Sanford MD 3112 E 1st St Duluth, MN 55812 This St Lukes communication is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify sender immediately.

Paul Sasik

42077

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Paul Sasik Minnetonka, Minnesota

Paul Schlaefer

39726

To whom it may concern, I am strongly opposed to the polymet mining proposal. It is my opinion that mining in this area with present technology is risky to the water quality. Clean water is the states most important asset and we need to be assured that future generations can drink it safely. More work needs to be done on the environmental impact of storing polluted waste safely in this fragile area. Like any big corporation, Polymet's primary concern is profit for it's shareholders. // Please see that my great great grandchildren are not effected by unwise decisions. Sincerely, Dr Paul Schlaefer

Paul Schrieber

44475

Hi, I just want to say that I do not agree with what PolyMet wants to do in Northern Minnesota. My Family has had a cabin on McFarland Lake(proposed land swap area) for 60 years. Although it is a great Land Swap proposal to McFarland lake area. I feel the bigger picture is not worth the environmental impact that this open pit mine can do. Please say no to the mining. Paul Schrieber 319 3rd Ave S. Cold Spring, MN Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Schurke

18075

Thank you. My name is Paul Schurke. I'm from Ely, Minnesota and I'm very proud, especially tonight, to be an Iron Ranger; just to be here and be part of the due process and democracy is extremely heartwarming and gratifying, I'm sure, for all of us, and it speaks heartily to how seriously we're all taking this matter because we need jobs and we need water and we need the beautiful environment that we call home. And I'm very proud to be representing, I think, those issues that we all share in common, here, tonight. My wife, Susie, and I, as you may know, we operate a couple of businesses in Ely and have for some 30 years. We founded Wintergreen Northern Wear 30 years back, along with Wintergreen Dogsled Lodge on White Iron Lake. Wintergreen Northern Wear was sold to another family five years ago and it sadly has just recently gone out of business, but I'm pleased to share with you tonight that I'm hopeful to rebooting it next spring to bring those jobs back to our town, just like the jobs we were able to offer through our dogsledding lodge now. But tonight's issue is not about that, it's about our concerns about the PolyMet Project and the EIS involved, we've all had a chance to review now. And I think we all agree that water, the purity of our water and the integrity of our lakes in the future is central to that issue and my key concern in that SDEIS, is if we're relying on the scientists as our great Commissioner, Mike Forsman with you and I share with him that I rely on that science and am counting on that science to be right because our future and the integrity of this ecosystem depends on that science, and I'm here to share with you, as many of you may know now, there are some significant flaws in the science on which the SDEIS is based. Most prominently, I feel, are the graphs and tables, particularly those, if I might cite from the report, Table 4.2.2-9 and others that compare the flow into Partridge River with which they have projected through their computer modeling and it is fatally flawed and the DNR has acknowledged that and it's a significant serious error and how well this SDEIS is going to give us a picture of what's can become of the water quality in these lakes and streams in the future to come. The values used in the modeling significantly are at odds with the latest data from stream flows. It has been acknowledged by the DNR as a serious flaw. The modeling has failed -- failed to predict what is currently known for its own existing standards being flow, how can we possibly rely on the same computer modeling to predict what's going to happen in 200 or 500 years. It simply can't be done. And again, I think we agree that water quality issues are central to this issue. Furthermore, particularly disturbing to me, is the fact that tribal scientists, that's the Grand Portage Band and the Bois Forte Band, have been telling the scientists working on this project for years that the groundwater data on the flowage of the Partridge River is seriously flawed, that they're off. Nobody knows better what's going on in the ground out there than the tribal folks, but somehow their input has been disregarded right along in this process. The scientists who were putting that modeling together were wrong -- the first SDEIS, now, they've got it wrong again. How can we trust them to get it right on the third go round? If we are to rest assured that the water -- (clapping) -- the data must be measured accurately.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Schurke

47232

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
FR: Paul Schurke, 1101 Ringrock Road, Ely, MN 55731 RE: PolyMet SDEIS Response To whomever it may concern: I am a resident and business owner in Ely, MN. I believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and that this destructive project must not proceed as currently proposed because of the 1) widespread and severe environmental damage inherent in the PolyMet project and 2) the failure of the SDEIS to include a cost/benefit analysis and specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. I believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. 3) Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures -The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. -The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The Mine Plan Requires an Absurd and Unachievable Level of Monitoring and Maintenance for Many Centuries -Minnesota

Paul Smith

22028

I have owned Polymet shares for over 4 years. I believe in the project, domestic material resourcing and creating jobs. Polymet has patiently responded to all the requirements set before them for the environment. The company will be a good steward I am certain. Damage to the environment is always a sensate issue. Though the years we have witnessed so many damaging events whether caused by man or nature. I am always amazed how well we are able to respond and improve for the future when these occur. Hopefully, not a problem in the case of Polymet, but should issues arise, their sensitivity to the issue will minimize damage and expedite repairation. More can not be asked of them than that. Sincerely, Paul Smith, MAS Chairman, Calconix, Inc. 821 Aubrey Ave, Ardmore PA 19003 USA 610 642 5921 Fax 610 642 5928

Paul Stolen

54517

See attachment

Paul T Mullen

57267

The Boundary Waters is one of the last places on this planet that humans can confidently expect to find all natural, unspoiled wilderness. We need to protect that with our lives, if necessary. Let's wait! There will be safer extraction methods in time if we still need these minerals. Don't let money gain unfair access to our lawmakers as it usually does. Paul T. Mullen 3017 Hillsboro Ave SoSt. Louis Park, MN 55426

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Tine and Sherry Phillips 42883

Attached are our comments on the NorthMet SDEIS. Sherry Phillips Paul Tine' 2102 Elo Road Brimson, MN 55602

Paul Underland 18165

My name is Richard O'Brien. I'm a 40-year member with Local 49 Operating Engineers. I would like to cede my time to Paul Underland who is with Minnesota Power. Paul. Good evening. My name is Paul Underland; and I'm from Aurora, Minnesota. I care about the environment and I support the PolyMet project. I also own land that is in the Partridge River Watershed where I have enjoyed outdoor activities with my friends and family. This land has been in our family for generations. It holds a very special place in our hearts. It's where my dad took me hunting and fishing when I was growing up; and it is where I have taken my kids to enjoy the same outdoor activities; and where I plan to introduce my grandkids to the outdoors. It's unacceptable to me to have this pristine area impacted. I'm also an engineer, and I believe in technology and the benefits of it. PolyMet is using proven mining technology and proven water treatment technology in their processes. The SDEIS also uses proven technology in developing the models used to determine if there will be any environmental impacts because of this project. The SDEIS is adequate and covers all impacts. Thank you to the DNR, Army Corps of Engineers, and the US Forest Service for doing a thorough job. There's a couple items from the SDEIS that have been taken out of context by opponents of this project. First, part of the SDEIS modeling has recently been challenged. The amount of groundwater flow that has been added to the Partridge River this was originally measured at .5 cubic feet per second. New data now shows that (inaudible) between 1.3 and 1.6 cubic feet per second. This does not mean the SDEIS is wrong, because part of modeling is using a band of flow ranges. In doing so scientists plug in lower numbers than .5 cubic feet per second and numbers as high as 2.4 cubic feet per second. And even at the higher level, the model showed no negative impacts. In other words, this new data is not likely to change the assessment of the project relative to the project's ability to meet water-quality standards. Second, others who do not want mining in our state are trying to create fear and doubt by saying the mine is going to require water treatment for 500 years. That's not what the SDEIS says. The models weren't designed to accomplish this, nor is it what they indicate. The models were actually designed to determine the impacts to water quality at key reference points in the watershed, not the length of water treatment. This SDEIS is clear on this matter, and it shows that even 500 years from now water-quality standards will be met. Because of the diligence of PolyMet and the sound application of science and engineering it has been proven that there will be no environmental impact to the area that I and others cherish. Thank you.

Paul Vonharnish 17020

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Let's just face it: The proposals to further degrade the environment for ANY mining operations is patently insane and suicidal. It is obvious that the water tables in Minnesota and Wisconsin are both extremely vulnerable to pollutants spreading through ancient underground aquifers. Permanent moratoriums on all mining operations should become mandatory. Further studies are a waste of money, and you know it. The majority of citizens in Northern Minnesota are firmly against this process. Why should you or any other agency have the power to supercede the will of the people you supposedly serve. It is also obvious that any profits derived by these environmentally exploitive enterprises, will never be seen by the citizens of Minnesota, much less the American people. These profits are leached out of our economy and go right into the coffers of international banking cartels. These cartels don't give a damn about clean water or the rights of States to reject these activities. Put an end to this planetary rape, and quit flogging a dead horse. Sincerely yours, Paul Vonharnish Paul Vonharnish 11 E 3rd ST Grand Marais, MN 55604

50294

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Let's just face it: The proposals to further degrade the environment for ANY mining operations is patently insane and suicidal. It is obvious that the water tables in Minnesota and Wisconsin are both extremely vulnerable to pollutants spreading through ancient underground aquifers. Permanent moratoriums on all mining operations should become mandatory. Further studies are a waste of money, and you know it. The majority of citizens in Northern Minnesota are firmly against this process. Why should you or any other agency have the power to supercede the will of the people you supposedly serve. It is also obvious that any profits derived by these environmentally exploitive enterprises, will never be seen by the citizens of Minnesota, much less the American people. These profits are leached out of our economy and go right into the coffers of international banking cartels. These cartels don't give a damn about clean water or the rights of States to reject these activities. Put an end to this planetary rape, and quit flogging a dead horse. Sincerely yours, Paul Vonharnish Paul Vonharnish 11 E 3rd ST Grand Marais, MN 55604

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Wagner

58170

I am writing to voice my strongest possible support for the proposed PolyMet mining project. As Chairman and CEO of a thriving, high-technology Minnesota firm, I speak from first-hand experience regarding the significant challenges - and opportunities - our state faces with regard to sustaining a healthy competitive economy in a globally-competitive market. I have toured the Poly Met facility and understand the rich history and suggested changes. Leadership is in place to secure strict adherence to environmental concerns. I have participated in many trips deep into the BWCA and have a sincere appreciation for passing this virgin wilderness on to my five kids. I look forward to a more vibrant north-woods that PolyMet will bring. The PolyMet project represents an opportunity to not only help the state remain competitive, but to lead. Minnesota Wire truly understands leadership in the technology sector: the company has no equal in obtaining federal R&D contracts, achieving a capture rate on proposals eight times the national average; and operating one of only three Advanced Defense Technology Clusters in the nation, funded by the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). We understand that a vibrant economy demands constant, aggressive pursuit of opportunities like the PolyMet mining project. This type of mining will help to broaden a state economy that has lost much of its technology diversity over the past generation. Not only will the mines be a source of critically-needed metals to growing and emerging industries; but they will also help to create jobs in a region that has struggled to contribute to the economy, but remains eager to do so. We cannot afford to let this level of opportunity pass us by- especially given that the exhaustive environmental review has led to overwhelmingly positive results. Our company respects, and in fact is an integral part of the state's proud history of environmentalism; but in this case the economic development benefits derived far outweigh any of the concerns for negative outcomes, as the review makes clear. Minnesota needs to be aggressive with its economic development efforts given the relentless acceleration of a global technology market. This company has certainly done so, and we expect that the rest of the state would follow our example and move ahead with the Poly Met mining project. We stand ready to support the effort in any way we can.

Paul Walker

11333

Dear Ms Fay, Statement of Dr Paul O. Walker My name is Paul Walker. I live at 4115 Reiland Lane in Shoreview for about half the year and the other half I live at 1372 Trygg Road in Eagles Nest Township on Eagles Nest Lake. At the last DFL Convention in 2012, the session opened with a prayer from an Anishinaabe leader. However, shortly afterwards, the candidates quickly abandoned any consideration of Mother Earth and began kowtowing for the support of the loudest Iron Range clique. Although in and around Ely, the local support seems to running in favor of those who are willing to sacrifice Mother Earth in favor of 200-300 short term, twenty-year jobs many of which will be filled by non-Minnesotans, there are plenty of us that view this proposal for mining as a dangerous and foolhardy operation, especially when the usable yield is only 1%, leaving 99% as contaminated waste. Nowhere on this planet has copper-nickel, sulfide mining been done without contaminating the waters. And this contamination is eternal, or if you believe the EIS requiring reverse osmosis for "only" for 200- 500 years. I might offer a reminder that Minnesota has only been a state since 1858, that is 156 years. How can any reasonably bright person believe that PolyMet or whom-ever their real owners are, will carry out reverse osmosis in this fragile eco-system, for 200 years at the mine and 500 years at the plant. It is unfortunate that this debate is taking place during an election year when Klobuchar, Franken, Nolen and Dayton are all playing politics with the environment. If PolyMet is allowed to sulfide-mine, the aquifers and watersheds of the Ely area will be eternally polluted and thus, sadly cause the eventual demise of the BWCAW and the tourism industry. This will be the legacy of Klobuchar, Franken, Nolen and Dayton. They truly should be ashamed. Glencore, a company headquartered in Switzerland funds Polymet. Glencore's history of world-wide wanton disregard for the environment and human rights atrocities, including child labor, are well documented. Does Minnesota want to get in bed with a company such as Glencore. I urge Governor Dayton, the Department of Natural Resources and the US Army Corps of Engineers to protect Minnesota's fresh water and the BWCAW by rejecting Polymet's proposal. My hope is that someone in the Department of Natural Resources will demonstrate an environmental ethos and compass and will see the foolhardiness of this proposal and not allow it to proceed. If I had confidence that the DNR was infallible, I'd be a bit more comfortable, but I don't. There have been too many bad decisions over the years. Paul Walker 4115 Reiland Lane Shoreview, MN 55126 651-484-8789

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paul Winslow 38250

Paul Winslow 237 7th Ave N. Hopkins, MN 55343 I am writing to express my concern about moving forward with the PolyMet mining proposal. The proximity to the BWCA is one of my primary issues. I value the pristine environment of the BWCA above the temporary nature of the proposed mine. Twenty of years of mining will have long lasting effects on the environment of the BWCA as run off from the mine finds its way to the watershed, and adds acid to the water flowing to the BWCA. I want the BWCA to last forever, and the short term nature of 20 years of mining and 500 years of clean up. Please consider these issues when deciding on the PolyMet mining proposal. Paul Winslow

Paula Allmaras 7149

I am adamantly opposed to a copper mine in Superior National Forest Lands. Acid mine drainage would pollute surrounding water. ADM's leach out heavy metals toxic to fish and humans. I am not willing to risk the boundary waters, Lake Superior or any ground water close to the proposed copper mine for a million jobs. Paula Allmaras

Paula and Jim Nessa 39797

As a grandmother I think about our grandchildren's future. Worry that the pristine sanctity of our northern Minnesota is being traded away for a few jobs. Our son and his friend canoed the boundary waters improvising a surf and turf menu for their first meal. They brought in steak and caught some crawfish. Will his children ever be able to do that. We have to think long term, not just 20 years. Will the mine owners be there to continue the clean up when the mine closes and there is no income from the copper ore. They have failed to do this in other operations. We need to know how much income the state will receive in exchange for the ore. Sincerely, Paula J. Nessa 588 Mt. Curve Blvd. St Paul, Minnesota 55116

Paula Angela 21612

Paula Angela, 8279 560th St, Pine City, .MN 55063

21614

No mining should be permitted as high risk of environmental damage. Minnesota needs to protect our natural resources and not give way to corporate interests and the flimsy guise of job creation. Thank you.

Paula Bidle 48479

PolyMet Mining Corp. has proposed large open-pit mines on 67,000 acres of Superior National Forest. If permitted, these mines would leave behind sulfide-bearing waste rock that could result in sulfuric acid mine drainage and would require treatment of polluted water for hundreds of years. While PolyMet will provide a few jobs for a few years, the overall deal is that they will profit immensely from the project, while leaving the people of the state of Minnesota to deal with clean-up and healthcare costs due to water pollution for years after PolyMet is no longer in existence. This is not a viable project. Please use your influence to "just say no" to it on both moral and economic grounds. Sincerely, Rev. Paula Bidle Minneapolis

Paula Connolly 42478

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Paula Connolly 3338 Bryant Ave Anoka, MN 55303-1453

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paula Frakes

15907

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Paula Frakes 529 84th LN NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433

Paula Gregg

4533

Dear Sirs, I am a resident of Minnesota and a voter. I want specifics on how PolyMet will pay the costs of treatment in the centuries to come, for the residual rock and water contamination. This is something I do not want the MDNP and the federal agencies to delay in getting; the specifics for the financial assurances of how PolyMet will pay the costs of treatment in the centuries to come. Minnesota law prohibits permits to mines that require perpetual maintenance after closure. Perhaps the mine itself will not require treatment for undisclosed centuries, but the treatment plant and its rock and water residue will go on in perpetuity. How many other mines will send their rock to be treated at this treatment plant. Yes, it is better to only have one treatment plant, but what will be the result to Minnesota in the centuries to come. You can't be naïve enough to think they are putting all this money into the treatment plant to only treat the rock from one mine. Get the financial specifics before this goes any further. Thank you. Paula B. Gregg 13517 315th Street Cannon Falls, MN 55009 651-258-4170

Paula Kay Pettit

54552

I feel our precious waters are too valuable to take any chances with unproven mining techniques. I strongly oppose the Twin Metals mining project proposed by PolyMet. Our water is our most precious resource.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paula Kwakenat

357

Dec 10, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Paula Nelson

47031

To Whom it May Concern; PLEASE do not allow this dangerous mining to take place in the Arrowhead. The destruction of beautiful land and the years of pollution simply cannot be justified. I own a cabin in the Superior National Forest which I hope will be around for future generations. Please do what you can to block copper/nickel sulfide mining. Thank you. Sincerely, Paula Nelson 972 Saint Clair Avenue St Paul, MN 55105 651-698-4152

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paula Okerstrom

18948

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Michael Okerstrom Paula Okerstrom 2537 34th Av. So. Minneapolis, MN 55406 612-724-2729

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paula Okerstrom

18952

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to say that you need to extend the comment period for all of us Minnesotans that need MORE TIME to consider the destruction ahead of us. My cabin is located in your ground zero area, and because I work, and have a family, and other things in life to tend too, I need more time to study this complicated impact statement. Many other people also need more time, as you know, it took you guys quite some time to put it together too, right. Don't rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Mike and Paula Okerstrom Minneapolis, MN 55406 Paula Okerstrom 2537 34th Av. So. Minneapolis, MN 55406 612-724-2729

Paula Slomer

39774

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Paula Slomer 103 Windsor Dr Butler, PA 16002-3832 (724) 282-7504

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pauline Gowing

13150

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, I am from Australia. I am highly concerned about this habitat being compromised. We only have one world. We need to care for it and it's inhabitants. Once gone there is no getting it back. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Pauline Gowing Sincerely, Pauline Gowing 69 Wharf Road Johns River, None 02443

Pauline Laybourn

31676

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Stop your profit machine from destroying our planet. Note these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. It is sickening to see what power corporations have to destroy our planet. All for PROFIT and GREED. Too many risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Pauline Laybourn PO Box 205 Bagdad, FL 32530-0205

Pauline Wahlquist

39368

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Pauline Wahlquist 10979 State Highway 23 Brook Park, MN 55007-4726 (320) 679-0879

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Paulissa Jirik

38706

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Paulissa Jirik 222 Wentworth Ave W Apt 203 Saint Paul, MN 55118-3858 (651) 450-9012

Peder Gear

41907

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Peder Gear 167 Congress St W Saint Paul, MN 55107-2151 (651) 494-4740

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peder Otterson

14888

7113 Muirfield Lane Eden Prairie, MN 55346 □ February 2014 I'm sorry I wasn't able to attend any of the public meetings, but have the following comments that I wish you to consider. I am a retired DNR hydrologist who began his work with the State of Minnesota on the Regional Copper Nickel Study in the mid-1970's when I was hired as a research scientist to do field studies in the Babbitt area where USS and Minnamax had some interest in copper nickel mining. Much of my work centered on the waste rock stockpile at the Dunka Pit of Erie Mining Company where the copper sulfide bearing rock of the Duluth Gabbro was stripped to access the underneath taconite. We monitored the leachate coming from the waste rock stockpile that was high in dissolved metals and sulfate. We tracked it through surface flow and subsurface flow through an adjacent bog to Bob Bay in Birch Lake. We monitored other sites including the Minnamax test site. We also put in groundwater observation wells and collected lake sediment samples and tested them for trace metals. This was all part of a much broader study that included field sampling of biota, flora, air and water quality, mining, sociology, etc If done now, it would probably be called a "generic EIS." DNR Minerals under the leadership of Paul Eger led the work that I was involved in. Bruce Johnson up at Ely did most of the extensive field monitoring. The UM School of Civil Engineering under professors Eisenreich and Hoffmann conducted bench studies of bog samples to determine the adsorption capability of the peat to take up the trace metals found in the leachate. My point in mentioning all of this is that there is a wealth of base line information that was gathered nearly 50 years ago that might help answer some of the questions that the current proposal to mine leave hanging. I would like some assurance that all the good work done on the Regional Copper Study was not in vain. Secondly, as a former Area Hydrologist for NE Minnesota and a person who was born in Duluth and spent much of his youth in NE Minnesota and the area that later became the BWCA, I have my own personal and professional observations that I wish to share based on my work with the Regional Copper Nickel Study, review of the Reserve Mining Company court case and general love for NE Minnesota. I can remember when Silver Bay and its islets were all that was to be seen there. I also remember the effects that the dumping of tailings had upon Lake Superior. Anyone could easily see the effect as much of the lake became a turquoise color because of the suspension of the fine sediment in the water. As a geologist, I would say the closest parallel would be in the small lakes and streams that are fed by glacial meltwater. "Rock flour" we called it. Who knows what effect it had upon the habitat and biota of Lake Superior. However, that alone would not have prevented Reserve Mining from continuing to dump its tailings into Lake Superior. It took the added health risk of the asbestiform fibers found in the tailings to finally force Reserve to move to an inland site at Milepost Seven to dump its tailings. How does that relate to the PolyMet proposal. Unforeseen consequences. A casual reading of the reports and discussions around them suggest to me that much is still unknown to allow this new and potentially hazardous operation to proceed without a strict set of checks and balances to guard against unexpected consequences that might topple the fragile ecology of the area that is already stressed by global climate change. While on the Copper Nickel Study, I also reviewed studies of other northern sites where mining of sulfide ore was either proposed or had taken place. Sudbury, Ontario, stands out as a worst case example of what a smelter can do to the surrounding countryside. One begins to see the effects on the vegetation hundreds of miles from the smelter. Closer

Peg Apka

20037

Dear DNR and anyone else who will listen What is the percentage of the world's fresh water through and from the Boundary Waters. Over the years I have heard percentages from 15 percent to 20 percent. Does any of that water flow into Lake Superior. And how much of the fresh water is contained in Lake Superior 15%, 25% more. How could we even think of having a project in Minnesota that would take a chance on polluting a third or more of the world's fresh water. I do not believe it is possible to proceed with this mining project and not cause pollution. And I do not understand how a mining company would have the resources to provide for clean up costs for 500 years. If they had that kind of money up front why don't they put it into research to find alternatives to these precious metals so we would not have to mine so close to our clean water. And if Polymet did have the money to cover costs for 500 years, does anyone really believe that it is really possible to clean up all the lakes and shorelines that would be affected. It is not logical that this could be done. One could imagine it on paper, but the physical reality of the magnitude of such a clean up paints a different picture. Is the DNR not supposed to help us protect our natural resources and use them wisely. Please help us out and do what is necessary to prevent this mining. Thank you Peg Apka 7940 Pequaywan Lake Road Duluth MN 55803

Peggy and Larry Smith

54567

In a few short years our water will be worth more than any mineral mined from the earth. If mining, FRACKING and drilling equals water pollution—we are against it. We won't be here to see the destruction, however, our children & grandchildren will.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peggy Endres 38901

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Money: even the hogs won't eat it. What we do affects everyone's ability to live on the earth. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Peggy Endres 943 Wilder St S Saint Paul, MN 55116-2026

Peggy Knapp 46527

Dear Lisa, and others making the decision on the PolyMet proposal- What is more important than water. Nothing. This is not a trick question. The proposal by Polymet puts water at risk, now and in the future. There is no good example anywhere on this planet of a facility such as the one proposed by Polymet that has not left a legacy of pollution behind. At a time when water resources are being depleted, when the state of MN is already struggling to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus, sediments and other system-wide pollutants, it is sheer lunacy to permit mining on this scale, and in such a fragile area. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to deny the Polymet project to proceed. Respectfully submitted, Peggy Knapp

Peggy Rae Hodil 57144

DO NOT ALLOW POLYMET MINING IN MINNESOTA
Peggy Rae Hodil 15 N. Chester Pkwy Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peggy Smith

42260

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Peggy Trezona

7737

To Whom It May Concern: I appreciate being able to register my grave concerns regarding the environmental damage that Minnesota is risking if the Polymet mine is allowed to proceed. The fact that water treatment will need to continue for many years post-mining reflects the gravity of the risks to our watershed and the health of human beings. I do not believe that increased jobs for a couple of decades can offset hundreds of years (maybe longer) of damage to the environment. I was born on the Iron Range. My family was in mining for generations. I have seen the ups and downs of the economic health of the Range over the last 50 years. And, I still believe that the short term uptick in jobs is just not worth the very high risk of long term grave environmental damage. Peggy Trezona

Pehrson Lodge

36707

I am resending message to be included in future correspondence. Eric Hanson 1512 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55812 [HYPERLINK "mailto:vacation@pehrsonlodge-com"](mailto:vacation@pehrsonlodge-com)vacation@pehrsonlodge-com Thank You, Eric Begin forwarded message: From: Pehrson Lodge Subject: Polymet coment Date: March 2, 2014 at 12:29:35 PM CST To: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us To whom it may concern, I feel the value of water as a critical resource will only increase over time. Our water resource will, hopefully, provide for hundreds of generations to come. I think it is very unwise to risk the well-being of many generations to come over 20 or 30 or 40 years of profits. We need to be thinking in terms centuries. To seriously consider the Polymet proposal, Polymet must be able to absolutely guarantee that they will not negatively impact our water resource, and I do not believe such a guarantee is possible. Please do not permit this, or other sulfide mining efforts in the Lake Superior watershed. Thank You, Eric Hanson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pehrson Lodge

36737

To whom it may concern, I feel the value of water as a critical resource will only increase over time. Our water resource will, hopefully, provide for hundreds of generations to come. I think it is very unwise to risk the well-being of many generations to come over 20 or 30 or 40 years of profits. We need to be thinking in terms centuries. To seriously consider the Polymet proposal, Polymet must be able to absolutely guarantee that they will not negatively impact our water resource, and I do not believe such a guarantee is possible. Please do not permit this, or other sulfide mining efforts in the Lake Superior watershed. Thank You, Eric Hanson

Penny Cragun

40178

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Our water is far too precious. I want my grandchildren and future generations to be able to enjoy safe water. Sincerely, Ms Penny Cragun 927 N 8th Ave E Duluth, MN 55805-1425

42602

See attachment

Penny Fuller

37527

Mar 1, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Historically there has never been safe operation of the mines in the sense of how the environment is impacted (aside from the safety of workers). Furthermore those financially benefitting from the mining are never held accountable in a meaningful way (equal recompense when the inevitable contamination occurs). There is no evidence that this would be any different. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Please don't give in to the pressures from those who stand only to benefit from this move. Protect our lands and water. Sincerely, Mrs Penny Fuller 4106 Burton Ln Minneapolis, MN 55406-3638

pepe

45088

It is absolutely *SHOCKING* that Minnesota is even considering allowing the PolyMet mining project. Even a cursory review of the facts-and of history-show clearly that it is likely to result in environmental catastrophe. And to take such a long term, high stakes gamble for so few jobs created. It is truly beyond comprehension. There are other states I would expect to cave to narrow private interests, veiled in supposed "job creation", but Minnesota is not one of them. - Stephen Pepe pepe@alumni.brown-edu

Alphabetical by sender's first name

PERRY CARPENTER

14846

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Personal Gmail

41731

Lisa, The state of Minnesota does not have the right to gamble with our health. As everybody knows, sulfide mining causes long lasting water pollution that can cause serious health probleMs Given the agency for whom you work, you might also know that tourism is the leading economic industry in our state. And people aren't vacationing here because of our dirty, polluted waters, but rather to escape the filth they probably live in in their home state. Maybe you and your supporters should reread the fable, The Goose That Laid The Golden Egg. There is a good lesson in there for you. Do your grandkids proud and stop PolyMet, Dan Roberts Sent from my iPad

Pete Fleming

15412

Attached is a comment on the Polymet sDeis. _____

Pete Fleming 6517 Crackleberry Tr Woodbury,MN 55129 tel: 651-459-0658

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pete Pellinen

40817

My name is Pete Pellinen, 724 16th Street North, Virginia, MN 55792- There seem to be inconsistencies between agencies regarding acceptable levels of metals and chemicals in water systems, and what is acceptable. Regardless, I believe that levels are being researched, and will be controlled. With the State requirements imposed in Minnesota, and developing techniques for mining, I trust that a system can and will be created that will successfully extract the metals, while protecting our waters and air. If such a process can be developed, it will probably only happen here, in Minnesota, but, it can then be used by operations in other parts of the world so that they can clean up their act. As a resident of this region, owning land on the Embarrass River, and a frequent visitor to what is now known as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, I am concerned that these resources be protected. I believe they can. Thank you.

Pete Seng

39337

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We don't need a future "SuperFund" site in Minnesota. Northeast MN is blessed with pure clean water that flows north to Canada and east to Lake Superior and beyond, and I would like to keep it clean and safe for future generations. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Pete Seng 4522 Drexel Ave Minneapolis, MN 55424-1130 (952) 915-9030

Pete Stauber

18111

My name is Pete Stauber, S-T-A-U-B-E-R. I live in Hermantown, Minnesota. I'm a married father of four. And I'm a St. Louis County Commissioner. Thank you for bringing your delegation here to allow us to have this civil process. I'm tired of hearing the untruths from the anti-mining crowd that the water treatment will be required for 100 years and cost billions of dollars. From what I read in the SDEIS that is a gross exaggeration. On pages three and four of the SDEIS it states, "It is uncertain how long the NorthMet project proposed action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be long term. Actual treatment requirement will be based on measured rather than modeled NorthMet project water quality performance as determined through monitoring requirements. PolyMet will be held accountable to maintenance and monitoring requirements and would not be released until all conditions have been met." It does not say, "treatment will be required for 500 years." It says "treatment will be determined using measured results." Which is the way the law is designed to responsibly handle it. Isn't that logical? The SDEIS shows that PolyMet built and operated a piling reverse osmosis water treatment plan to show that it can successfully treat the kind of water it will have on the project. The plan worked. It's proven technology that's been used in lots of other municipalities and industrial applications. PolyMet has been working with regulators for nearly 10 years to ensure compliance. Any holes that were discovered during the EIS have been addressed in the SDEIS. The SDEIS is a clear reflection of PolyMet's and the agency's work to develop a successful copper-nickel mine bringing an important investment to St. Louis County. I'm confident based on the SDEIS that water quality standards will be met for many generations of the mine and plant site; and that mining will not compromise the beauty of the area or our natural resources. I hope the DNR will listen to its own scientists and not the fabrications from the anti-mining crowd. I have confidence in the environmental review process and faith in the regulations and regulators to hold the company accountable. Mr. Commissioner, the good Lord has blessed this region with these precious metals. They are ready to be mined by our working men and women of Northeastern Minnesota. Our men and women need the jobs. The range delegation of the building and trades, the Duluth area of trades are the best men and women to work it. Thank you.

Pete Vanderlinden

21533

My name is Peter Vanderlinden. I am strongly opposed to Polymet or any other mining near our precious wet lands and water resources here in MN. If you have any other information for me as a Minnesotan in love with our state parks and wetlands as far as how to better oppose this I am all ears. Thanks for your time, Peter Vanderlinden, RN, BSN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pete Wohlers 15001

Greetings, We have a permitting process in place. If that process is followed and a business provides all necessary information the permits should be approved. Polymet has gone above and beyond what they should have to. Please approve this project and issue the proper permits. Sincerely, Pete Wohlers 28566 East Bass Lake Road Grand Rapids MN 55744 Pete Wohlers Industrial Lubricant Company HYPERLINK "<http://www.industriallubricant-com/>"www.industriallubricant-com 35108 Hwy 2 West – Grand Rapids, MN 55744 Cell: 218-259-3115 – Office: 218-328-0278 HYPERLINK "<mailto:pwohlers@indlube-com>"pwohlers@indlube-com IND_LUBE_v5

Peter A Sethre 42775

See attachment

Peter Alan Haugan 57233

I remember a sense of toxicity in the people from its northern industrial cities. Those cities have been cleaning up and hopefully the next generation will be healthier. Heavy metal contamination makes a real and negative effect in people's lives. To create a situation of long term heavy metal pollution costs a lot in people's pain and suffering. Have the company pay more or better yet, only allow that kind of toxic mining.If the government does it and the profit goes to the people – perhaps for the U.S. debt?Peter Alan Haugan1161 Oakcrest Roseville, MN 55113

Peter Berridge 40615

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I know the message contains a lot of technical information. Bottom line, regardless of the specifics above, this type of mining is unsafe, detrimental to our ecology - which we value highly in Minnesota - and is not worth the small number of jobs that are produced for such a limited period of time. You'll be remembered for the actions you take now. Sincerely, Mr Peter Berridge 2522 Lost Lake Rd Mound, MN 55364-1679 (952) 472-2386

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Borchard 24547

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Attention Polymet Corporation: Whoever it was that originally came up with the whole idea about Murphy's Law must have been thinking about modern industry in general and the Mining Industry more specifically. To promise the population of where they are planning to work that there won't be any accidents or harmful pollution is pure fantasy. And the purity of Lake Superior is a very fragile thing. Back in the 1960's when the pollution of Lake Erie was setting off alarm warnings all over the Midwest and adjoining Canadian region people were warning that it would take 30 or 40 years to clean up, and they were right. But it was only possible because Lake Erie had three bigger lakes with 8 or 9 times more water upstream to clean it out . We won't get that kind of chance with Lake Superior. Lake Superior it at the "headwater" of the Great Lakes system of our water supply and would take over a hundred years for Mother Nature to clean out. My children and grandchildren don't have that kind of time to spare; and I'm sure they don't want to risk the possibility of developing cancer or some other hideous health problem. How about you people at Polymet . Do you or your families want to risk your good health by digging up some more strong chemicals out of our earth. I think the price of a loved one's health is higher than I would want to risk. Sincerely, Peter Borchard 1420 E Lowden Ln Mt Prospect, IL 60056-2608 (847) 921-0037

peter bormuth 43002

Dear DNR Please accept the attached document as my public comments on the proposed NorthMet Mine and SDEIS I would like verification that you received this document and that it is being included in your file. Peter Bormuth

Peter Branca 54165

I do not support this mining. This is a mass mailing by MPL CEO Alan Hodnik who is also on the board of directors for PolyMet. This mining is not safe and this company has no financial backbone to mine safe or for cleanup cost. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

57342

My name is Peter Branca. I am from Duluth, Minnesota. My concern is twofold: One is the financial stability of PolyMet. I happened to look at PolyMet's stock today and it is selling for 1.01, or just over a dollar a share. My other names, like Apple, is 500 some dollars and Google is well over a thousand. I checked the financials of PolyMet and over the last ten years, their stock has been only as high as \$4.50. Since I'm not a financial analyst, I'm not sure what this all means. But common sense would tell me it has very little financial stability. Especially for the long term. As well as how can they meet the cost of a consequence, a negative consequence or pending lawsuits? Since this is a very risky and expensive operation and has inherent dangers over the years, I feel very uncomfortable having a company come in to -- since I am a stockholder in the State of Minnesota -- come into my state, with little or no financial reserves to back them up. Also, I've been to Utah and Arizona, where the vast majority of copper mines are in this country, and they're three-quarters of a mile to a mile and a half deep, and the reason why is they don't have a water issue. Their water table is not a factor. In Minnesota, where PolyMet will be mining in a literal swamp, with literally no water table, and my feeling is the consequences will be severe to this, regardless of the amount of osmosis and filtration or holding ponds and pits. Fine metals will seep through the ground, into the water table, into the rivers, and eventually into Lake Superior. Since I'm a stockholder in the State of Minnesota, I feel the consequences well outweigh the gain.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Brask 4778

Here is a copy of a note I sent to the people opposing the Polymet expansion. I FIRMLY believe in approving the copper/nickel expansion at Polymet. Thanks for allowing me to comment. Here is the link I responded to <http://www.miningtruth-org/thank-you/#.UsiZTRx7QwY> My Note .. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine SHOULD be built as described. This mine SHOULD be allowed to be built and expanded. Just remember, EVERYTHING we have in our advanced society is either mined or grown. We need both. Once we allow special interest groups to influence major decisions, just as this, we are doomed to become a third world country. If we didn't mine the iron ore, resources from northern Minnesota in the early 1900's, we would not have been able to build the ships and planes that allowed us to win WW-1 and WW-2- The copper and nickel resources in northern Minnesota are still a very important resource to our entire country - not detrimental to a few environmentalists that think the project that would ruin the northland. The small number of environmentalists should not be allowed to influence the rest of the residents, workers, and support infrastructure that is in place to ensure that the mining is done safely and in compliance with our guidelines and laws. Just look at Minntac . 1400+ jobs and they are on the road to expansion. Polymet would provide jobs and tax revenue with the copper/ nickel expansion and contribute, not deter from tax revenue. I am not an "Iron Ranger". I am just an informed realist that understands the impact to our future and economy. Bottom line When Polymet gets to expand, we MUST ensure we have procedures in place to ensure they comply with our pollution guidelines. Thank You for allowing me to express my opinion.. Best Regards, Peter Brask Peter Brask Minnetrista, Minnesota

Peter D Doran 54725

See attachment

Peter Doughty 47235

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. It comes down to this: Assurances of corporate ability and intention to provide for cleanup of "possible" spills, as long as necessary, are ludicrous. If the long view is to preserve and protect the vital northern waters upon which ecological health and human life depend, then the only sensible course is to refuse to allow any sulfide mining operation in the region. Sincerely, Mr Peter Doughty 3617 Architect Ave Minneapolis, MN 55418-1207

peter faure 42232

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr peter faure 34 st mary st tarxien, CA 90210-4119

Peter Fleischacker 18236

My name is Peter Fleischacker, F-L-E-I-S-C-H-A-C-K-E-R. I'm really troubled by this because there appears to be no way that the public is assured that their response to the whole issue is even considered. I think it's a done deal and this is a farce, and I'm really troubled by that, and I hold the media and the politicians responsible for that, and that's really all I have to say. I'm just here to see what happens.

Peter Fleischacker 58095

I can't think of anything that is worse than this. 300? Jobs? And all the profits go where? The only support seems to be from the unions. What!!! They must not know that their days are numbered. Commenting on the SDEIS? What a joke. The DNR is already sold on the project. Real Problems. A) Children born with pollution in their system. Everything else is gravy. We do not need this in any form.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Gemuenden 20047

Thanks for your continued efforts to bring a final date for conclusion. Please stay the course and approve the Polymet project. Sent from my iPhone Kindest Regards. Pete Gemuenden 1202 W 8th St Duluth, Mn 55806

Peter Gesell 18371

I'm Peter Gesell. I live in Duluth. And I'm going to cede my time to Michael Dahl.

Peter Harle 41912

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Peter Harle Minneapolis, Minnesota

Peter Henry 54731

See attachment

Peter Krause 18382

Thank you to the regulators for bringing this hearing to Duluth. And thank you to the members of the Northland communities for coming and attending here today and staying along. My name is Peter Krause. I'm from the Duluth area. My concerns are not based on hard science, like parts per billion of water purity. Rather I am concerned with the social and historical factors. 500 years. Even if it's only 200 years, future generations are not going to be pleased to be committed to cleaning up this mess. As in the past, great changes are bound to happen. Wars, changes of government, climate change, civil collapse. Future generations may not even be able to maintain the system nor schedule of monitoring and repair. Failures and accidents happen. Just this last week in West Virginia and before that the BP spill in the Gulf, Exxon in Alaska, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl. The list is endless and inevitable. Copper-nickel has had nearly 100 percent failure rate in Montana, Canada, and around this globe. This is a great risk and the Boundary Waters we are gambling with. We are playing with high stakes for short-term gain. I strongly encourage rejection of this plan. Thank you. Good night.

42640

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter L. Gove 9618

I attended the St Paul hearing last evening and picked up a copy of the executive summary. I noticed on the Figure I map, there is a category for "national park" and a portion of Voyageurs National Park is noted on that map. However, Isle Royale National Park is not on the Lake Superior map and while several of the Apostle Islands are on this map, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore is not noted. While the Grand Portage reservation is on the map, Grand Portage National Historic Site is not. I also question why the several state parks located on Lake Superior are not on this map. Perhaps in the full document there is a map with these key federal and state natural resources located in the impact area from this project included. However, given the potential impact to Lake Superior from surface and groundwater sulfide pollution from this project, I suggest these designated federal and state protected areas be included. Thank you. Peter L. Gove 14 Pearson Place North Oaks, MN 55127 P 6513408080 F 6513408081 C 6512465939 pmgove@comcaStnet

Peter M Leschak 42785

See attachment

Peter Mattson 38610

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I grew up in a hard-rock underground mining area in Upper Michigan. There is still acid mine water from several mines closed 100 or so years ago discharging into the Iron River, which ends up in Lake Michigan. The mining companies are long gone. That story is repeated in every location where sulfide mining is done. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Peter Mattson 28072 550th Ave Austin, MN 55912-6580 (507) 567-2570

Peter Mitchell 54814

See attachment

Peter Molenda 44640

To Whom it May Concern, I forgot to include our contact information on the email I just sent. Peter and Rosalise Molenda 5209 Drew Ave S. Minneapolis, Mn. 55410

44668

To Whom it May Concern, We are deeply concerned about the damage to Northern Minnesota that would probably occur if PolyMet is allowed to mine various minerals. That area of our beautiful State is a National treasure, allowing both Minnesotans and citizens from across our country a chance to experience a true wilderness experience, with clean water and air a gift to all. We believe that allowing PolyMet and others to mine in Minnesota, creating a limited number of local jobs for a limited period of time, is not nearly enough to counterbalance the long term negative environmental impact such mining would have on that area. In addition, such mining would probably have a detrimental effect on the tourist trade that Northern Minnesota relies upon to help keep the area economically viable for those who currently live there. We ask that the DNR reject such mining in Northern Minnesota for the good of all Minnesotans, those here now and future generations. Sincerely, Rosalise and Peter Molenda

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Murphy 42475

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, It would extremely reckless to allow a mine such as this to threaten the pristine environment of the North Shore. I have vacationed up there for 30 years and appreciate the area's unique offerings. There has never been a mine of this size that has not caused damage. They can not assure that THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT. It is folly to think so. The gamble is not worth it. There won't even be that many jobs in automated operations like this. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Peter Murphy 4851 5th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5642

Peter O'Gorman 40618

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Peter O'Gorman 2224 3rd St White Bear Lake, MN 55110-3211

Peter Oja 38356

To Whom it May Concern, My name is Peter Oja and I just wanted to email my support of Polymet Mining. I grew up in northern Minnesota and know how important mining is to the north. I know that area is in a great need for jobs and this provides that opportunity. I know that with mining there is negatives, but in this case I feel that the positives are what we should concentrate on. Thanks for your time, Peter

peter pawlowski 39909

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr peter pawlowski 1209 E. Hennepin Ave Minneapolis, MN 55413

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Pfarr

16080

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Peter Schurke

48121

Dear Ms Fay, I was born and raised in Ely, Minnesota and I am a biology student at the College of St Scholastica in Duluth. I am very concerned about the effects this proposed Copper Sulfide mining project will have on the waters near my home. Ely is not very far away from PolyMet's mining site. It is expected that lead in PolyMet's tailing basin seeps will be 5 times or more higher in groundwater than the levels currently are. At the LTV tailings basin manganese is already far above Minnesota's health risk limit, but that is also expected to increase by 45 percent. All of this is in the SDEIS pg 169 of Chapter 5- Lead in drinking water is known to cause brain damage. Manganese in drinking water causes neurological damage and can reduce IQ in children. This is very concerning to my family and me as PolyMet's SDEIS reports of 27 residential wells downstream of the tailings basin. Citizens just downstream of the tailings basin will be drinking this water; some of the wells already have high levels of toxic metals. SDEIS Chapter 4- The SDEIS does not contain any analysis of whether or not pollution from the tailings basin could affect these wells. The SDEIS must be redone to analyze the potential impacts of tailing basin seeps to groundwater of the wells that my family and friends drink from. Why has there not been an analysis of this dangerous pollution to the drinking wells of Minnesotan citizens just downstream from the tailings basin. What is protecting the water that my family, friends, and I drink, year round day after day. Peter Schurke 1101 Ring Rock Road Ely, MN 55731 2183656022

Peter Seppanen

42677

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Smead

38911

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The fact that PolyMet needed to underwrite the high school hockey tournament as a PR move tells me this is not a good deal for Minnesota. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Peter Smead 4704 Hibiscus Ave Minneapolis, MN 55435-4002 (612) 226-8213

Peter Spooner

39615

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Peter Tanghe 10934

To whom it may concern I am writing to oppose the proposed copper-nickel mine as it is planned. I am a Minnesota resident and previously lived in Ely, MN. Any potential benefits of this project, which will be largely captured by the PolyMet corporation, simply do not justify potential environmental impacts whose cost will be borne by the residents of Minnesota as well as the surrounding US and Canadian regions. I am concerned that the changes to air quality and the watershed do not seem to have enough safeguards to protect myself, my neighbors and our natural resources. Please do not allow this regulatory capture by the narrow interests of PolyMet. Thank you. Pete Pete Tanghe 234 Ryan Ave St Paul, MN 55102 http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/sdeis/fact_sheets/cumulative.pdf The information included in this e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or organization to which it is addressed. This e-mail message may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you receive this e-mail message and are not the intended recipient or responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you may not use, disseminate, distribute or copy the information included in this e-mail and any attachments. If you received this e-mail message by mistake, please reply by e-mail and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.

Peter Thibault 54137

I don't believe that PolyMet's project design and controls will keep the environment safe. We can live without the mine but we need clean water. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Peter Thompson 54653

See attachment

Peter Uzelac 54900

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Petyer Dziuk

19078

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Its not a moment to rush when a project such as this that can have an environmental impact for centuries- long after you and I will be dead. I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Peter M. Dziuk Petyer Dziuk 1590 Long Lake Road New, MN 55112 651-262-8654

Pewter Katts

39461

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Pewter Katts 1027 16th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-2409

pham thihoa

40879

Dear Sir, I'd like to express strong opposition to any mining permits in the vicinity of the BCWA. It is a pity that this is happening and I sincerely hope that you will consider the many years of the future. Minnesota is precious because of its waters. Water is short everywhere. Please protect the waters and the living species that depend on waters, most of all us. Thank you. Pham Thi Hoa 8729 bentwood drive EP MN 55344

Alphabetical by sender's first name

pharmbw tds.net 46569

I believe there is no way that PolyMet can mine for 25-35 years and then guarantee there will be funds available to cleanup any pollution spill up to 500 years in the future. The cost to our children's future and environment is too great a risk. We can't let this happen. Graden R West, Rebecca A West, PO BX 422, 15625 56th St NE, New London, MN 56273, 320 354 5373

Phil Bergh 42706

See attachment

42708

See attachment

54887

See attachment

Phil Chambadal 38733

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Mr Phil Chambadal 151 W 17th St New York, NY 10011-5414

Phil Hogan 45263

To: Lisa Fay, MDNR Project Manager, There has been considerable hope placed on reverse osmosis to control sulfide mining pollution. Reverse osmosis is not a filter process, it is essentially a separation process. It separates an input stream of polluted water into two output streams, one being almost pure water, and the other being a stream of water in which the pollutant is more concentrated. The total amount of water contained in the two output streams is the same as that contained in the input stream, and, more importantly, the total amount of pollutant contained in the concentrate output stream is that same as that contained in the input stream. The reverse osmosis process does not reduce the total amount of pollutant. Of course the output of the pollutant concentrate stream could be further concentrated by further passing it through a second reverse osmosis process, but the total amount of pollutant remains the same, just further concentrated. So the important question is what happens to the pollutant contained in the final concentrate stream in which the total amount of pollutant has been concentrated but not reduced, . How is the concentrate stream processed. In what form will it be. How much will there be. How will it be handled, used or stored, and where will its final resting place be. Who will be responsible to perform this task of processing the output concentrate stream, and for how long. What will be the total operation, maintenance, and replacement costs for the life of the need for pollution mitigation. Respectively submitted, Philip A. Hogan 1902 Pine Tree Trail Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Phil Larson

18323

Hello. My name is Phil Larson. I reside in the City of Duluth. I am a fifth generation resident of Northeastern Minnesota. And many of my – in all five generations we have worked in the resource industry. I work in the resource industry today. So I understand how important the resource industry, mining, and logging, are to our way of life. I'm proud to live in the state of Minnesota, which has adapted some of the most stringent environmental laws and regulations in the world, in particular with regards to mining. A lot of comments have been directed toward the environmental consequences of this project. And that is part of this SDEIS. However, there is also an aspect of the need of the project. And the only thing I have to say about that is this: Since PolyMet initially submitted their environmental scoping document in 2004 -- they've been in some form of environmental review for 10 years now -- the population of the US has grown by 24 million. We know that per capita copper consumption in the United States is about 12 pounds per person. PolyMet is projected to produce -- just doing the calculations on my calculator, so correct me if I'm wrong; but they are projected to produce about 72 million pounds of copper a year. The number of people who have come into our country in the last 10 years, more than -- will more than consume the additional production that PolyMet will bring to the market. And the reason I say this is it's important to understand that we need -- we are global citizens. We live in a world where we consume resources. And we can consume them from here at home where we control the process. And we have control over how things are done. And we can step in and correct things when there are problems or we can consume these resources from a global market where we have no control over that. And I think it's our responsibility to take this into consideration in this EIS. Thank you.

42998

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
Dear Ms Fay, The following constitute my comments on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. I touch on a number of topics; for your convenience I have organized comments according to the section of the document to which they refer. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you desire copies of some or all of the documents I reference. Best Regards, Phil Larson Senior Geologist Duluth Metals Limited 306 W Superior Street, Suite 610 Duluth MN 55802 M: +1-218-491-1378 email: plarson@duluthmetals-com

Phil Ledermann

10702

Dear Ms Fay, Dear DNR, From a relatively uninformed but interested citizen, the SDEIS does not sound well done. How can an accurate prediction of long term impact be made when the science does not seem sound. I am very concerned that long term impacts are addressed now not 20-30 years from now. On the other hand I understand the need to gather materials for our industries and provide good jobs. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and require the study to be re-done with more realistic and recent data. Sincerely yours, Phil Ledermann Phil Ledermann 534 Saratoga St S St Paul, MN 55116

51494

Dear DNR, From a relatively uninformed but interested citizen, the SDEIS does not sound well done. How can an accurate prediction of long term impact be made when the science does not seem sound. I am very concerned that long term impacts are addressed now not 20-30 years from now. On the other hand I understand the need to gather materials for our industries and provide good jobs. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and require the study to be re-done with more realistic and recent data. Sincerely yours, Phil Ledermann Phil Ledermann 534 Saratoga St S St Paul, MN 55116

Phil Martens

42429

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I have my entire life traveled to the North Shore of Superior on vacations and believe it is one of the most beautiful and pristine places on our planet. The PolyMet mining project is unacceptably dangerous to the environment environmental risks and should be stopped. In a state known for its lakes we already have countless that are polluted and damaged by chemicals to an unacceptable level. PolyMet will do the same I have little doubt. And even with substantial 'protections' in place and 'allowable and non-harmful levels' of the pollution they will inevitably produce, it only takes one accident to damage the lake and surrounding areas for hundreds even thousands of years. Please do not allow this in our state. It is in the welfare of all the animals, the health of the boundary waters and the ever growing tourism industry to that area that you block PolyMet. Sincerely Phil Martens 3401 NE Lincoln St Mpls 55418 Sincerely, Dr Phil Martens 3401 NE Mpls, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Philip Hult

31985

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. An open pit sulfide mine will release toxic metals into our rivers and groundwater for hundreds of years - long after the products are spent and buried in landfills. PolyMet's own study says that the water from the mine site would need at least 500 years of treatment.[Marcotty, Josephine, "Iron Range mine could pollute water for up to 500 years," StarTribune. 7 October 2013-] I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Philip Hult 401a County Road 2425 N Mahomet, IL 61853-9704

Philip Rampi

16792

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Philip Rampi 2150 Jefferson Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Philip Rampi

50138

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Philip Rampi 2150 Jefferson Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Philip Ricketts

38800

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Philip Ricketts 2025 Zealand Ave N Golden Valley, MN 55427-3344 (763) 546-6790

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Philip Rogosheske

39058

---Original Message--- From: pvrogo@gmail-com [mailto:pvrogo@gmail-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 12:03 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Philip Rogosheske 517 9th Ave S Saint Cloud, MN 56301-4238

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Philip Spensley

40206

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Philipp Gross

47269

Philipp Gross 666 Hague Ave, Apt 1 Saint Paul, MN 55104 USA [HYPERLINK "mailto:philipp@theneighborhoodwoodshop-com"](mailto:philipp@theneighborhoodwoodshop-com)philipp@theneighborhoodwoodshop-com (651) 233-0242 To whom it may concern, I am, as many, deeply concerned with the proposed sulfide mining project of Polymet. Following are my comments regarding the SDEIS: 1) Water quality The SDEIS states: "Both mechanical and non- mechanical treatment would require periodic maintenance and monitoring activities. Mechanical water treatment is part of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action for the duration of the simulations (200 years at the Mine Site, and 500 years at the Plant Site). The duration of the simulations was determined based on capturing the highest predicted concentrations of the modeled NorthMet Project Proposed Action. It is uncertain how long the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would require water treatment, but it is expected to be long term; actual treatment requirements would be based on measured, rather than modelled" My concern is that all this is just based on modelling software and does not state any real world experiences. Who ran those models and how reliable are they. How is Polymet held responsible to the long term water treatment. Is it not true that Polymet has formed recently and actually has not earned any money yet and is likely to file bankruptcy after the proposed mine site closes (no more income). How much money do they put aside for the clean up and if any where are the estimates that this money is enough for the worst case scenario cleanup needs. What does long term water treatment mean, 10 yr, 50 yr, 500 yr. If we don't know that should we not figure this out first. 2) Jobs/ profit The SDEIS states: "According to PolyMet, the NorthMet Project Proposed Action would create up to 500 direct jobs during peak construction and 360 direct jobs during operations. These direct jobs would generate additional indirect and induced employment, estimated to be 332 additional construction-phase jobs and 631 additional operations-phase jobs. Indirect and induced effect employment numbers are calculated by IMPLAN and may include temporary, part-time, full-time, long-term, or short-term jobs. While some skilled workers would be involved only temporarily and would possibly relocate from outside the region, the majority of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action-related jobs are expected to be filled by those currently residing in the Arrowhead region." Besides the point that I do not think that this is even close to the number of jobs that would justify the risk I would like to see what those jobs are, how well they are getting paid (each position). It mentions further: "Federal, state, and local taxes would total an estimated \$80 million annually. During operations, there would be approximately \$231 million per year in direct value added through wages and rents and \$332 million per year in direct output related to the value of the extracted minerals. As with employment, these direct economic contributions would create indirect and induced contributions, estimated at \$99 million in value added and \$182 million in output." These numbers mean to me that the profit margin of Polymet is huge for only so few workers. If the argument is that we need these minerals for survival/ green energy etc should we not figure out a way how Minnesotans profit the most of these minerals. And maybe this means that the operation should be run by a non-for profit company or even the state and all the theoretical "profit" should be put in a trust fund until clean up is completed. I would still be very critical of any copper mining in Minnesota but at least I would know that the business is not just ran by the principle of maximising profit for share holders. 3) Policy Last but not least I would like to propose that a decision like this (permit or not) should be made by the majority in a voting procedure. In addition to this we need to make sure that the voters ar

Phillip A. Lermon

7447

MN DNR Please accept this comment on the proposed copper/nickel mine. This proposal reminds me of the runnup to the Hinkley fire and disaster when large corporations came to take all available lumber resources without thought for the future. The companies came in and gave no thought to the slash left behind as long as production and profits flowed. Then when the trees were gone and the slash started burning the lumber companies were long gone, leaving destruction and death to the local population. Freedom Industries in West Virginia is recent example of private companies not able to ever pay for the destruction they cause when poisoning the environment. This proposal is not economically feasible when the future costs are added to the picture. Once it is up and running there will be ways for Poly-Met to pay off regulators. Phil Lermon

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Phillip Sterner

18959

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Phillip Sterner 7373 147th Street West, #158 Apple Valley, MN 55124 6127512973

Pho Lay Thao

54207

I think it's a bad idea to mine near the boundary waters because the boundary waters is our only protected wilderness. Mining near it will be bad because the water will be contaminated with acid and will kill all the animals there. We've killed many animals and destroyed many of their homes. Why would we keep destroying more? Why do we want so much that we can't think of nature. If the acids go into the rivers then it would go to Lake Superior which has the most fresh water of all the great lakes. If we keep destroying the homes of these animals, where would they go? There are many places to go to but you always have to realize that, there's no place like home. Let's keep our waters and rivers clean so that we can be good to nature. We could also prevent global warming which is also a worldwide problem for us.

Phoebe Cushman

38831

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Phoebe Cushman 4600 Midmoor Rd Monona, WI 53716-2044

Phyllis Annoni

54707

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Phyllis Mead 42649

See attachment

Phyllis Saliin 45043

Dear DNR, I am strongly opposed to the PolyMet Mine. I believe that it will have an extremely detrimental and long lasting negative effect on the environment and to the overall health of people. The pollution it would bring to land and water would affect many generations to come. The damage that would occur would far outweigh any jobs that would be generated. Also, clean up of toxins would be a huge burden to bear financially. We have many environmental treasures here in Minnesota and we can't afford to do harm to our lakes and wilderness areas. We need to learn lessons from the past, as we still continue today to clean up our environment of contaminants from previous industrial sites. Minnesota also brings in a substantial income from tourism and that would be in jeopardy. We need to make sure that the health of the people and of the natural environment in our state are our priority. Sincerely, Phyllis Saliin 5309 Otsego St Duluth MN 55804 218-310-2753 prsaliin@gmail-com Sent from my iPhone

pieplace@boreal.org 47636

Dear DNR, Thank you for responding to my email. Would you be able to tell me what permitting requirements would need to be changed in order to stop PolyMet and others from mining in Minnesota. Also, who would be able to make the changes (Legislature, a State government committee, DNR, local government.). Thanks

Piper Donlin 39572

To whom this may concern, I am a native of Minnesota now living in Oslo, Norway, where I am a researcher at the University of Oslo. I spent much of my childhood canoeing and camping in the BWCAW. This area means a great deal to me and is a cultural and historical landmark in Minnesota. Despite my distance, I have been following this fight closely, as I care deeply about the fate of my home. It is up to the DNR, USFS, and the USACE to fulfill ethical and legal obligations and defend the natural "commons" and "public trust" that your agencies are sworn to protect on behalf of the citizens of this state. Instead, as in other places, the universal rights of both human and non-human inhabitants are being trampled to serve the property/profit interests of the rich international corporations who have lied and bribed their way into "legal personhood" and political control in Minnesota. Here is the short list associated with copper-sulfide mining operations. This is the ecological, social and economic legacy footprint that will impact OUR STATE for hundreds of years; that's a scary prospect when Polymet, Northmet and their cohorts will be long gone by the year 2040 or so, without intention or means to pay for the superfund site they leave behind for us. Their track records should be enough to convince the State of Minnesota to drive them away before they do any more damage than they already have

- Water pollution -fresh water is the world's most precious natural resource; now threatened in many places.
- Impacts to three watersheds.
- Loss of pristine wetlands and forest
- Impacts on wildlife.
- Climate change due to carbon emissions.
- Serious health threats to people including cancers and respiratory ailments.
- Mercury poisoning- people who live in the Superior Basin are already exhibiting dangerous levels.
- Loss of public lands.
- Devastating aesthetic impacts.
- Loss of wilderness.
- Loss of northeastern economy based on eco-tourism.
- Loss of wilderness jobs- thousands of people depend on ecology and wilderness for their wages (compared to three hundred jobs that will last a couple of decades—and then where will the miners go when the last traces of mineral are gone.)
- A strange lack of any cost/benefit analysis is a dangerous red flag.
- Superfund cleanup to the tune of billions of dollars for hundreds of years.

Thank you, Piper Donlin Nedre Silkestrå 18 0375, Oslo Norway

pmetcalf@tcq.net 12

My concern with the new mining facilities in N Minnesota is water use. If they are going to use water that feeds into Lake Vermilion for their production or manufacturing uses, that may reduce the lake level. In the Fall, Lake Vermilion level gets very low, and dangerous for boating in some areas. Currently the water level range seems to be about 3 feet between high water mark in the Spring and low water mark in the Fall. If water is removed from any of Lake Vermilions watershed, river sources, this may affect the level of the lake, and potentially very negatively in the Fall. Also if the company removes water out of the aquifer (or river) and cleans it then puts it back in, my concern would be if they put back less than they took out.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Pooja Shah 39328

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Miss Pooja Shah 2004 Randolph Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1750

Prospect Hill Friends 54689

See attachment

Protect our Manoomin 42976

Protect Our Manoomin Comments for the NorthMet SDEIS are enclosed in attached Word document file. Thank you.

PXB 54158

NO NO NO [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Quinn Kilanowski 44306

Hello, As a young Minnesotan of legal voting age who enjoys my state and it's bountiful parks, I must say I disagree that a mine very near the states crown jewel would not be ecologically or economically worth it. With not very many jobs being created, they would not last very long. The project would only last a limited amount of time, then where are those workers going to be working afterwords. Would you continue to employ them after the project is complete. Or possibly compensate them beyond their work. With methods of mining having things to do with acids, this mine could effect the aquatic life which would snowball into hundreds of problems including eagle populations, wild rice harvest, and the quality of the overall environment for tourists visiting the area. That is something that would be more sustainable, having people visit the park. While you claim the mining project would last a while, the park could last forever. FOREVER. That is definitely more economically sound than employing near a hundred people for a short amount of time. Having people with a set of work skills that are strictly for the mining industry are going to have a hard time finding employment afterwords. With Minnesota having a decently low unemployment rate, you would be putting that in jeopardy by having to eliminate the jobs when you are done. With the mine only being there for a short time, the ecosystem will (hopefully) be there for hundreds and hundreds of years. A project that will probably only last a few decades will compromise everything living there and everything that ever will. It does not matter how many steps are taken to prevent ecological damage, damage will be done. And seeing as this would be your first mining project I'm sure it will be damaging beyond what you estimate. I appreciate the time taken for the company to take the time to listen to actual Minnesotan voices fighting for their states most precious natural resource. Quinn Kilanowski

R Nicholas Rowse 58047

This proposed mine would cause severe degridation to NE MN & the BWCA. I do not want this to happen. Project our natural resources. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

R Rita Caruso-Santamaria 20748

To whom It May Concern, I consider myself a citizen of the world and the USA. I want the best for both: prosperous and sustainable lives for all the people and creatures, safe extrusion of precious materials from the earth, and maintenance of earth's wise and delicate balance. In regards to the proposed mining in Minnesota by PolyMet, I would like to address some things: 1- Is it worth risking polluting the environment for 500 years and the subsequent health effects in exchange for any kind of profit. 2- Is it worth risking the lives of thousands of people and mass environmental contamination for profits that are not going to remain in the USA. 3- We have been entrusted with this beautiful land. We do not have the right to use and destroy resources. We have the priviledge and responsibility to care and protect the resources entrusted to us, the human race. 4- What is going to happen when the environmental balance is severely disrupted thanks to our irresponsible contributions. 5- Who is going to protect us from the earth's wrath when there are no more natural checks and balances. I propose that the job creation and economy be geared to cleaning up the existing contamination in our lands. I also propose to promote an economy that is in synchrony with earth's balance. We need to balance environmental and economic interests, renewable technology to produce energy that is not going to take humanity and the world to self-destruction. Sincerely, Rita Caruso-Santamaria 1645 Hazelwood St St Paul, MN, 55106 Tel. 651-231-8461 HYPERLINK "mailto:rcwhitgr@smumn-edu"rcwhitgr@smumn-edu

R Scott Thiem 54652

See attachment

54704

See attachment

R. Fitzgerald 39570

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr R. Fitzgerald 123 Privacy Blvd. Rochester, MN 55906-4456

R. Nicholas Rowse 57356

This proposed mine would cause severe degradation to NE MN & the BWCA. I do not want this to happen. Protect our natural resources. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

R. Yaeger

57666

To whom it may concern: Scientific evidence and analysis of the PolyMet project SDEIS indicates that the issues below still have NOT been satisfactorily addressed:
1- Inadequate assurance that Minnesota's water will stay safe and clean PolyMet will pollute Minnesota's waters for at least 500 years by their own estimate. Their reverse osmosis plan has never been tried on this scale and there is no proof that it will work as advertised. Is it right to put a National Park at risk just to see if this "experiment" works. 2- No strong safeguards in place for when things go wrong PolyMet's mine plan doesn't include anything for basic, common sense contingencies. Historically, things have gone wrong at these mines with dismaying regularity in nearly all cases. 3- Inadequate assurance that PolyMet will leave the site clean and maintenance free PolyMet would leave behind a site requiring very expensive maintenance for centuries. No open pit sulfide mine has left clean water and healthy, fertile land behind when they've gone, and the majority have left highly polluted and infertile sites. A cosmetic top dressing with a few non-native hardy grasses on it is NOT fertile, useful soil. 4- Virtually no assurance that Minnesota's taxpayers be protected from clean up costs Granted that the SDEIS is not about cost benefit ratios, but the proposed plan contains almost no information about financial assurance. There is no assurance that PolyMet won't just declare bankruptcy, and once again, taxpayers will be stuck with billions in cleanup costs for untold decades. Damage deposits left by previous mines have been laughably inadequate to cover the actual clean up costs. Twenty years of (likely) way fewer local job opportunities than currently advertised, is in no way worth the loss of likely as many other jobs in the tourism and guiding industries forever. These jobs will not simply resume when the mine folds. How could they when the mine has left behind an ugly mess of polluted land and water with few of the most popular sport fishes, charismatic animals, or its iconic forests and wetlands. Respectfully, R. Yaeger 3750 Hill Ct NE Rochester, MN 55906

R.M.

57874

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project. This type of mining is not worth it, we need to protect our natural resources, especially water quality.

Rachael Lehman

18098

Rachel Lehman. I am Rachel Lehman and I am going to uncharacteristically give my time to my husband to speak.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachael Sarto

45613

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rachael Sarto 3817 22nd ave s Minneapolis, MN 55407

45614

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rachael Sarto 3817 22nd ave s Minneapolis, MN 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachel and Don Christensen 54475

See attachment

Rachel Bollis 46049

DNR I urge you NOT to accept the SDEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage a

Rachel Butler 27517

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters are a national treasure and a refuge. I grew up on the shore of Lake Superior and return every year for its solitude and clean environment. With pollution and industry affecting so many of our natural places, our public lands need to stay public, and not be given away for the benefit of a few in industry. Please keep these lands protected for public enjoyment rather than private benefit and reject the open pit sulfide mine. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Rachel Butler 987 61st St Oakland, CA 94608-2307 (262) 565-8819

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachel Christensen 48159

See attachment

48303

FYI

Rachel Eckert 57970

Save the beautiful boundary waters. They are one of the most beautiful places in Minnesota that more people deserve to enjoy. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Aletemative.

Rachel Garwin 41913

Dear Ms Fay, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet/NorthMet SDEIS. They represent my personal opinion and expertise as a conservation scientist (I hold an M.S. in Natural Resources from the University of Vermont) and an outdoor professional (I have worked for the Voyageur Outward Bound School as an instructor for 5 years). Cumulative Effects Insufficiently Examined CEQ defines cumulative effects as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other action.” The SDEIS considers actions related to the taconite industry and public sector in this section. The SDEIS, however, fails to account for any additional copper-nickel sulfide mining activity related to the NorthMet project, and it is thus inadequate. I recognize that the NorthMet project’s location in the Lake Superior Basin will have little direct effect within the BWCAW watershed. I am concerned, however, that approving the NorthMet project will make it easier for other projects (such as the Twin Metals Minnesota, LLC, project along Spruce Road) in the BWCAW watershed to go forwaRd Twin Metals has already proposed using the LTVSMC processing plant, assuming that the NorthMet project goes forwaRd Since retrofitting an existing processing plant to process new materials would make it a hub for more proposed copper-nickel sulfide mines than just NorthMet, this action should be considered as connected to other foreseeable projects, including those in the BWCAW watershed. The co-lead agencies should properly study the cumulative impact of all related copper-nickel sulfide mining projects facilitated by the approval of the NorthMet project. SDEIS Inadequate as Model Process As the NorthMet project is the first copper-nickel sulfide mine to undergo environmental review in the State of Minnesota, this process will serve as a model for those that follow. I am deeply concerned about sulfide mining projects that will be proposed in the future, and I would like to have faith in the scientific rigor with which the NEPA process is undertaken. After a thorough reading the SDEIS, it is clear that it remains lacking in several respects. First, the degree of unknown associated with the NorthMet project is still too high. The SDEIS should include estimates for the length of time and amount of money necessary to treat the water in order to meet Clean Water Act standards. Instead of dodging the 200/500 years of pollution question, the SDEIS should have been designed to provide some guidance to the citizens of Minnesota as to how long environmental mitigation would have to laSt The lack of this crucial piece of information makes it impossible for the public to accurately weigh costs and benefits. Waiting until the permitting stage of the process is too late, as so much momentum will have built behind the NorthMet project that it will almost necessarily go forward at that point. The co-lead agencies should revisit this question and give the public a reasonable estimate of the estimated time and cost associated with treating the pollution associated with the NorthMet project. Second, the SDEIS uses a low-quality, unreliable study to support its socioeconomic impact analysis. The Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) 2009 and 2012 studies are inadequate to the task of informing public policy, as they only consider assumed benefits of expanded mining activity in the region and do not assess costs. Buried in Appendix B, the authors admit, “Readers are encouraged to remember the BBER is providing an economic impact analysis. Policy recommendations should be based on the ‘big picture’ of total impact, and a cost-benefit analysis would be needed to assess the environmental, social, and governmental impacts of ferrous and non-ferrous mining in the State” (p. A-16).

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachel Imholte

40446

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Rachel Johnson

41923

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Rachel Johnson Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachel Katkar 38759

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, My hope is to bring my children to experience Lake Superior as I did growing up. We must make decisions that positively impact future generations, not pollute and irreparably destroy our world. I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Rachel Katkar 773 Ohio St Saint Paul, MN 55107-3423

Rachel Kinnunen 42455

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. This gift of nature is too precious to jeopardize. For all these reasons, again I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Thanks for your concern. Sincerely, Ms Rachel Kinnunen 1415 8th St SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-1557

Rachel Lee 54544

I work on a lake right outside of the BWCA and I also spend time on Lake Superior. These places mean so much to me—more than could ever fit on this card. They help people grow and they help people learn about respect and wonder. We have to protect these places for us and for the future.

Rachel Lord 54869

See attachment

Rachel Nelson 42825

See attachment

Rachel Rausch 39753

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. The containment of mining wastes is a problem that cannot be solved definitively. The magnitude of waste created by sulfide mining would make it impossible to guarantee that pollution of the fragile ecosystem would not occur. Once mining wastes have been created, they continue to persist in the environment for decades to centuries and continue to pose a threat to the environment long after the mining operations have been abandoned. Once mining is done, will PolyMet be diligent enough to ensure that the waste from its operations have been taken care of. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Rachel Rausch 516 4th St SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-1718

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rachel Rostad

42031

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Rachel Rostad St Paul, Minnesota

Rachel Schramm

40891

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Rachel Schramm 711 S Inglewood Ave Inglewood, CA 90301-3203 (513) 593-2725

Rae Busch

14453

You must be CRAZY if you think we TRUST INDUSTRY to self-regulate, take any responsibility for cleanup, or to do the right thing in ANY way. Look at what has happened in our nation due to LACK OF REGULATION, lack of oversight, under-funded OSHA and EPA, and continued coddling of big business in this nation: West, Texas - 15 DEAD Enid, Oklahoma - 2 DEAD Ghent, West Virginia - 4 DEAD Upper Big Branch Mine, West Virginia - 29 DEAD Bayer, Institute, West Virginia - 2 DEAD Deepwater Horizon - 11 DEAD West Virginia - poisoned water for 300,000 people, "Freedom" Industries declares bankruptcy, dodges hearings North Carolina "Patriot" Coal - toxic sludge in the water, but hey, it's all OK: the GOVERNOR OWNS STOCK in the energy company and has helped it to avoid ANY consequences for its actions The HALLIBURTON RULE that exempts fracking companies from any responsibility for cleanup. Those are just examples I can think of off the TOP OF MY HEAD. No research needed. Give me an hour and I'll find you a THOUSAND OTHERS. Trains derail because we don't spend money on infrastructure, too busy giving that money away hand over fist to the POLLUTERS. Pipelines rupture because the companies that build them do NOT CARE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT: they WORSHIP profits. NO. NO, I do NOT support you. NO, we do NOT want our beautiful state to turn into a waste dump so YOU can make MONEY. NO. NO. NO. NO.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Raechel Murphy

42225

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

rafael johnson

15918

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, rafael johnson 322 lake st apt 307 excelsior, MN 55331

Raia Meltzer

54873

See attachment

Ralph Butkowski

43067

852 Brenner Ave Roseville MN 55113 MN DNR I have read most of the readily available SDEIS and other summary documentation, and wish to express some thoughts and concerns about the project analysis. Understandably it may not be possible for the agencies involved to provide detailed technical information, however the lack of specific information in the report also invites the concern that details are either not determined or they are being kept from view. The lack of knowledge about impacts of the mining project is suggested by Eric Carlson's statement that "details would be further worked out" on how one would manage the 3 main pollutants identified by the MPCA. I am concerned that the metals (some of which are highly toxic) are grouped into one category while mercury is a separate category. MPCA surely knows that several of the unnamed metals are far more toxic than is mercury, but seems to overlook this fact. With details to be worked out after a mining permit is granted suggests a lack of understanding about how things are likely to go after mining has begun. The land exchange program lacks an apparent realization that dollar equity exchange for land does not equate to environmental impact equity. The land exchange plan, like the pollution issue, is a plan "to be further developed". Only superficial mention is made of habitat fragmentation and how to compensate for its effects. The lack of a confident plan suggests that this assessment is premature. Personally I believe this is a high rick project for short term gains, and I do not currently support its implementation. Sincerely, Ralph Butkowski

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ralph Karsten

16850

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I must protest this mining proposal. A few hundred jobs are being offered in exchange for the loss of environment that is enjoyed by thousands in this state; these thousands support the tourism in this area. You will actually ****lose**** jobs, not gain them. In addition, we will have to monitor the waste for a period longer than our country has even been around. What are you thinking.. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ralph Karsten Ralph Karsten 160 So. Wheeler St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ralph Karsten

50182

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I must protest this mining proposal. A few hundred jobs are being offered in exchange for the loss of environment that is enjoyed by thousands in this state; these thousands support the tourism in this area. You will actually ****loose**** jobs, not gain them. In addition, we will have to monitor the waste for a period longer than our country has even been around. What are you thinking.. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ralph Karsten Ralph Karsten 160 So. Wheeler St Paul, MN 55105

Ralph Wyman

43349

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I am writing to urge the MN DNR to not approve the PolyMet mine application. It is not credible that surface water treatment for hundreds of years will be paid for by a mining company that will have made its profits and departed the region within a few decades. The United States is littered with mining and other industrial polluters who make short term profits and then declare strategic bankruptcy. We are saddled with things like Superfund sites that spend public dollars, and even then, take decades or longer to remediate what damages businesses do in mere years. Our state can develop its natural resources in other ways, through tourism, through renewable energy production, and continued innovation in things like healthcare. We do not need the short term jobs and the long-term damage. Sincerely, Mr Ralph Wyman 400 Groveland Ave Apt 407 Minneapolis, MN 55403-3243 (612) 805-7314

Ramon Torres-Ortiz

41760

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Ramon Torres-Ortiz 3142 Lyndale Ave S Apt 32 Minneapolis, MN 55408-2943 (612) 309-9280

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Randall Heldreth

31017

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. And while we're discussing it, can you please try and shutdown the very same kind of mining that is going on in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. It will only end with another Superfund cleanup situation. Why should the government keep having to use our tax dollars to cleanup corporate America's messes. Stop them in the first place and save us all huge financial and environmental burden. Sincerely, Randall Heldreth 367 E Hewitt Ave Marquette, MI 49855-3711

Randall Wright

39593

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Randall Wright 5212 Knollwood Dr NE Bemidji, MN 56601

Randolph Gaul

19953

Feb 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Many years ago I canoed in the Boundary Waters. It is kind of a holy place in my memory. And learning of a mining operation that would threaten not only the Boundary Waters, but also waterways that lead to non other than Lake Superior itself is an absolute nightmare. Decades (or Centuries.) of reclamation is not worth the ore that would come from the PolyMet mine. I personally object. Sincerely, Mr Randolph Gaul 4120 Morrison Ct Baltimore, MD 21226-1315 (410) 636-0212

Alphabetical by sender's first name

randy hauserman

41126

DNR ..regarding this proposal, I looked at the risks/rewards of this project from a business and environmental impact, reviewed the overall pros and cons of this issue and find the risks out weight the rewards. Analyzing the investment and assuming my facts are correct, Polymet is a Canadian company based in Vancouver even though it seems they want you to believe they are based in St Paul. I also believe that a large portion of their financial investment is from a Swiss company that stock trades around a \$1- When I review the economy issues it's always a positive to have jobs created but when it's limited to just 20 years, that to me doesn't sound like a good investment when measured against the risks. What I would prefer as a solution for long term employment in the area is like the NWA/Delta reservation center in Chisholm that is green with no environmental risks and is not limited to just 20 years. I believe the state should seek out investments in these types of industries that don't have the environmental risks or potential negative impacts. Regarding the potential harm to the environment, if there are problems, there are no do over's and Minnesota's taxpayers could take a big hit. Damage to the environment, so close to one of our most precious resources, the BCWA might be forever. Is the state ready to take that risk. There are better, cleaner ways to increase long term employment and not just limited to 20 years the Polymet payback to the state is minimal at best and could do harm forever. You can never have enough financial guarantees when dealing with a precious resource like the environment certainly more than the minerals Polymet intends to extract. You cannot place a price tag on mother earth. The fact that they are proposing at least 200 years of water treatment should be the biggest red flag and for what, 20 years of operations. The state should be thinking about generational job growth, not just short term of 20 years. Also look what has happened in other issues around the country, what happens if they file for bankruptcy. All of the potential EPA fines, etc are worthless. Look at the water issues in the Appalachian states because of neglect in the coal industry and there are many other examples of similar scenario's around the country. With a proposal like this, the state has to look long term, fully weigh the potential negative impacts and protect one of Minnesota's most precious assets ..the environment. Randy Hauserman 72 Birnamwood Drive Burnsville MN 55337

Randy Holland

43243

Hello, The past two summers I've spent three months at a cabin in the Arrowhead region. After reading about this issue my concern is that sulfide mining permits for ALL mines (not just Polymet) is being rushed before the DNR can do more site-specific studies of underground aquifers. It's been pointed out that generic water flow assumptions are being used that may underestimate required site-specific treatment facilities. Furthermore, given that sulfide mining may require the longest water treatment plan in history, it's shocking that there is little scientific basis for the estimates of 500 years or more of treatment. Lastly, it is truly stunning to me that the mining job estimates don't factor in the risk to the much larger tourism industry. Collectively, these reasons beg that more time and science is allowed to ensure no environmental disasters occur, ultimately reducing taxpayer cleanup risks and possible harm to local wildlife, citizens, and Minnesota's future economy. I would also argue that any licensing revenue for the state goes into a trust fund that spreads out the revenues over the life of the water treatment. Otherwise this is simply pillaging Minnesota's resources for short-term gain that no one can deny puts future Minnesotans at risk (even if small) of paying for an epic cleanup. The reason is funds put aside may not be enough since corporations never remain static for centuries. Thus it's certain that Polymet and other mining companies won't exist in their present form centuries from now so restitution seems unlikely in case of disaster, leaving future generations to pay for the benefit of existing Minnesotans. If skeptical of this scenario, imagine Polymet being acquired or it's "risky" business segments being spun off and then later declaring bankruptcy. The legacy of Minnesota's current government is at stake to show that they have thought of all scenarios. Given the Arrowhead region's total mineral deposit potential, spending another 6-12 months to inject more science and facts into this discussion would show that short-sighted greed by both the state's budget and mining special interest won't trump the risk of polluting the Boundary Waters, Arrowhead region, and Great Lakes watersheds. If the science is reassuring, then few will protest if proper precautions are made. Rushing matters is a sign that the science and facts in favor of mining are weak. Please show Minnesota isn't afraid of science and continue studying whether this mineral opportunity is worth the risks. Thank you for reading my concerns about the Northmet SDEIS. Sincerely, Randy Holland 13225 Thomas Drive Little Falls, MN 56345 612-840-6914

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Randy Lasky

38851

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager: From: Randy Lasky, Northspan Group, Inc. My name is Randy Lasky, President and CEO of the Northspan Group, Inc. Our address is 221 West First Street, Duluth Minnesota. Northspan is a private non-profit, 501(c) 4 business and community development corporation serving northeast Minnesota since 1985- On behalf of the Board, I am submitting comments on the proposed PolyMet project and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). First and foremost, we support this project based on our analysis of the SDEIS documentation; we feel PolyMet is prepared to use modern mining technology to responsibly and economically mine the significant non-ferrous mineral deposit in our region in an environmentally safe and responsible manner. We have relied on the sound work done by our agency regulators and acknowledge your modeling and findings to be supportive of approving this document and authorizing the project to move to the permitting stage. In those areas of the SDEIS document where we have some expertise including understanding the modeling and findings shared about the potential local, regional, statewide and federal economic impacts of this project as well as current state law and the process to set financial assurances as part of the permitting process, we feel confident in sharing our perspective and support in these two areas. First, we feel the project has demonstrated via credible economic impact modeling, that it will deliver a significant economic impact over the 20 year planning period and beyond. This economic assessment modeling and significant returns must be recognized in its importance to the State as we also recognize the importance and value of meeting all of the regulatory standards, mitigation requirements and assurances that will eventually be imposed and monitored for years to come. Economic impacts such as an upfront investment of \$500 million in construction of the plant site as well as redeveloping a former iron mining area into a viable new non-ferrous mining operation improves the area, leverages the current physical assets, and improves the conditions of the mine site now and into the future as the area is reclaimed. It's about jobs and the environment and with the addition of 360 new, quality skilled mining jobs as well as over 600 indirect, valued-added, living wage jobs that can support families; this is significant in a region dependent on our natural resources for upwards of 50% of our regional Gross Domestic Product (GDP). If we look at direct financial impacts on the schools statewide and in the region, as well as tax revenues to local, state and federal government of approximately \$55 million annually, this is a win-win for us all. Second, in terms of financial assurances, we understand laws currently exist to provide permitting agencies the flexibility needed to make sure that the State and all of us are not forced to deal with a bankrupt situation and major environmental problems should something happen to PolyMet and this project. Those safeguards for non-ferrous mining can and will be imposed by Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) during the permitting stage. In terms of flexibility to hold PolyMet accountable, appropriate assurances can be determined and implemented; under the law, MDNR could select from any number of financial assurance tools including trust funds or escrow accounts, surety bonds, letters of credit, certificates of deposit or insurance policies. Whatever instrument is selected, we agree it has to be bankruptcy proof, held in title by the State, continuously in place, annually updated and readily available to regulators to safeguard the State's interests. To further monitor and adjust assurance requirements for the long term, we understand the law provides MDNR the ability to conduct a detailed review of all of the costs of reclamation annually, and can adjust the financial requirements of the compa

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Randy Mahurin

40322

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Randy Mahurin 1021 Greenturf Rd Spring Hill, FL 34608 US

Randy Wenthold

37877

My name is Randy Wenthold 38771 189th Ave Menahga MN 56464 612-817-4873 I must oppose the copper mine based upon what I am aware of in the taconite mining industry. I am a chemical engineer and represent a small company with chemistry technology to precipitate fine materials (flocclate) in water. I've worked with the US Steel facility and at the Minntac plant where nearly 45,000 gallons per minute of dirty water used to rinse the crushed ore is treated with a 1-4 million pounds per year of a chemical commonly called DADMAC (Diallyl dimethyl ammonium chloride) which is added to this dirty water to recover the solids that are suspended in the water being pumped to a settling pond 5 miles x 5 miles in size. I visited the Minntac facility and then obtained samples of this process water to show the company representatives what can be accomplished via the use of my companies chemistry. US Steel representatives provided us with samples of this water and samples of the Nalco company DADMAC chemical material currently in use. Note: Nalco is a large chemical company that provides this material to all the taconite facilities in MN and the paper mills as well. My company produced results that show our product would reduce the DADMAC consumption by 1/12 of present Nalco company product use and save US Steel an estimated \$200K per year in chemical expense plus shipping expense of 1/12th the present amount. US Steel representatives have decided not to move to my companies material. So the mining industry will continue to use 12X DADMAC material and discharge this chemistry into the environment vs. moving to a new DADMAC product chemistry that is readily available. It can be assumed the same situation/condition will be established at the copper mine (ie large chemical company establishing the use of their products which results in 12X the discharge of DADMAC chemical into the environment). The mining companies must use DADMAC and other polymer products to help recover the suspended solids as part of the mining and ore rinsing process. This cannot be avoided. What can be avoided is the use of massive amounts of the material vs. alternate suppliers.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ravi Katkar

41848

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ravi Katkar St Paul, Minnesota

ray

15779

I support the Polymet project: My concern is in the comment process, and the ability of the DNR to remove the political pressure based on the number of comments. Please, evaluate only on the technical validity of individual comments. I believe that you will be flooded with comments beyond out borders which could distort the project decisions and cause delays for another year of two. Ray Yuzna

15780

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands.

15781

Ray Yuzna 8016 32nd place Crystal, Mn 55427 I believe that the NorthMet SDEIS. and eventual operation of the reverse osmosis water purification will provide a research platform for future pollution control other than mining. Minnesota could become a leader in solving water pollution problems worldwide. Lets build this mine and see where it leads the world.

15782

Please consider, the Polymet process to control water pollution is a perfect platform for learning and moving Minnesota into the world stage of this type of pollution control. I believe that eventually it could be a new industry for Minnesota above and beyond mining world wide.

15783

I believe that the SDEIS is a complete document. My concern is the comment process, and the political weight DNR will place on the number of responses instead of the validity of content .

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ray 21538

I support the Polymet project: My concern is in the comment process, and the ability of the DNR to remove the political pressure based on the number of comments. Please, evaluate only on the technical validity of individual comments. I believe that you will be flooded with comments beyond out borders which could distort the project decisions and cause delays for another year of two Ray Yuzna

Ray Allard 15974

Ms Fay: attached please find a letter of concern about the Polymet plan. I will follow this up with a copy sent through the postal service. Ray Allard Visit our website www.WilliardWorks-com to - See: Ray Allard's Artwork Gallery - Hear: Gerri Williams' Audio Productions -Read: Columns, Blogs and More

Ray Fenner 16726

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ray Fenner 52962 Erickson Lane Sandstone, MN 55072

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ray Fenner

50090

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ray Fenner 52962 Erickson Lane Sandstone, MN 55072

Ray Lewis

52229

When the science of the long-term health and environmental impact is uncertain, I would recommend delaying development. The minerals will still be there until we can be sure the shared resources of the state can be maintained in as an original state as possible. Ray R. Lewis 2 Circle Drive Circle Pines, MN 612-227-4209 <http://www.linkedin.com/in/rayrlewis>

Ray Schmitz

43740

While I have significant concerns about the proposed mitigation involved in this mine and processing my comments are addressed to the issue of long time protection of the environment by guarantees. While it appears that some of the proposed assurances would be fleshed out in later documents, there is nothing that assures me that there is any legal framework or financial instrument capable of assuring its existence for the time periods involved. With the possible exception of the British East Indian Company formed in the days of the raj, there is no corporation or other legal framework that has existed for the time periods involved. What is to prevent a future court or legislature from excusing the commitments in the future, and even if they did not do so, the corporation or other institution could simply stop performing. Even with financial assurances they are no more valuable than the underlying institution issuing them, and unfortunately those do fail. I urge you to not approve these permits or allow this to continue until there is some assurance that the taxpayers are fully protected. Ray Schmitz 210 14th St NE Rochester, MN 55906 507 288 3948

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ray Yuzna 3424

I support Polymet for the following reasons: First, I have a personnel interest, I own stock. Second - I have invested in Minnesota, especially the Iron Range for the following reasons: *The project will bring in tax dollars and boost the economy in support of future development in the state. *A University research platform for future state wide environmental issues. Consider using the reverse osmosis processes designed in removing effects phosphate from farm lands which is now a much greater source of water pollution than Polymet. Also, the possibility of recovery of fertilizer, recycling it to provide cost reduction of the processing plants. *Polymet could provide a practical training aid in environmental engineering. *Controlling the existing pollution from the old LTV operation and refurbishing the plant and area. Last – Its good for the DFL party because: * The people living the area want the mine. The young people need a reason to stay in the area. Failure to pass the permits will give the GOP ammunition. Most of the environmental activists are not from Minnesota and do not contribute to the tax base. I hope you understand the great opportunity that Minnesota has to secure the future and protect the environment. Ray Yuzna

raybryan 14937

Do you really think that PolyMet will clean up the toxic waste generated by copper/nickel mining for the next 500 years. This is proposed for a very sensitive environment that if upset would destroy an entire _current_ industry for a half millennium - Tourism. Allowing the mining to proceed with such plans using current technology is short-sighted in the extreme and wasteful of valuable natural resources for the long-term future. Raymond C. Bryan

Rayma Cooley 52362

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rayma Cooley 2520 Hunt St Unit 1 Ames, IA 50014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Raymond Asomani-Boateng 39331

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Raymond Asomani-Boateng Urban And Regional Studies Ins Mankato, MN 56001 (150) 738-9503

Raymond Carlson 39770

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Raymond Carlson 337 W Sycamore St Sycamore, IL 60178-1412

Raymond George Salin 57197

I don't want to see any hazardous materials coming out of our ground, polluting our water, put the grave to rest. Raymond George Salin 9654 Zim Rd Zim, MN 55738

Raymond H Allard 42828

See attachment

Raymond Klosowski 41230

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Dear Governor Dayton, I urge you to provide your strongest support for the planned Poly Met mineral mining project. It will give Minnesota citizens a long term economic benefit with stable high paying jobs, increase the annual state revenue intake providing funding for critical infrastructure improvements, health care, and education while precluding adverse impacts to our environment. The results of the eight year long 50 million dollar environmental review and assessment indicate the projected Poly Met project can meet Minnesota's stringent environmental requirements. Sincerely, Ray Klosowski 3509 Maxwell Ave Duluth MN 55803 Sincerely, Raymond Klosowski 3509 Maxwell Ave Duluth, MN 55803-1940

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Raymond Nevison

16932

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Raymond Nuesch 40308

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Raymond Nuesch 2000 16th Street NW Washington, DC 20009 US

Raymond Olson 54820

See attachment

Raymond Shelerud 57199

I am truly worried about the after effects of sulfide mining. The length of the project does not warrant the lifetime of cleanup from the effects of this type of mining. Sulfide mining has never been proven to be safe for the environment. Until it has, I never will be for this project. Raymond Shelerud 6403 Nashua St Duluth, MN 55807

Rebecca & John Gaertner 31655

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I remember the taconite tailings from Silver Bay in Lake Superior when I was a child. It took years before Reserve Mining was disciplined. I don't think we can trust these out of state companies. We all know they will file bankruptcy as soon as they are required to be responsible for their environmental messes. Profit is all companies like this care about. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Rebecca and John Gaertner 4717 Dupont Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5323 (612) 822-5763

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Borrud

41618

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Rebecca Borrud Minneapolis, Minnesota

Rebecca Branham

16814

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Protect us from the mine. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rebecca Branham 2310 10th St S. Apt. 11 Moorhead, MN 56560

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Branham

50155

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Protect us from the mine. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Rebecca Branham 2310 10th St S. Apt. 11 Moorhead, MN 56560

Rebecca Burich and David Zins

42881

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Carlson

38709

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
FR: Rebecca Carlson, 7445 110th St E, Northfield MN 55057 RE: PolyMet SDEIS Response To whomever it may concern: Our family owns property and resides seasonally near Ely, Minnesota. We believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and that this destructive project must not proceed as currently proposed because of the 1) widespread and severe environmental damage inherent in the PolyMet project and 2) the failure of the SDEIS to include a cost/benefit analysis and specific provisions regarding amounts and sources of financial assurance. We believe the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate in the following areas: 1) Economic Impacts -The SDEIS contains no cost/benefit analysis of the PolyMet mine. - The SDEIS does not say whether wages paid to mine employees will stay in Minnesota or whether they will go primarily to transient employees who will spend only a fraction of their income in Minnesota. The SDEIS does not discuss the impact of the loss of jobs when the price of copper declines and mining becomes unprofitable, although it acknowledges that such job loss is inevitable: "Mining-related employment is volatile and fluctuates from year to year due to the market price of commodities being extracted." SDEIS, 4-325—4-326- The SDEIS fails to assess the cost of unemployment benefits and other social services, increased crime rates, and other societal costs associated with volatility in employment. - The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. - What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. 2) Permanent Water Pollution -PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. -Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. -The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. -The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. 3) Absence of Planning for Inevitable Accidents and Failures -The SDEIS fails to provide contingency plans for the kinds of failures and mishaps that routinely occur in mining operations. During operations, at least 6-2 million gallons of polluted water would need to be treated every day. Pipeline spills, accidental releases, failure of water collection and treatment infrastructure, and tailings basins failures are virtual certainties. And because the provisions regarding financial assurance are so plainly inadequate (see below), the SDEIS does not tell us how the costs of responding to such failures will be covered. -The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The Mine Plan Requires an Absurd and Unachievable Level of Monitoring and Maintenance for

Rebecca Cramer

10204

Thank you for providing this space to comment. From the information I have read, mining for copper and nickel so close to the boundary waters and other watersheds is not advisable. The risk of contaminating vital waters needed for the present and future generations of people and animals outweighs any short-term gain of employment. Secondly, it would behoove our federal and state governments to support industries which safely "mine" for these precious metals in the discarded equipment that has already been manufactured. We need a comprehensive solution to the waste and current mismanagement of our industries that allows valuable components to be put into landfills instead of recycled for reuse. Minnesotans must take care of the natural resources that grace our state: first and foremost is the water and the biodiversity of our Northern tier. Jobs will be created in the realm of ecotourism and sustainable use of our forest resources. That is the trend we must believe in and plan for. Respectfully,
Rebecca Cramer 3148 29th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55406

Rebecca E. Berg

42921

Erik Berg 1300 10th street S.E. St Cloud, MN 56304

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Ekmark 46475

Good afternoon, I am writing in support of the Polymet mining initiative. My belief is that the Polymet group has done extensive environmental research and has proven successfully that the techniques used and preventative measures they plan to use are going to help keep our waterways clean. The groups fighting Polymet are mostly people who do not have a vested interest in the success of this area. I personally want beautiful lakes and clean water, and as well, I know that mining keeps this area vital. Thank you, Rebecca Ekmark raekmark@gmail-com

rebecca jorgensen 34921

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest our great lakes are our greatest treasure. look around at the droughts, and the housing developments in the western states they want our water. do we want our lakes to end up looking like the river in west Virginia, or the lake and river in north/south Carolina. remember the tar sands spill in kalamazoo. well it is STILL polluting, and it needs to continue to be cleaned up. let's start protecting what is a great natural resource. Sincerely, rebecca jorgensen 6830 Apache Trl Westland, MI 48185-2802 (734) 748-3873

Rebecca Kemling 40189

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Rebecca Kemling PO Box 205 Ottertail, MN 56571-0205

Rebecca L Rom 42671

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Luxenberg

16305

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Rebecca Lystig

18246

R-E-B-E-C-C-A, L-Y-S-T-I-G. PolyMet's plan for an open-pit mine will directly destroy more than 900 acres of wetlands and threaten more than 10 square miles of additional wetlands with toxic contamination and drainage. No information is provided in the SDEIS about the amount and form of financial assurance damage deposit that PolyMet will be required to provide to cover cleanup costs extending over centuries. Abandoned mining sites across our nation are the single most costly environmental liabilities left to taxpayers. When funds are not available, waters, lands, wildlife and people in the area suffer toxic effects for generations. Instead of opening new mines which will cost taxpayers and the environment, we could greatly increase recycling of copper, nickel and other metals with less impact to the environment, reduced emissions of global-warming gases and provide greater potential for jobs. The US is presently recycling far less than half of the copper and nickel we discard every year.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Nash

39072

---Original Message--- From: RMNHOME@aol-com [mailto:RMNHOME@aol-com] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 7:47 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Rebecca Nash 4632 Columbus Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3528

Rebecca Otto

42929

Name and legal mailing address as required: Rebecca Otto State Auditor 525 Park St Suite 500 St Paul, MN 55113 Comment attached. Sincerely, Rebecca Otto State Auditor (651)296-2551 (651)296-4755 (fax) 525 Park St Suite 500 St Paul, MN 55103 Caution: This e-mail may contain CONFIDENTIAL information or information protected by state or federal law. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please do not read, distribute, or reproduce it (including any attachments). Please notify us immediately by return e-mail, and then delete it from your system. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Ratcliff

45646

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Glencore should be a responsible party for financial assurance in PolyMet's mine plan To [Decision Maker], The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Rebecca Ratcliff Sincerely, Dr Rebecca Ratcliff 1058 Hague Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-6519

Rebecca Rom

18375

Hi. I'm Rebecca Rom. My last name is spelled R-O-M. I'm from Ely, Minnesota. I'm a third-generation Slovenian from Ely. My grandfather was an iron ore miner. I want to talk about how the project, the PolyMet-NorthMet project, as described in the supplemental EIS violates Minnesota law. The provisions that it violates relate to perpetual treatment. Minnesota rules 6132.3200 does not allow perpetual treatment. It reads, "To receive a permit to mine, the permittee must be able to close the mine in such a way that it is stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrological impact and release of substances, and is maintenance free." The project features that require perpetual maintenance and monitoring are these: The hydrometallurgical tailings facility will contain highly reactive waste and must be isolated from the surrounding environment in perpetuity. The floatation tailings basin seek-and-to-capture system must operate at peak efficiency for at least 500 years. The category-one waste rock stockpile cap-and-see-to-capture system must operate at peak efficiency in perpetuity. The tailings basin and mine site reverse osmosis water treatment systems must operate for at least 500 years. The West Pit outlet structure must operate in perpetuity. Monitoring of water quality must occur at all receiving waters and groundwater points of compliance until the (inaudible) from mine areas meet water quality standards without treatment, which is over 200 years. The monitoring of the wetland vegetation must occur until the hydrology reaches a steady state, which is decades or more. And until (inaudible) from the project meets water quality standards without treatment, which is 500 years or more. The PolyMet SDEIS states that long-term treatment of wastewater is aided, which means the site will not be maintenance free at closure. This is over 500 years of treatment at the plant site and over 200 years of treatment at the mine site. (Inaudible) federal testimony before the US Senate committee on energy and national resources presented findings that the federal government spent at least \$2.6 billion to remediate hard rock mine sites from 1998 to 2007. In 2009 the US Environmental Protection Agency cost estimate for existing hard rock mine pollution cleanup was 20 to \$54 billion. In 2009 as part of the largest environmental bankruptcy case in history, the mining company was ordered to pay \$194 million in damages.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Scott-Rudnick 54665

See attachment

Rebecca Skouge 17034

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rebecca A. Skouge Bloomington, MN Rebecca Skouge 8620 3rd Ave S. 8620 3rd Ave S. Bloomington, MN 55420

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rebecca Skouge 50309

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rebecca A. Skouge Bloomington, MN Rebecca Skouge 8620 3rd Ave S. 8620 3rd Ave S. Bloomington, MN 55420

Rebecca Stoner 54837

See attachment

Rebecca Tollefson 43857

I am a 27 year old woman born and raised in Minnesota all of my life. Some of my earliest memories include camping. We used to go to the Untainted Beautiful Waters of the Boundary Waters and enjoy our summers. If I was ever thirsty I would stick my hand in the water and get a drink, just like the animals do. We did not purify our water in the 80's. My family always told me stories about how the animals live here naturally with no pollution and these are some of the cleanest fresh waters in the world. Time has passed and I have gotten older, but the Boundary Waters is as pristine as ever. There are times that I still drink the natural waters. After the mining starts would you drink the polluted water. Is filtering it going to be enough. How about the animals. Do they have the ability to filter their water before drinking. NO. I would challenge anyone after this starts to come and drink the water now. Its more common than not unfortunately that after mankind starts to mine, log and destruct the natural habitat that horrible catastrophic effects on Mother Nature and all of her inhabits. I would urge everyone to reconsider this proposal for all of the reasons. I hate having to just comment on one, I could comment on everyone. Save our forests and wetlands for generations to come. Rebecca Naomi Tollefson 3109 Utah Ave South StLouis Park, MN 55426 Sent from my iPad

Red Cliff Band 42974

Ms Fay, Please accept the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa's comments on the NorthMet SDEIS in the attachment as a PDF. The Red Cliff Band is a Chippewa tribe that is guaranteed the right to exercise our treaty rights with the ceded territory of 1854 where the proposed project is located. The tribe's mailing address is as follows: Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa 88385 Pike Rd, Hwy 13 Bayfield, WI 54814 Thank you and best regards, Anastasia Walhovd Tribal Mining Resource Specialist Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa 88385 Pike Rd, Hwy 13 Bayfield, WI 54814 Work: [HYPERLINK "mailto:715-779-3650"](mailto:715-779-3650) Cell: 715-292-1733 [awalhovd@redcliff-nsn.gov](mailto:715-779-3650)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Reed Heffelfinger 38840

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Reed Heffelfinger W 44th St Minneapolis, MN 55424-1025

Regan J Scuffy 54647

See attachment

Reginald Defoe 19511

Reginald Defoe R-E-G-I-N-A-L-D, D-E-F-O-E, 55 Morning Star Lane, Cloquet, Minnesota, 55720.Okay. I'm just -- how I'm kind of equating this is like to the Lower St. Louis Estuary and old Fond Du Lac, let's say, is where they used to have thousands of acres of wild rice stands and plants, and now you look at that area today, and it's just remnants of wild rice and a few plants here and there. And I remember when my folks used to tell me they used to harvest rice down there back in the '50s and '60s, and 1950s and 1960s, and now you go down there and look, and there's nothing there. So what happened is from industrialization and pollutions and over the years, and this is part of the watershed that extends up to the mining areas and PolyMet areas, and that's the headwaters up there, and everything down here degraded, and what we're going to do now is spend millions and millions of dollars to try to clean up that area in the Lower St. Louis River area. Lots of different agencies are in the process of cleaning up that area, get rid of all that pollution, all those contaminants that came down through that watershed. Now, what that makes me think is why would we further damage the area, the watershed, by opening up the sulfuric mining operations and to damage it any further when we're spending millions and millions of dollars on cleaning up an area that once used to be pristine with thousands and thousands of acres of wild rice. So to me, it doesn't make sense why you would further destruct a watershed and wildlife and that kind of stuff. And that's about it. Thank you.

Reid Carron 18316

My name is Reid Carron. I am from Ely, Minnesota. I'm married to a Slovenian. The SDEIS is wholly inadequate in a great number of ways to reflect the real environment and the economic cost of the proposed project. This comment is on focused on the inadequacy in the SDEIS with respect to certain socioeconomic considerations. The SDEIS does not attempt to correct the effects of the proposed exchange of Superior National Forest lands and of the destruction of wetlands with the protection provided to citizens by the Federal WEEKS Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, and the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act. (Inaudible) near the mine site project would destroy 913 acres of unique wetlands, plus many hundreds of acres of lands of high (inaudible), including (inaudible). These lands are currently owned by the US Forest Service in the Lake Superior Basin. Virtually all of the wetlands in mitigation in that site and basin are substantial distances from the habitat that would be fragmented and destroyed by the mine. The project indirectly affects thousands of acres of other wetlands in the Partridge and Embarrass River Watershed by pollution and changes in hydrology. The SDEIS fails to address any mitigation of a great majority of this wetlands exchange except to say that they have to be monitored after permitting and additional compensation may be required. The SDEIS admits that allowing private surface mining would be inconsistent with the US Forest Service legal mandate for acquiring and managing these lands. The SDEIS fails to address adequately the socioeconomic cost of the loss of intact contiguous existing habitat at the mine site or the relative value to non-contiguous lands to be acquired in exchange. The currently intact land exchange at the mine site has significant socioeconomic value for wildlife habitat, watershed protection. The SDEIS does not explain how the Forest Service could abandon its responsibilities to manage (inaudible) watershed protection. And there lies inflict harm upon the socioeconomic wellbeing of the citizens through the simple exchange that does not even pretend to provide replacement land in the Lake Superior Basin. Further, the SDEIS is inadequate because of its failure to acknowledge – the proposed project ignores basic rights to a clean environment guaranteed by Minnesota law. It acknowledges that the project will destroy or impair thousands of acres of land, pollute the water for at least hundreds of years. It will create other harmful environmental impacts such as pollution. The legislature declared in Section 116B4 of the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act that the state has a paramount concern for the protection of its air, water, land, and other natural resources from pollution, impairment, or destruction. The statute explicitly states economic considerations alone shall not constitute a defense to violations of the Environment Rights Act.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Reid Carron 29860

Comment letter attached. Reid Carron 3100 Hartley Point Road Ely, Minnesota 55731 cell 218-232-0622 resource://skype_ff_extension-at-jetpack/skype_ff_extension/data/call_skype_logo.png218-232-0622 landline 218-365-5399 resource://skype_ff_extension-at-jetpack/skype_ff_extension/data/call_skype_logo.png218-365-5399 Call Send SMS Add to Skype You'll need Skype CreditFree via Skype

42519

See attachment

42596

See attachment

Reid Larimore 40345

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Reid Larimore 2915 Reed Ave Cheyenne, WY 82001 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Reka Crohn

14680

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Remy Lee

42645

See attachment

Rena Rodgers

42917

To whom it may concern, Please find attached to this email my submission for the public comment period on the proposed PolyMet mining project for northern Minnesota. Best Regards, Rena Rodgers 1319 Franklin Ave SE Apt 1 Minneapolis MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rene Gelecinskyj

45342

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rene Gelecinskyj 2901 w 93rd st Bloomington, MN 55431

45343

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rene Gelecinskyj 2901 w 93rd st Bloomington, MN 55431

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Renee Aro

19907

To Minnesota's Department of Natural Resources, I was born and raised in Virginia, MN and have always loved the Iron Range. I am in tears when I see our wonderful small towns withering away. I want jobs, just as most of us do. However, I want quality and honorable investors in our area, not those who abuse the system. In my research, which is just the tip of an iceberg, I found the following: GLENCORE XSTRATA "While only few were paying attention to the price of aluminum, some important industry players such as Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase and Co and Glencore Xstrata, were allegedly inflating prices and disrupting supplies for the commodity. This is the central claim of HYPERLINK "<http://www.reuters-com/article/2013/08/07/lme-warehousing-idUSL6N0G82Q120130807>" a growing number of lawsuits, which state the named institutions conspired with the London Metal Exchange in hoarding aluminum and violating antitrust laws. The legal actions, brought by small aluminum manufacturers in the United States, include one filed Wednesday in Florida against Goldman, JP Morgan, the LME and Glencore Xstrata, as well as one against Goldman and the LME in Michigan." - etc, etc, (See article at: <http://www.mining-com/lawsuits-against-goldman-jpmorgan-glencore-xstrata-for-suspected-aluminum-price-manipulation-pile-up-57037/>) It is my understanding that Polymet has never operated a mine before so they have no track recoRd But Glencore's record is rather unsavory beginning with its association with MARC RICH "The Marc Rich Group History and company profile The Marc Rich Group is internationally active and engaged in the management of a diversified portfolio of financial market instruments and real estate projects. Its business includes direct investments in stocks, investment funds, currencies and the construction of residential, office and shop buildings. Recently, the Marc Rich Group is engaged and active in the international art market through MR Art Trading GmbH, Zug. In 1974, Marc Rich, together with his partners Pincus Green and Alec Hackel, founded the Marc Rich + Co AG (company limited by shares) in Zug, Switzerland, a commodity trading company which was renamed Marc Rich + Co Holding AG in 1987, while the commodity trading business continued to operate as Marc Rich + Co AG. In 1997, the Marc Rich + Co Holding AG was reorganised as a GmbH (limited partnership) which it remains to date. In 1993/94, Marc Rich sold his interest in the Marc Rich + Co AG to the company's senior traders. The company was renamed Glencore International after the sale. Glencore, the former Marc Rich + Co AG, also held a 53% interest in Südelektra Holding AG, which is today known as Xstrata. In 1996, Marc Rich returned to the commodity business arena by forming a smaller commodities trading group, which was sold to its management in 2003- Marc Rich, in close partnership with Denise Rich, Libby and Pincus Green and Val and Alec Hackel, founded The Rich Foundations. The Rich Foundations are made up of The Marc Rich Foundation for Education, Culture and Welfare, The Gabrielle Rich Leukemia Research Foundation and The Swiss Foundation for the Doron Prize. For over 20 years more than \$150'000'000 were allocated to approximately 4000 projects and individuals engaged in non-profit work in education, culture, social welfare and healthcare as well as in building up democracy and civil society." (See http://www.marcrich.ch/mrh_profile.html) "HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Marc_Rich" Marc Rich, a HYPERLINK "<http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Fugitive>" fugitive who had fled the US during his prosecution, was residing in Switzerland. Rich owed \$48 million in taxes and was charged with 51 counts of tax fraud, was pardoned of HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Tax_evasion" tax evasion. He was required to pay a \$100 million fine and waive any use of the pardon as a defense against any future civil charges that were filed against him in the same case. Critics complained that HYPERLI

42513

See attachment

Renee M Manning

3075

To Whom it May Concern; I am writing in support of PolyMet Mining and their current Minnesota project under review. I am strongly in support of environmental issues and fully support PolyMet. I have been closely following published information and know several people involved with the project. They are committed to the highest standards and working diligently to support and provide Minnesota with a clean and environmentally sound mine. They will produce needed metals and create hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. PolyMet is committed to utilizing the best available emission control devices possible on all their mobile mining equipment. I back this project 100% and believe in PolyMet to fulfill their promises while proving needed metals and job opportunities. Please issue PolyMet the needed permits to proceed. Sincerely, Renee Manning Renee Manning, RN, BSN Nurse Clinician * United Heart and Vascular Clinic * United Hospital, part of Allina Health Phone: 651-241-2963 * Pager: 612-510-8333 * Fax: 651-241-2980 * renee.manning@allina-com Mail Route 65500 * 225 Smith Ave N, Suite 400 * St Paul, MN 55102 This message contains information that is confidential and may be privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Renee Reece-Murray

39981

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Renee Reece-Murray 20343 Nightingale St NW Cedar, MN 55011-9377

Renee Rumler

41992

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Renee Rumler Owatonna, Minnesota

Renee Valois

21574

Mar 5, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Like all Minnesotans, I am concerned with protecting our clean water. PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota as described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) are problematic. The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to make a smart decision. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest-the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. A paltry twenty years of profit for that company could create hundreds of years of toxic runoff and water pollution. If you do the math, that does NOT make sense. I care about this state which I live in-unlike the PolyMet people. Please do not let them sacrifice our quality of life for their short-term gain. Reject the PolyMet mining proposal. Sincerely, Ms Renee Valois 2014 Cleveland Ave N Roseville, MN 55113-5309 (651) 631-0499

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rep David Hill

18082

Thank you very much, Mark. Tonight, I am here representing the views and opinions of the Iron Range Delegation of Legislators. The Iron Range Delegation of Legislators encompass virtually 100 percent representation of all ferrous and non-ferrous metals in the State of Minnesota, and I'm here to tell you that Representative Didovich, Representative Anzalc, Representative Melin, Representative Metsa, Senator Saxhaug, Senator Tomassoni, and Senator Bakk, and I all have a position that we are here and it is our job to do the very best that we can for you folks and the taxpayers of this entire state to add value to the natural resources that we have, whether they be ferrous and non-ferrous, wood, tourism, the water, the use of the water. That is our principal job and that's what we strive for every single day and every single year. We are confident, all of us, that this process will move forward based on data-driven outcomes and that the emotions of the project will be set aside so that those outcomes can prevail and lead this project either to happen or not to happen. So in short and in closing, first I'd like to thank the former members of the legislature that are here tonight; Rukavinas, and Begich and Senator Dicklich. I know that they feel similar if not exactly the same. But we are here tonight as a group to tell you people that we unilaterally and unequivocally support the development of non-ferrous minerals in Minnesota until such time it is proven by the data-driven outcomes that it cannot be done, and then we are unilaterally against it until such time that we can prove that it is feasible, environmentally and financially. That is our position. We've held that position the entire time. This project has gone on for nine years, and I hope that people can understand that, embrace that, and that we can move forward with this project. Thank you, very much.

Rep. Barb Yarusso

42916

From: Rep. Barb Yarusso 201 Bridge St Shoreview, MN 55126 My comments are contained in the attached PDF file, but also printed below: Comments and Questions Regarding the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) From: Representative Barb Yarusso rep.barb.yarusso@house.mn 1- From the point of view of a chemical engineer, the SDEIS does not adequately account for all of the material outputs of the project. Amounts consumed by the process are listed for a variety of process chemicals, but there is no description of where they will end up. They can't just disappear. Will they degrade (into what.). End up in the tailings, concentrate, sludge disposed of offsite, discharged water. 2- The assessment of the probability of a spill of potassium amyl xanthate (PAX) during transportation to the site is judged to be "moderate". According to the modeling estimate, there is approximately a 1/60 chance of a spill due to a highway accident over the 20 year working period of the mine. The consequences of such a spill of course depend on location. However, they may be significant, since PAX is highly flammable and produces hydrogen sulfide on contact with water. Are local communities prepared to handle these specific hazards. 3- Will there be residual PAX on the copper concentrate which is to be shipped out by rail. Will this cause an odor issue as it degrades and gives off hydrogen sulfide. 4- The bedrock under the tailings basin is assumed to be a "no flow boundary". What effect will the possible lowering of the pH in the basin over time due to the addition of acid-producing tailings be on this. Will it have any effect on whether small fissures grow, or on the integrity of the boundary between the bedrock and the bentonite barrier at the walls. 5- Is there any historical data or anecdotal information to indicate that well water quality in the area changed after the start of previous mining operations at the site. 6- Descriptions of the use of reverse osmosis to treat water for discharge focus on sulfate concentrations. Will the process also remove copper, nickel, and other heavy metals. 7- What is the potential environmental impact of concentrate spilled along the railway when it is shipped out for processing. The area between the plant and Lake Superior has several trout streams How close are the tracks to these or other streams or rivers, do tracks cross any of them, what would the cumulative impact of spills be on aquatic life. 8- Is there ever going to be a time when the potential of environmental harm from the tailings and other materials left behind will cease. The modeling did not address this question, but Minnesota law doesn't allow for perpetual harm. There should be modeling of the long term time evolution of the concentrations of components of interest 9- There is the hope (but not a guarantee) of development of a passive, biological system – is this to address sulfate issues. I can't see how it could help with heavy metals, because you can't make them go away. 10- Would it make more economic (and environmental) sense to use a system that increases rather than minimizes oxygen contact with the tailings in order to exhaust the potential for sulfate formation, while treating the water, to eliminate the indefinite treatment of polluted water at the site. 11- Is there any point along the Embarrass, Partridge, or St Louis Rivers where heavy metals would tend to precipitate (due to local chemistry) and accumulate. 12- What is the oldest facility that has a liner of the type to be used for the hydrometallurgic residue facility. What does the manufacturer say about the expected lifetime.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rep. Diane Loeffler

44962

I am writing in response to the request for public comments. 1) Not enough science and successful modeling has been presented to give confidence to the public on the scientific basis on which to assure sufficient protection of the waters of northern Minnesota. The limited availability of proven models supports a more cautious approach that requires demonstration sites and laboratory demonstrated sustainability. Why have small demonstration sites and implementation models of the proposed processes not been required as part of the establishment of a scientific analysis of the validity of the proposed protections. 2) There is insufficient sensitivity analysis of the groundwater modeling. Why weren't more sophisticated approaches used and required. 3) It is noted that exceedences on lead levels can be expected during times when there is a lot of natural runoff in addition to that created on site. Lead is one of the best documented pollutants and can result in lasting impacts in lowering human intelligence and having major other impacts on human and animal health. Why should exceedences on this known dangerous pollutant be in any way acceptable and why were these not flagged as unacceptable and in need of lasting prevention and mitigation. 4) The recent studies of wild rice impacts of the expected pollutants threatens a historic and cultural resource to the Native Americans and all residents of our state and a valueable source of food and habitat for key Minnesota species. Insufficient assessment of alternatives that would preserve, not mitigate this unique historic, cultural, diet, and habitat resource are noted and deserve specificity and the honoring of Treaty rights. Why has this area not been more sufficiently analyzed. 5) There is no demonstrated capacity for the state to develop and implement models of financial assurance that will adequately enable continuous monitoring and environmental response for many centuries. That greatly exceeds the time period that our country and its rules of laws have existed. No economic models that are accepted broadly within that field of science can establish confidence in predicting future costs and revenues over that period of time. Therefore acceptable risk levels cannot be determined and financial advance funding cannot be adequately planned for. What economists and economic research can support the assumptions for financial assurance. What legal structures for enforcement are needed at the federal, state, and international levels to enforce accountability over the next five centuries. Given that the company proposing the mine has international ownership, is US and MN law sufficient to enforce actions against that entity and or its successors. Should the "no action" alternative be adopted until such time as there is established scientific confidence that risks can be managed and funded within a time period of less than 75 years. 6) The Minnesota Constitution clearly limits the purposes and processes for long term obligations of the state. Can the need to maintain, monitor, and fund risk related activities for periods measured in centuries be defined as an ongoing financial obligation of the state. If so, under what authority other than specific, direct legislative act can authorize such longterm obligations and is that able to be delegated. How is that supported by recent Supreme Court rulings. 7) Minnesota has a long history of "pollutor pays" even for clean up of environmental risks that were not known or identified at the time of the polluting event or processes. How can that be enforced against pollution risks not identified or anticipated at this time. How will that added potential risk and obligation be accomodated in financial assurance. 8) What testing evidence is available that the proposed liners, membranes, and other containment and protection materials are sufficient to last through 500 or more centuries without deterioration, cracks,

Rep. Jean Wagenius

42901

I'm officially submitting these questions, from our February 10th meeting, for comment on the NorthMet PolyMet mine project. Jean Wagenius Jean Wagenius State Representative, District 63B 449 State Office Building 100 Rev. Dr Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. St Paul, MN 55155 (651) 296-4200 [HYPERLINK "mailto:rep.jean.wagenius@house.mn"](mailto:rep.jean.wagenius@house.mn) Please join me for "Second Saturday" Sept - May at 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m. Mayflower Church 35W and Diamond Lake Rd (come for a few minutes or stay for the whole meeting) Questions. Contact Nanette 651-296-5402 If you would like to receive my email updates please sign up here: <http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/members/join.asp.id=10690>

42977

In addition to my questions, I'm submitting these comments. Thank you, Jean Wagenius Jean Wagenius State Representative, District 63B 449 State Office Building 100 Rev. Dr Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. St Paul, MN 55155 (651) 296-4200 [HYPERLINK "mailto:rep.jean.wagenius@house.mn"](mailto:rep.jean.wagenius@house.mn) Please join me for "Second Saturday" Sept - May at 9:30 a.m. -11:30 a.m. Mayflower Church 35W and Diamond Lake Rd (come for a few minutes or stay for the whole meeting) Questions. Contact Nanette 651-296-5402 If you would like to receive my email updates please sign up here: <http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/members/join.asp.id=10690>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rep. Jim Swiderski 42886

Attention: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Email: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Dear Lisa, Attached please find the Statement by Congressman Richard M. Nolan 2447 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC 20515 202-225-6211 on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for The NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Proposed for portions of St Louis and Lake County, Minnesota Please confirm receipt and contact me with any questions. Jim Jim Swiderski Legislative Director US Representative Rick Nolan 2447 Rayburn HOB Washington, DC 20515 HYPERLINK "mailto:Jim.swiderski@mail.house-gov"Jim.swiderski@mail.house-gov 202-225-6211

Rep. Phyllis Kahn 37929

Please find my comments attached.

Rev. Canon John Rettger 54146

NO POLYMET. TOO DANGEROUS LONG TERM [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Rev. Charles Flynn 57341

My name is Father Charlie Flynn. I am the priest in Gilbert and Eveleth. And I suppose one thing that I would like to do in a gathering like this is to get a big collection, but I'm not going to do that. In the last year I have presided over 55 funerals and seven baptisms. The range is dying. The people are dying. Its population has been like that. And I would like to have something like PolyMet come in that could possibly reverse that and resuscitate our communities that are dying. So, hopefully, I am fully in support of PolyMet and providing jobs to our dying communities. I looked up the environmental review statement. It seems to be very much in accord with preserving God's creation and making sure that nothing bad happens to it. There seems like there are more rules out there than our church has rules and they have more power out there than the Inquisition ever had, so basically, the whole thing seems like it is going to preserve our clean water, preserve our environment and keep everything the way it should be. So, again, I have no fears that that will happen because the long arm of the law is out there. And I am fully in support of clean water, as well as PolyMet. So, I believe that's going to happen. Good luck with PolyMet. I hope it happens. Okay? Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rev. Myo-O Habermas-Scher

41752

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Rev. Wendy Jerome

51615

Dec 22, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The public may be easily misled into welcoming sulfide mining into the state, since we have a long history with iron ore mining and taconite. However, sulfide ore mining will change the face of northern Minnesota forever. Our watersheds are huge porous underground resources that sustain a world-celebrated wilderness. 100% of sulfide mines leak toxic carcinogens and sulfuric acid. The ancient Greek and Roman mines around the Mediterranean are still leaking today. We can count on the death of aquatic life and the terrestrial life - including human beings - dependent on it, if sulfide mining is allowed in Minnesota. Some think that sulfide mining would bring jobs to MN. On the contrary, it would bring a few hundred part time and full time jobs, that would be intermittent, given world ore prices. The mining would last 20 years. Minnesota would lose a slowly, but steadily growing recreation economy - and wilderness that is a world treasure for the world. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Rev. Wendy Jerome 37 Upton Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55405-1943

Alphabetical by sender's first name

RH Smith

40644

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, You know all the good scientific and health reasons for rejecting the PolyMet Mining project. They're all listed below. I just have one question: Do you want a 500 yr legacy of sulfide pollution of northeastern Minnesota and Lake Superior TO BE YOUR LEGACY. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessmen

Rhoda Drake

38447

I strongly oppose the Polymet Mining Project in Northern Minnesota. The potential pollution problems and destruction of the environment are my main concerns. The clean water and natural environment should be protected. Please do not permit the Polymet project. Thank you for your consideration. Rhoda Drake 20235 See Gull Rd Brainerd, MN 56401

Rhonda Baack

54669

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rhonwen Tas

39715

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to provide a reasonable range of probabilities for liner leakage at the hydrometallurgical waste dump, rather than just assuming zero leaks forever. The SDEIS should also disclose the volume and level of contamination of this permanent, highly toxic waste facility. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rhonwen Tas 4896 kent drive shoreview, MN 55126

Ri Zoldak

42473

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Ri Zoldak 3339 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3528

Rich

38360

To whom it may concern,I'd like to share my support for Polymet and to tell you that they are committed to keeping a clean,safe operation that will employ thousands to begin with and hundreds for a long,long time. Please grant Polymet the permits that they're requesting. Myself,family and friends all want to work for Polymet or a vendor/supplier/ contractor of Polymet. Thank you Richard Wright 4906 hwy 100 Aurora,MN 55705 218-229-2249 218-290-5910 Fatfrank@rocketmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rich Femling

39263

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Rich Femling 1946 Tatum St Saint Paul, MN 55113-5442 (651) 647-1860

Rich Grover

21877

HYPERLINK "mailto:waterfly23@gmail-com"waterfly23@gmail-com rich grover 52 minnesota St rochester, n.y. 14609 On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 12:14 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Rich Libbey

43026

I would like to submit the attached study of using FLY ASH from coal fired power plants in closing mines with acid mine run off as part of the Polymet mine EIS review. The study analyses the effectiveness of using coal fired power plant fly ash in preventing acid mine run off. Minnesota Power land fills 100% of its millions of tons of fly ash in their ash ponds. THE EIS FAILS TO CONSIDER THE USE OF FLY ASH AS A SOLUTION TO POTENTIAL ACID MINE DRAINAGE AND USE AS A MINE CAP CLOSURE ALTERNATIVE AND US AS A NEUTRALIZING AGENT IN THE MINE PIT. Richard Libbey—18603 Hale Lake Drive—Grand Rapids MN. 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rich Libbey

44953

I am commenting as an individual saying the only option is zero treatment after closure. If this is not possible then no mine should be permitted. Rather than refilling the pit with sulfate laden crushed waste rock like mixing a martini in a glass with class 2-4 ore piles high is sulfur to instead completely enclose the stock pile with a bottom liner and impervious overlay of geomembrane and concrete plus soil overlay --. The EIS needs to consider the use of fly ash from Minnesota Power's electric power plants which is high in PH and now put in tailings basins to be mixed with the concrete mixture. If we can keep the sulfides from air and water it might work. The runoff during stockpiling before mine closure would have to be treated. --- If the Polymet mine can't develop a plan with zero discharge after closure then leave the ore body in the ground for future generations. ---I question the ground water migration figures and suggest test wells be drilled and pumping from the fracture zones to measure the ground water movements and fracture zones. This will give a more accurate basis to determine ground water migration. -- What is the predicted out flow of the mine pit after closure and the water quality with and without refilling it with waste rock. --I worked for Minnesota Power for 25 years and was a control room operator at Cohasset's Boswell Coal Fired plant . We are the second largest power company in the state behind Excel. We recently installed a reverse osmosis system to treat well water similar to what Polymet plans to use for water treatment for as long as necessary. It is a high maintenance system computer controlled with pumps constantly running and filters to be changed once a week. The Polymet water treatment plant would have to be manned 24 hours a day with at least 4 full time employees if one person is on per shift plus fill in for the weekend coverage plus vacation coverage plus needed maintenance personnel. One of the most common alarms I got in the control room was the 'Reverse Osmosis System Trouble alarm'. A plant employee would be dispatched to attempt to correct the reverse osmosis problem. I'm not sure how long these can run before they wear out and become obsolete and require complete replacement. Also a back up power supply is necessary and the electric grid may have to remain intact for 200 plus years. The contaminates that are removed from the water have to be disposed of somewhere. How is Polymet going to handle the dirty contaminates that are removed from the water. Also I would suggest at least 500 million guaranteed up front bond tied to the consumer price index. The labor expense alone needs to be calculated. I would estimate at least \$250,000 per year in operator wages. --**DEMONSTRATION MINE TO PROVE SAFE MINING AND SUCCESSFUL CLOSURE—NO MORE MINES SHALL BE PERMITTED UNTIL ONE MINE CAN OPERATE AND PROVE NO DISCHARGE OF POLLUTANTS AFTER CLOSURE**—If the EIS predicts mining can be done with no negative environmental affects only one mine be permitted until successful closure can be demonstrated for a demonstration mine. Prove it can be done before the floodgates open. - Also under environmental law related actions and cumulative affects are to be considered. The draft EIS does not consider the total impacts of possible future mines in the Duluth complex that is a certainty if Polymet is approved. - I would also suggest that we pass a law similar to Wisconsin's that requires citing a similar mine that has operated at least 10 years and has showed successful closure for ten years any where in the world before applying for a permit to mine. No applicants have been able to demonstrate this to date in Wisconsin. Respectfully submitted-Richard Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive-Grand Rapids MN 55744

45000

Information on using waste fly ash [CCP'S] in mine closures. This should be considered in the Polymet EIS. The EIS is incomplete without considering all alternatives. Extensive research conducted by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) indicate that the placement of coal combustion by-products (CCP'S) on the mine site usually result in a beneficial impact to human health and the environment when used to mitigate other potential mining hazards. This activity can also improve the economics of mining when used as a non-toxic fill within the spoil area prior to grading and final reclamation. Current beneficial mining related CCP applications are as follows: An alkaline seal or fill material to contain acid forming materials and prevent the formation of acid mine drainage. An agricultural supplement to create artificial soil on abandoned mine lands where native soils are not available. A flowable fill that seals and stabilizes abandoned underground mines to prevent subsidence and the production of acid mine drainage. A construction material for dams where such materials are needed to create a compact and durable base. A non-toxic fill material for final pits within the spoil area to reduce reclamation cost
Richard Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive-Grand Rapids MN-55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rich Libbey

45061

I Feel the SDEIS is inadequate because it does not analyze a ZERO discharge upon closure option. The current option of indefinite treatment by Reverse Osmosis is totally unacceptable. The only way this mine can be permitted responsibly is a NO ACTIVE TREATMENT OPTION. I propose placing the waste rock in class 2-4 be placed on an impervious bottom liner with a collection system in case of failure. Plus totally encapsulating the top of the waste pile with another impervious layer rather than back filling it in the East pit. The composition of the protective cover should consider the use of Minnesota Power's FLY ASH that has a high PH and when combined with Calcium Carbonate or Portland cement forms an impervious solid barrier. The EIS should also consider using Minnesota Powers fly ash as a neutralizing agent either on the waste rock pile or adding it to the mine pit water. It has a PH of 10-12 but contains trace amounts of heavy metals. Fly ash has been used to successfully close coal mines and has been shown to neutralize the acid mine runoff. The fly ash is currently placed in an ash pond . To prevent acid mine drainage the pile has to avoid exposure to oxygen and water in combination. THE SDEIS SHOULD ANALYZE THE FEASIBILITY OF TOTALLY ISOLATING THE SULFATE BEARING WASTE FROM AIR AND WATER. IT DOES NOT DO THIS AND IS THEREFOR INADEQUATE. A concrete and fly ash mixture could be used in conjunction with a geomembrane and a top cover of native soils with vegetation. The EIS should consider a concrete-fly ash cover of sufficient thickness to prevent water in filtration. If the Russians can entomb the highly radioactive Chernobyl site we should be able to encase a pile of waste rock. The soil layer would have to be of sufficient depth to prevent the penetration by mature tree roots. The cost of such a system would be high up front but when compared to long term maintenance as proposed for water treatment and vegetative removal could be feasible a long term solution. This should be analyzed as an alternative in the final EIS. The proposed action of filling the East pit with the sulfate bearing waste rock is a recipe for disaster. It is like putting crushed ice in a martini glass. The surface area of the rock mixed with oxygen rich water will produce acid and sulfate runoff. THE FINAL EIS NEEDS TO PREDICT THE WATER QUALITY OF THE EAST PIT WHEN FILLED WITH WASTE ROCK AND WHAT IT WOULD BE WITHOUT THE WASTE ROCK BACK FILLED INTO IT. THE FINAL EIS NEEDS TO DETERMINE IF THE PIT WILL OVERFLOW IN PERPETUITY AS THE CANISTEO IRON MINE ON THE NORTH SIDE OF BOVEY IS DOING AND COSTING TAX PAYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO CONTROL EVEN THOUGH THE WATER IS SOME OF THE HIGHEST QUALITY IN THE STATE. IF THE POLYMET MINE OVERFLOWS WITH TOXIC RUNOFF THE PROBLEM WILL BE UNMANAGEABLE. Thank You for this opportunity to comment-First the environment-Second jobs and business profits. A life long Ranger. Richard Libbey - 18603 Hale Lake Drive - Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744

52238

Hi I sent 4 additional comments yesterday and today on Polymet and was only noticed of receipt of one of them at 4:33 Pm today. Did you receive my earlier comments. My "sent " email box shows they were sent. Thanks Richard Libbey 18603 Hale Lake Drive- Grand Rapids Mn-55744 From: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 4:33 PM To: HYPERLINK "mailto:rllibbey@mchsi-com"Richard Libbey Subject: RE: Please consider alternatives like underground mining in the PolyMet mine plan Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rich Sill 43686

Five years ago I visited the former LTV site and toured the mine area to learn more about Polymet,s plans. I was impressed with their presentation and felt the local people involved were sincere in their belief that no environmental damage would occur because of the operation. Upon returning home I purchased 100 shares of Polymet stock. I acquired the stock for two reasons. First, I feel strongly that if we, as Americans, are going to continue to demand gold, copper, platinum, paladium, etc we need to be responsible for mining those minerals here and be willing to take ownership of the problems associated with that mining. It seemed unethical to throw our demand on other counties, many of which do not have adequate environmental or labor laws to protect either their land or their people. Secondly, since I felt I a personal responsibility I wanted to make sure if my opinion changed I would be able to have a say, even though it would be a limited one, in how the company was run and have an avenue for expression. After reviewing the SDEIS I am becoming increasingly concerned about the mines effect on wild rice. The latest report shows the 10 parts per million limit as probably a sensible amount of sulfite in the water. I am seriously concerned that their will be an aggressive action by certain parties to increase that greatly (in some reported cases to as much as thousands of parts). This is a vary troubling development. Wild rice is a sacred grain to the Ojibway people of this area and is protected by treaty. If the permit is granted I would strongly feel very strong ongoing monitoring be required. Wild rice is a valuable resource in itself and should not be sacrificed in order to extract other resources such as copper. Lastly, though this is not so much an environmental concern, I am deeply troubled by what I am currently hearing regarding the fact that nearly all the copper is scheduled for transport to China. I supported the mine originally because I believed we would be using these minerals primarily for domestic use.

Rich Sill French River, MN 218 525-6458 Sent from my iPad

Rich Staffon 42681

See attachment

Richard & Carol Colburn 42764

See attachment

Richard & Justine Kingham 40204

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Minnesota is too fragile yet important a natural resource to threaten with this. Sincerely, Richard and Justine Kingham 4821 Dexter St NW Washington, DC 20007-1018

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Adams 40844

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Richard Adams 2257 Gibbs Rd Traverse City, MI 49696-8056 (231) 421-8275

Richard Amey 39989

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Amey 710 14th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-1595 (612) 304-8315

Richard and Katherine Collman 636

Dear Lisa Fay, In a Dec. 5 letter, opinions are sought, so here is mine. What price wilderness. What price our nation's great parks. What price pollution in our lovely northern waters. What price put on the short term vision for copper and nickel for world computers only to ruin some waters and woods in the next 100-500 years. We can put a price on short terms needs and suffer in the generations to come. What will the fourth generation from us think of our decision now. Will they bless us or curse us. Will we sell our souls for short term profit. It was done with the buffalo. It was done with the white pine. I cannot believe it will again be done with minerals under the earth in spite of promises of mining companies to clean up their acts against the environment. Fracking be damned if that is even possible.. To quote Mark Twain (.) "A mine is just a hole in the ground with a liar standing next to it." When will we wake up. Thank you, someone, for listening. I have never yet heard back from DNR on any issue I have written them about, but I did want to register my opinion. I grew up just west of Duluth. Rev. Richard F. Collman 15 Fareway Drive Northfield, MN 55057 507-645-1357

richard anderson 41170

Please do not permit PolyMet to proceed with the proposed project of sulfide mining. I strongly believe that preserving our natural resources, including uncontaminated water, is more important than temporary financial gain. Respectfully submitted, Richard A. Anderson 6880 East Highway 61 PO Box 215 Grand Portage, MN 55605

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Arne

16226

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Bergman

9951

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Richard Bergman 317 Valley Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616

18705

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Richard Bergman 317 Valley Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Bergman

50780

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Richard Bergman 317 Valley Rd Two Harbors, MN 55616

Richard Bradford

6686

While I understand the passion of those that are focused on environmental issues, I have a difficult time accepting this narrow perspective. I would really like to put a box in front of the hearing sites suggesting that those who are absolutely opposed to the project deposit their computers, cellphones, car keys, medical devices, etc into the box. Anyone that would do that may not have my agreement, but they would have my respect. For those that don't use the box, you have to assume that mining for materials for these products is ok as long as it is done in some other country. Is it fair though to the folks in these other countries if there is really no safe way to do this mining. I don't see how you can have it both ways. We need what Polymet will mine and this mining can not be done more safely in any other part of the world. I believe that the review process is as complete as it can possibly be. Let's get the project moving. Richard Bradford, 315 Dorchester Drive, Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Brainerd

16171

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Richard C Staffon

42682

See attachment

Richard Carlson

39463

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Carlson 12521 74th Ave N Maple Grove, MN 55369-5282

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Carlson

40213

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Richard Carlson 12521 74th Ave N Maple Grove, MN 55369-5282

richard carothers

10

This project is not worth the cost of our sacred forest and waters.I'm an outdoorsman along with my family.We say no to the mine.The jobs are not there now so what's the difference.To big of a gamble . Sent from my iPad

Richard Cooter

54659

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Daly

16240

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Decoster

14900

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Flesvig

18067

My name is Richard Flesvig, F-L-E-S-V-I-G. I'm a resident of Eagle's Nest Township near Ely. I'm here to express my strong opposition to the acceptance of the SDEIS. I'm here because the law requires me to speak out. According to section 116B.01 of the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, the legislature finds and declares that each person is entitled by right to the protection, preservation, and enhancement of air, water, land, and other natural resources located within the state; and that each person has the responsibility to contribute to the protection, preservation, and enhancement thereof. The proposed SDEIS must be rejected because it is significantly flawed in many sections. I will briefly speak to a few of these flaws. By express admission in the SDEIS significant water pollution will last for 200, 500 or longer in terms of years; and will require perpetual water treatment. Not all of the polluted water will be treated. Respective to perpetual environmental contamination. The 90 percent capture rate of polluted water bears no scientific proof or substantiation. So the SDEIS must be rejected. Again, according to section 116D.04, subsection 6 of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act states, "No state action significantly affecting the quality of the environment should be allowed nor shall any permit for natural resource management and development be granted where such action or permit has caused or is likely to cause pollution, impairment or destruction of the air, water, land, or other natural resources located within the state so long as there is a feasible and prudent alternative consistent with the reasonable requirements of the public, health, safety, and welfare. And the state's paramount concern for the protection of it's air, water, land, and other natural resources from pollution, impairment, or destruction. Economic considerations alone shall not justify such conduct." No such conduct is provided – no such alternative is provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS indicates that the details of the financial assurances required to sustain a 200- or 500-year period will not be disclosed until the permitting process commences. This is unfortunate as I seriously question how anyone can properly calculate the staggering dollar amount let alone provide a financial assurance for this long term of a period. Based on these flaws on the SDEIS must be rejected. Thank you.

54478

See attachment

Richard Frase

39695

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining must be banned in Minnesota until it can be proven safe. And it has not been. This type of mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Frase 2831 James Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-2158 (612) 872-8559

Richard Fryberger

57257

I have to ask myself what do I value the most – and our fresh water resources are at best endangered. Iron mining ok – sulfide copper extraction no – please don't allow this to happen here. Thank you. Richard Fryberger 3399 Riley Road Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Fuller

7673

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Lisa Fay and others interested in the PolyMet SDEIS The PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Richard Fuller 1081 Laurel Ave St Paul, MN 55104

15272

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are threatened, endangered or of significance to tribes. •The SDEIS fails to study cumulative adverse impacts on moose of the PolyMet project and other activities that destroy habitat and increase global climate change. •The SDEIS fails to provide a cumulative analysis of impacts to clean water, plants and mammals that are significant to tribes and protected under treaties, throughout the tribal Ceded Territories in the Lake Superior Basin. In summary, please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine and Land Exchange as destructive to the public interest and harmful to tribal rights, clean water, vital habitats and the health of future generations. Sincerely Richard Fuller 1081 Laurel Ave St Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Fuller

51102

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights:

- Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines.
- Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes.
- Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected:
- The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands.
- The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense.
- The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx, moose, and other species that are threatened, endangered or of significance to tribes.
- The SDEIS fails to study cumulative adverse impacts on moose of the PolyMet project and other activities that destroy habitat and increase global climate change.
- The SDEIS fails to provide a cumulative analysis of impacts to clean water, plants and mammals that are significant to tribes and protected under treaties, throughout the tribal Ceded Territories in the Lake Superior Basin.

In summary, please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine and Land Exchange as destructive to the public interest and harmful to tribal rights, clean water, vital habitats and the health of future generations. Sincerely Richard Fuller 1081 Laurel Ave St Paul, MN 55104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Gravrok 18940

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Richard Gravrok 2925 Monterey Ave Apt. 102 St Louis Park, MN 55416 952-926-6655

Richard H Hudelson 54892

See attachment

Richard Harris 54643

See attachment

Richard Henke 7161

I am writing today in support of the Polymet Mining proposal for Northeast Minnesota. There is no question that this area is in need of the jobs this mine will create and support in the surrounding communities. It appears the company has addressed the environmental concerns with this recent Environmental Impact Statement and has reasonable plans in place to address these concerns. Having visited a number of copper mining areas around the world both during mining and smelting periods and after, I am convinced that the industry has come a long way in addressing environmental damage it caused and now is better prepared to minimize such damage from newer operations such as Polymet is proposing. I grew up in Virginia, MN and still enjoy visiting the North Shore of Lake Superior and the boundary waters lakes every year. I certainly do not want the quality of my visits affected and I do not think they will be by this project. This review process has gone on long enough. It is time to move ahead and provide this needed economic boost to Minnesota. Dick Henke 1077 Sibley Memorial Hwy #607 Lilydale, MN 55118

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Hjort

16217

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

39531

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Hjort 9506 270th St Chisago City, MN 55013-7315 (651) 257-2553

Richard K Newkomet

57207

Only thing this is going to benefit is the politician's pocket books. This mining is going to pollute the land and waters so my grandkids will not enjoy what I have. And when they are done making their millions of dollars they will pull out and leave the taxpayers to clean their mess up. Just like Duluth's steel plant cleanup and cement plant cleanup. Gregory N. Rautell 5557 N. Cloquet Rd Duluth, MN 55810

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Lee Hallfrisch 54570

I would not trust these high [illegible] money people as far as I could throw anyone of them Money is the only motive for them to be allowed to destroy parts of our north country for years to come. Send them packing down the road to destroy some other area.

Richard Lutes 33843

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Concerning the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement - I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST Sincerely, Richard Lutes 23670 McAllister St Southfield, MI 48033-2962

Richard Mammel 1091

Thanks instead to you folks . You are a splendid crew. It is simply outrageous to find that PolyMet, or any industry, can manage to worm its way as far as it has into mutilating this state's environmental values and policies, to actually be considered to exploit all the citizens of this state for the financial gain of a very few. Rick Mammel 1209 Birch Hill Drive Albert Lea, MN 56007 Ph: 507-377-5046 On Mon, Dec 9, 2013 at 4:25 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

4869

Thanks so very much for the good work you folks are doing on behalf of all citizenry not only of the U. S. but of the entire planet It seems to many of us that as Minnesotans voted for the Water Legacy Act only about five years ago that having this PolyMet issue pop up is a total contradiction as well as violation of policy, good sense, and ethics as well. Rick Mammel 1209 Birch Hill Drive Albert Lea, MN 56007 On Fri, Jan 10, 2014 at 7:52 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Mammel

39079

---Original Message--- From: mudman0007@gmail-com [mailto:mudman0007@gmail-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 8:05 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Richard Mammel 1209 Birch Hill Dr Albert Lea, MN 56007-1802

57672

Thanks so very much for the good work you folks are doing on behalf of all citizenry not only of the U. S. but of the entire planet It seems to many of us that as Minnesotans voted for the Water Legacy Act only about five years ago that having this PolyMet issue pop up is a total contradiction as well as violation of policy, good sense, and ethics as well. Rick Mammel 1209 Birch Hill Drive Albert Lea, MN 56007 On Fri, Jan 10, 2014 at 7:52 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Richard Martin

42940

Please include the attached letter as part of the decision on the Polymet proposed mining project. Thank you, Richard Martin

Richard McGehee

3617

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is a unique wilderness treasure. My family enjoys camping trips there every summer. Please do not allow the pollution inevitably produced by these dirty mines. Please reject the proposed PolyMet project. Richard McGehee 77 Mid Oaks Lane Roseville, MN 55113

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Morrison 44360

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MNDR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit I am writing to request an extension for further review of the Polymet Plan for sulfide mining adjacent to the Boundary Waters area of Minnesota. I am concerned because of a decades-long personal association with the BWCA of Minnesota and also because of my concern about the long-term potential public financial obligation for remediation of damage to the BWCA. I am urging an extension of the time for public review of the Polymet sulfide mining plan for the following reasons: 1) Allow time to review and correct the misleading statements about drainage from the 100 mile swamp. It is clear from expert geological review that the swamp drains in part via Langley Creek into the BWCA. This is a fact which Polymet has omitted from its plan. Mining wastes, which will certainly flow into the 100 Mile Swamp will therefore ultimately flow at least in part, into the BWCA. 2) Provide time to plan and execute, before operations begin, water flowage tests within and out of the 100 Mile swamp. These would presumably include both water volume flow rates at appropriate times and also potential contaminant migration rates. 3) Provide for a secure funding source in the event that remediation is found to be necessary at some future time. I do not have financial expertise, but it seems that this should be in the form of bonding rather than dependence on a corporate balance sheet subject to the vagaries of a bankruptcy court. This remediation, if ever needed, should not become a public expense. Sincerely, Richard D. Morrison N7120, County Rd F Menomonie, WI 54751

Richard Morse 44542

To whom it may concern, I am vehemently opposed to the Polymet mine project. I fear that my beloved BWCAW will be forever spoiled for short term profits. I moved to Minnesota in 1974, immediately after college. My primary reason for selecting the local job over a job in a different area was Northern Minnesota. I currently have a cabin in the Ely area on Burntside Lake. Not enough emphasis has been given to the fact that this mine is not only putting the jobs of the tourism area at risk, but many, many people like me would not relocate here if the environment is spoiled. I enjoy a BWCAW trip every year and if that is taken away because of pollution I will relocate to an area that values pristine wilderness more than the State of Minnesota. I know the lure of jobs and economic prosperity is great. If you decide to proceed with this mine, my advice is this. Have Polymet run their mine for 1 year and then monitor the effects on the environment for 5 or 10 years. Let's face it, those precious metals are not going anywhere and they also become more valuable the longer they stay put. This will test out the theory that Polymet can mine the sulfide laden rock without polluting the valuable waters of Minnesota. Trust, but verify. Please, please do not trust the mining industry. Many broken promises have been made. Are you prepared for the brain drain that would occur if the environment is polluted. Thanks. Rich Morse 1405 29th Ave NW New Brighton, MN 55112

Richard Newmark 42815

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Olson

19119

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Richard Olson 45 University Ave SE Unit 610 Minneapolis, MN 55414 612 331-9798

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Olson

39154

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

42486

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Richard Olson 45 University Ave SE Unit 610 Minneapolis, MN 55414-1196 (612) 331-9798

Richard O'Neil

38756

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Is there no part of our environment and heritage that is sacred to you, your children, and grandchildren. Sincerely, Mr Richard O'Neil 3530 Rustic Pl Shoreview, MN 55126-3018 (651) 481-1591

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Pierce

32893

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. With the midwest poisoning their water supplies with herbicides, pesticides and other chemicals. Other states having water supplies contaminated from fracking or having water supplies rationed due to drought and climate change disrupting weather patterns throughout the world, plus human population of earth near 8 billion, it is no longer prudent to endanger our GREAT LAKES with further pollution. I will remember your decisions and party affiliation in future elections. Sincerely, Richard Pierce
1060 Georgina Dr Ypsilanti, MI 48198-6312

Richard R Lund

57264

Is it worth it?? Would it be economically more feasible to subsidize mine workers (unemployed) than to pay for environmental cleanup for 100 years? With residual damage really beyond restoration. Richard R. Lund 8104 Highwood Dr, G121 Bloomington, MN 55438

Richard Spyhalski

41787

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Staffon

18347

My name is Rich Staffon. I am a resident of Cloquet, Minnesota. I lived in -- it is Rich, R-I-C-H, Staffon, S-T-A-F-F-O-N. I have lived here in northeastern Minnesota most of my life. I grew up hunting, fishing, camping and canoeing in the beautiful forest here in our northeastern part of our state. These comments reflect my personal view and I think it is important that the people of Minnesota have the opportunity to comment on the PolyMet sulfide ore mine project because the land on which this mine will be built is our land, the mine's wealth and the earth beneath is our mineral wealth, and the forest, fish and wildlife and waters of this land are owned by us, the people of Minnesota. We have the right to expect the federal and state natural resources agencies that we fund that they will, with our sacred trust, preserve, protect and wisely use these resources. This mining proposal I believe does not live up to this sacred trust. It will destroy at least three square miles of high-quality sufficient wildlife habitat, including forests, wetlands and streams. This habitat would cost several million dollars if you went out and tried to buy it in the open market today. And the project may impact a much larger area of land. This project will increase mercury and water pollution in the St. Louis River Watershed, which is already impaired by these pollutants. This has serious implications for human health, especially fetal development (phonetic) in northeastern Minnesota, for people who eat fish, and it will also impact wild rice. And finally, it will leave a legacy of polluting the soil and water in the St. Louis River Watershed that will need to be treated at great costs for possibly hundreds of years. Millions of dollars have been spent to clean up the legacy of industrial pollution that was left right here in the lower St. Louis River several years ago. Much progress has been made, but yet much work is left to be done to clean up this mess. Have we learned so little, that now we are willing to create the same problem in the upper regions of this watershed? I am not opposed to mining, but I am opposed to an irresponsible mining project that destroys too much land, leaves us with a long-term legacy of pollution and increases the enforcement nightmare for our public agencies. These agencies are unlikely to have the ability to monitor and to require the mining companies to actually do what they promised. Let's leave these minerals in the ground for now. They are like money in the bank and they will only grow in value over time. We need to learn how to mine them responsibly. Thank you.

richard taylor

39145

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr richard taylor 1619 E 6th St Duluth, MN 55812-1210 (218) 428-8233

Richard W. Swanson

47025

I stand with the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy and the Mining Truth folks in opposition to allowing the permitting process to go forward, for all of the reasons stated by those entities. We simply cannot afford to risk our environment for "progress and jobs." Those two elements cannot be allowed to drive everything and outweigh serious concerns about environmental and health dangers. If there is any doubt, the doubts must be resolved in favor of the environment and health. There certainly have been doubts raised in the EIS and subsequent comments. Please do not sweep those doubts aside in favor of economic gain or the technical "needs" of our modern lifestyle. Demand more. Thank you for listening. Richard W. Swanson PO Box 508 Grand Marais, MN 55604-0508 h(218) 387-1862 w(218) 387 2902 cell(218) 370-1119 _____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 9533 (20140312) _____ The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus. <http://www.eset-com>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Watson

3687

Dec 20, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There could not be a worse time in our countries history to even contemplate putting sulfide ore mining in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota. We are just beginning to understand how badly we have fragmented the forest here, how impaired our waters are already, and how even iron mining has degraded the health of citizens in this region. Our efforts should be put to cleaning up what we have already mucked up and not trying to determine just how much more pollution we can tolerate. This is the worst type of mining at the worst possible time in our history. The myth of "strong regulations" in Minnesota must be scientifically evaluated, mining company variances denied, and corporate polluters held totally accountable before we embark on further pollution of this region. I strongly suggest we need to hold off on sulfide ore mining in this region until we have a much better plan in place than offered by Polymet. Let's begin to create a living zone in N.E. Minnesota rather than another dead zone. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Watson 114 E Boundary St Ely, MN 55731-1331 (218) 365-5511

44623

<http://beforeitsnews-com/environment/2014/03/polymet-environmental-impact-statement-has-incorrect-maps-2495246-html> A website that provides more detailed information about the mapping issue at [HYPERLINK "http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.bwcasulfideminig-org/"](http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.bwcasulfideminig-org/) www.bwcasulfideminig-org is receiving increasingly serious attention. The website documents that the first incorrect map in the SDEIS appears as Figure 4-2-3-1 on page 472 and that a comparative government map of the swamp area is available at [HYPERLINK "http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer"](http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer) www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer. The downstream flow mapping feature of the [HYPERLINK "http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer"](http://beforeitsnews-com/r2/.url=http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer) www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer map was used to show that the eastern portion of the One Hundred Mile Swamp drains via Langley Creek and the Dunka River to the BWCA, and that the drainage will also affect the Quetico Provincial Park along the US – Canada border. Real life understanding of the effect of the proposed mine on the BWCA requires determining the split of waste drainage in the swamp that goes to the St Louis River and BWCA watersheds by hydraulic conductivity testing which has not been done. Ongoing protection of the BWCA requires periodic water testing for mine waste at Langley Creek and the Dunka River which is not provided for in the uncorrected SDEIS. Rwatason [HYPERLINK "mailto:rwatson@elyminnesota-com"](mailto:rwatson@elyminnesota-com) rwatson@elyminnesota-com 218-365-5511

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Richard Watson

45689

I've commented before on other issues but have discovered other issues with the SDEIS that should be brought to your attention. The Polymet SDEIS should not be approved and will require significant clarification, changes, and research in an attempt to rectify, if that is even possible. The Beneficiation Process requires Ore Crushing and Ore Grinding both of which are not designed specifically for low grade sulfide ore. The SDEIS claims: Ore Crushing "The existing coarse- and fine-crushing building emission control systems would be replaced with components that meet or exceed the particulate emission standard required of new sources at taconite plants." Ore Grinding "The existing ore-grinding emission control systems would be replaced with components that meet or exceeded the particulate emission standard required of new sources at taconite plants." Those comments in the SDEIS relating to the emission control systems for the ore crushing and grinding operations of low grade sulfide bearing ores shows a basic lack of concern or knowledge of the basic differences between iron mining and low grade sulfide ore mining and processing. It should not have to be stated the two are significantly different. The chemical and physical characteristics of the low grade ore crushing and grinding will, of course, have a different chemical composition and will also have a different particle size profile with the possibility of much greater quantities of dust and fine particles, possibly even Ultra Fine Particles that should be handled in a different manner than at a taconite plant. At the very least, the physical and chemical differences should be tested and defined for appropriate and specific design of the emission control system for the low grade sulfide ore crushing and grinding operations and not rely on taconite plant designs. Additionally, I could find no mention of Ultra Fine Particles in the SDEIS. The science is well understood. Ultra Fine Particles are toxic due to their size and not necessarily their chemical makeup. Nano Particles or Ultra Fine Particles which may be present in crushing and grinding operations are definitely produced when high explosives are used to blast rock and are present in diesel exhaust. Testing for UFP's at all physical handling stages, blasting, crushing, grinding, and transport should be standard. And, elimination or control of UFPs, a known health hazard, must be accomplished. Could UFP's be partially responsible for the higher than average incidents of certain cancers in the mining areas of Minnesota. Current research shows that with nanoparticles comes nanotoxicity. These UFPs may be as hazardous or more hazardous than amphibole asbestos. Any EIS must include a consideration of all sources of UFP's, quantities of UFP's generated by each source, and a method for controlling such particles to eliminate human exposure to UFPs. In studying the Beneficiation Process, we discover that there is a list of chemicals that are listed as "Consumed." This list amounts to a total of 29,738-5 tpy (tons per year) of additional chemicals, of varying degrees of toxicity, that will be added to the tailings basin according to a reply I received from the DNR. The destination of these process chemicals are not listed in the SDEIS. These chemicals are not innocuous as their MSDSs show. This is problematic in itself, a large quantity of varying degrees of chemical toxicity that have essentially been unaccounted for and is not included in modeling and could have a significant impact on chemical interaction in the tailings basins. The modeling of what happens in the tailings basin is therefore incomplete and misleading. The complexity of the total chemical and biological (microbial) makeup of the tailings basin is far from realistic or representational. The current SDEIS is flawed, incomplete, and not acceptable for the protection of workers, the watersheds of Minn

51774

Dec 20, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There could not be a worse time in our countries history to even contemplate putting sulfide ore mining in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota. We are just beginning to understand how badly we have fragmented the forest here, how impaired our waters are already, and how even iron mining has degraded the health of citizens in this region. Our efforts should be put to cleaning up what we have already mucked up and not trying to determine just how much more pollution we can tolerate. This is the worst type of mining at the worst possible time in our history. The myth of "strong regulations" in Minnesota must be scientifically evaluated, mining company variances denied, and corporate polluters held totally accountable before we embark on further pollution of this region. I strongly suggest we need to hold off on sulfide ore mining in this region until we have a much better plan in place than offered by Polymet. Let's begin to create a living zone in N.E. Minnesota rather than another dead zone. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Richard Watson 114 E Boundary St Ely, MN 55731-1331 (218) 365-5511

Richard White

40767

Hey all- So PolyMet is definitely going to fuck up the environment. Probably better to stay on the safe side than the "destroy the planet" side, right. PolyMet can go wreck North Dakota or wherever they don't care about fracking.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rick 39533

Hello, I would like to address the issue of backfilling the East Pit after year 11- Section 5-2-2-3-1 of the EIS. Common sense tells you that the aquifer in the area and in the pit will be affected by such an operation. There is no way the current compaction levels can be redone to seal off any contaminants from entering the aquifer. The plan calls for pumping water back in it including "treated water" from the WWTF. The word limit is in the EIS. Limit to me means not quite as much. There should be no oxidation of the sulfide minerals. To allow this type of operation to proceed would lead to a direct injection of sulfides and heavy metals into the aquifer. Minnesota has worked hard to clean up and update old septic systems and municipal waste water treatment system that can contaminate the aquifer. Now is not the time to start another contaminator of the aquifer that will have to be addressed and paid for by future generations. 500 years plus is a long time with prohibitive costs that will be a burdon on future taxpayers. Thank you, Rick Fry 9322 West Branch Road Duluth, MN 55803

Rick Brandenburg 54658

See attachment

Rick Cannata 18203

I'm Dennis Loosbruck. I'm a member of the Local 49 Operating Engineers, and I'd like to turn my time over to Rick Cannata, a fellow union member. I do support the mining industry. Thank you, Dennis. My name is Rick Cannata. I've been a member of Minnesota-North Dakota's Laborer's Union for 35 years, and I'm actually wearing a dual hat. I'm the mayor of Hibbing, Minnesota, too. I was born and raised on the Iron Range. I've been in construction, in the laborer's union, like I said, for 35 years. My grandfather was a miner, an underground miner. My father-in-law owns a cattle farm that's a quarter mile from Hibbing Tap, when mines are built without the studies and all the precautions there is. I support PolyMet Mining. I support and believe in the agencies from the State to Federal that did the studies. And I can -- one thing I want to make clear. Someone was up here that said, "I wonder if PolyMet is going to use union workers." Well, they are going to use union workers. They've talked to us about a project labor agreement, so that's a myth right there alone. Another thing is, I've been hunting and fishing since I could walk up in Northern Minnesota. I enjoy the outdoors, and I live up there, my family lives up there. If I didn't believe in this project, I would be against it, but they've done the studies, and it's a proven fact. They spent many years right now, a lot of money to get this project going. We need the jobs in Northern Minnesota, not just the construction jobs and the mining jobs, but it's all here, the manufacturing, all the spinoff jobs, because like the mayor of Hoyt Lakes said, we have thought outside the box. We're a way bigger town than Hoyt Lakes. We have economic developers. We've tried everything up there. The IRRRB helps us out. Mining is what Northern Minnesota is. And for all you people that are against this project and all mining, like Tom Rukavina said, you might as well throw your phones on the ground right now and stomp them because this is what the future is, and if you want to make the Iron Range profitable and see this country grow, you've got to let this project go ahead and quit fighting about it and let them build it and show what the future holds. So thank you very much. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Rick Dahn 15962

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Rick Dahn 50 Hays Cir Silver Bay, MN 55614-1242

Rick Edwards 18363

I am Rick Edwards. I would like to give my time to John Doberstein.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rick Gravrok 19959

- Rick Gravrok St Louis Park, MN

Rick Holcomb 48165

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Rick Holcomb 1701 Madison St NE #403 Minneapolis, MN 55413

Rick Liljegren 37521

I believe the review process has been thorough, and that regulators will ensure Polymet's planning, design, and controls will address environmental impacts. Our regulators have shown they have a clear understanding of mining issues, have done an excellent job to date ensuring existing mining controls protect our environment, and have no doubt they can continue to do the same at the Polymet site. This project is good for Northern Minnesota, Minnesota as a whole, and the country, and should move forward. Rick Liljegren 130 Ropponen Road Esko, Minnesota 55733

Rick Mayerich 22275

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I would also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Richard Mayerich 11739 Townline Road Hibbing MN 55746 Rick Mayerich CWI Industrial Systems Technology Department Head Program Instructor Hibbing Community College 1515 E. 25th Street Hibbing, MN 55746 218-262-7358 Email: rickmayerich@hibbing-edu

Rick Olson 44693

The risk to water quality, wild rice, fish, birds, other wildlife, and other segments of the environment are too high to permit sulfite mining in northern Minnesota. I am convinced PolyMet can't conduct mining operations and at the same time not damage the environment. How is the DNR assured PolyMet will be able to pay for environmental cleanup years after the jobs are gone and the environment is severely damaged. What is the economic impact on the region. Are the top jobs for Canadian's. Jobs would be created by mining; however the potential to lose jobs in the area is a factor. The net gain of jobs is not known. Tourism and recreation jobs may be lost and property values may decline or increase in some areas. Potential benefits of sulfide mining is not worth the potential to severely damage a watershed that connects to the largest fresh water lake in North America. Richard E. Olson

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rick Putnam

39076

DNR I urge you not to accept the SEIS regarding PolyMet for the following reasons I do not think it is in the best interest for the citizens of Minnesota to be responsible for future tax burden as a result of cleanup costs for pollution that will result from poly mets project. The reason I am so concerned about this, in spite of poly met saying that they would be responsible, is that the financial assurances need to remain in place for an extreme amount of time. Financial assurances that need to be in place for 200 to 500 years have not ever been proven. Have there ever been any financial assurance vehicles that have been tested or proven effective for 500 years. I understand that the financial assurance part of this project is actually looked at in the permitting stage, but I strongly feel it is important that it is addressed here as well. The land swap between the forest service and poly met in my mind needs to have its own separate review. The proper amount of time needs to be allotted to this important piece of poly mets project. It cannot be lumped together and hurried through. The use of the national forest has restrictions put on it for a reason. We need to respect that and not put the needs of a corporation ahead of the rights of the citizens of the United States. We were personally involved in a land trade with the federal government. Our land trade took 12 years to go through and it was to trade lakeshore recreational property which was already in use and leased for that purpose. I feel it is a mistake for us to make this trade which would allow non ferrous mining to be done in our national Forrest without a longer period of time for public comment and education on this important change of use. It just does not make logical sense, unless a for profit corporations project does not need to have the same scrutiny as an individual. There is some discrepancy as to the amount of water being released from the project. I would believe the tolerances were put into the model for a good reason therefore it would make sense that the correct numbers be put in and the model be rerun. This is an important part of the EIS. In order to protect our citizens it is only responsible to redo the calculations and do a revision of the model. I am a concerned citizen, who loves this part of Minnesota, and is very troubled by the potential harm this type of mining could bring to northern Minnesota. I believe this harm will not only come to the earth but also would be damaging to the already established tourism environment of that area. This includes businesses as well as cabin owners. The related jobs, as well as construction jobs, taxes and other benefits this tourism economy and vacation home industry brings to the state is sustainable and can be grown. I do not believe that the current tourism economy and vacation home industry could flourish side by side with the nonferrous mining economy which brings pollution and greater industrialization to this unique part of our country. The following are items I would like the DNR to fix in PolyMets mine plan Plan to account for the destruction of moose habitat as well as other natural habitat for the Canadian lynx Plan should call for a detailed plan for financial assurances that protect current and future taxpayers Plan should accurately assess health risks to the public Address the risks of mercury pollution for our children as well as future generations Plan should improve wetland protection and replacements Provide Minnesotans with accurate information about how long polluted waters will require treatment Glencore must be recognized as a responsible party for permitting because of its ties with PolyMet Fix the inaccurate water data used in the model and redo the water model In conclusion it is my opinion that the few hundred jobs and monetary gain for a corporation is not worth the perpetual damage and pollution non

Rick Schroeder

21201

I am adamantly opposed to the Polymet mine and others like it currently being considered in Northeastern Minnesota. Pollution is caused by either bad laws allowing people or companies to pollute legally or people or companies breaking the law by making poor decisions, be it through ignorance or greed or both. I am under the impression the mining of these minerals has never successfully been completed without significant pollution. Evidence of this is the outlawing of this type of mining in other states. I hope through your due diligence you have an opportunity to discuss the concerns of law makers and residents of these other states to understand the experience they gained and what they would do differently. The BWCAWA was an unbelievable achievement, creates lifetime memories and, can provide extraordinary opportunities for centuries to come if, and only if, you make the right decision. Let's hope you do and we are not (especially those who are making the decision) made a fool of. Rick Schroeder - Vice President of Construction ROBERT MUIR COMPANY | 7650 Edinborough Way, Suite 375 | Edina, MN 55435 direct 952-857-2809 | cell 612-670-5169 | fax 952-857-2801

Rick Skoog

54515

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rick Skoog 57347

My name is Rick Skoog, S-K-O-O-G. I guess my main point is I really find it hard to believe that a for-profit company, who is a foreign corporation, is going to put up the money, and they fully admit that it is probably going to be for 200 years' worth of water treatment. I really find it hard to believe that a for-profit corporation is going to put up that amount of money and guaranty that amount of money. And I find it hard to believe that that amount of money can be put in a safe place, without some politician stealing from this, "We have got a big fund here and it is just sitting here and it is not doing anything, so we better borrow from that fund." I really find that hard to believe. Plus, during that time, all of that waste rock isn't going anywhere. It is just staying right there. They are only treating the water problem. They are not treating nothing. They are not treating the problem. They are just treating the runoff from the water. I just find it completely hard to believe that a for-profit company is going to put up the money and the financial assurance to make this happen, because they are a for-profit company and they are in it for the money. And, plus, it is a foreign corporation. And the second that anything goes bad, they can go back to Chile, they can go back to Switzerland, and they totally leave the state taxpayer or the federal taxpayer for the cleanup. And I just don't see any reason that -- no compelling reason to have 20 years' worth of mining that is going to end up producing 200 years' of pollution.

Rick Upton 40225

Ricki Disdier 16569

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Listen, we need nature. We need it. Let's not destroy it for yet more profit. Please reject SDEIS. Sincerely yours, Ricki Disdier 1149 14th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ricki Disdier

49979

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Listen, we need nature. We need it. Let's not destroy it for yet more profit. Please reject SDEIS. Sincerely yours, Ricki Disdier 1149 14th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ridge Pidde

41706

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Rita Ann Youngs

9591

Hi. NO. I am totally AGAINST this project. There is nothing more important than our most precious resource, clean water. We cannot leave future generations of Minnesotans strapped with polluted water. Industries are dumping some very hazardous chemicals into the ground around the USA when fracking. It will come back to bite this country in future years. Then where will communities turn for fresh drinking water. Minnesota and the Great Lakes. We need to do more recycling and reusing materials versus digging into this precious land. I do want the people of Ely and surrounding areas to have jobs and commerce. There has to be some other "clean" industries that can help the area with creating jobs. Please put my "NO" vote into the recoRd I am TOTALLY against this project. Rita Ann Youngs 11247 Cedar Pointe Dr S. Minnetonka, MN 55305 P.S. Please confirm receipt of this e-mail.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rita Bauer

39325

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. We need to seriously consider the impact on wildlife and the environment as well as humans. I do not feel this is too much to ask. It is the minimum . Sincerely, Rita Bauer 4119 Excelsior Blvd St Louis Park, MN 55416-4726

Rita Jarrard

20706

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: The proposal by Polymet to trade acreage in the Superior National Forest for other land in northeastern MN sounds unlawful and dangerous. 1- These other lands include those "protected" by treaties with Ojibwe Indians. How many more times will people of power vote to disrespect our early Americans. 2- Pollution from such mines would destroy the land for hunting, fishing and growing of crops by the Ojibwe, and create untold health hazards for ALL future generations of Americans. 3- Meanwhile, big oil companies get richer and more careless . HELP. Do not approve this proposal. Sincerely Rita Jarrard 976 Cortland Dr S Apple Valley, MN 55124 952-236-8996

Rita Kovtun

43220

To whom it may concern, I would like to add my comments on the PolyMet Mining Inc Project: For the safety of Minnesotans and Americans for generations to come, I do not believe that this project should be continued. Sulfide mining releases toxic metals and can create Acid Mine Drainage (AMD), polluting our rivers and groundwater for hundreds of years - long after the profits are spent and the products buried in landfills. PolyMet's own study says that the water from the mine site would need at least 500 years of treatment. When weighing the pros and cons of the project, it seems logical to discontinue the project as the number of years of profit are only a fraction of the number of years of treatment and rehabilitation of water and land. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Please try to weigh the project in terms of the effect on your own future daughters, sons, grandchildren, and all those that come after them. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments. Rita Kovtun 10652 Alison Way Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rita OConnell

47774

FROM: Dr Rita O'Connell 5378 Ugstad Road Duluth, Minnesota 55811 218-729-6250 HYPERLINK "mailto:oconnell12345@gmail-com"oconnell12345@gmail-com
March 13, 2014 RE: NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), November 2013 I am Rita O'Connell, D.Env. (Doctor of Environmental Science and Engineering from UCLA), a biology and environmental science instructor at Lake Superior College, Duluth, Minnesota. I also worked for many years at the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, specializing in water quality protection, both surface and ground water. I am also a native and long-time resident of northeastern Minnesota. I have no objection to harvesting the resources of this beautiful region by mining, logging, etc, but am also very concerned that we protect our environment, for human enjoyment AND the continued health of our ecosystems, as well as the important ecological services they provide. I commented on the previous EIS for this mining project, and found reading this new SEIS an even more formidable task than reading the EIS. I have a number of concerns, but have limited my comments to a few, all related to water quality issues. COMMENT 1 – WATER QUALITY TREATMENT TIMELINE: Providing water quality treatment for 200 to 500 years (or more) is incomprehensible to me. Questions it raises include: Do you really think the company will be around or responsible for that long. Will the state of Minnesota be around in 500 years. Look back at what was happening 200 years ago (1814) or 500 years ago (1514), and could people in those times accurately predict what would happen today. No, and no more can we predict our distant future. So can we really, in good conscience, even consider permitting a mining action whose wastewater discharges do not meet water quality standards without mechanical treatment at the time of or shortly after closure. Is it legal to permit a facility with such a long-term timeline. If the company is still in existence in 200-500 years, its own estimate of postclosure costs is \$3-5-6 million per year (Table 3-2-15), which multiplied by 200 years is \$700 million to \$1-2 billion. Will the company's profits from 20 years of mining be sufficient to pay for that. It seems to me that this is an indication that they don't expect to need to pay these costs. Or will they prepay those entire cost in an upfront manner ("Financial Assurance Instruments described in 3-2-2-4-2) – \$3 billion for 500 years. Will this instead become like Minnesota's Closed Landfill Program (authorized by the Landfill Cleanup Act of 1994, which resulted in the state taking over the responsibility (and costs) for proper closure and postclosure care at many landfills around the state. As in that case, the state's citizens will again foot the bill. Will this mine do any better job treating their wastes than any in the past. For examples, how about the 5,000 years of acidity and toxic dissolved metals in the Rio Tinto district in Spain where the river pH reaches as low as 2-2-5 or the 2-37-2-57 pH and toxic dissolved metals in the abandoned open-pit copper mine called the Berkeley Pit in Butte, Montana. I think we should adopt Wisconsin's position – a "ban" on future sulfide rock mines until they're PROVEN safe. No mine has yet done so. COMMENT 2 – WATER QUALITY TREATMENT METHODOLGY: I have several concerns on this issue: REVERSE OSMOSIS (RO) – I was surprised when I heard, via our local Duluth news sources, that Polymet had chosen RO as the water treatment process to be used after closure (page 3-52). This is a very expensive process. It also produces a concentrated waste product that must be removed to "appropriate off-site facilities" (page 3-72). There is likely to be a very large volume of those wastes, and they are easily water soluble, since they were dissolved in the water that was processed in the RO facility in the first place

Rita Powers

47305

To Whom it May Concern, I am writing to share my strong opinion against PolyMet mining proposal near Babbitt and Hoyt Lakes, MN. Please do not allow this mining to take place. Thank you, Rita and Lyle Powers 320 1st St SW Elgin, MN 55932 507 876-2777 HYPERLINK "mailto:rfpowers7@gmail-com"rfpowers7@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

River Gordon

16874

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

River Point Resort & Outfitting Co.

7653

Dear Commissioner Landwehr and DNR Staff, I am writing to request that at the next two Public Meetings for PolyMet's North Met mine plan in Aurora and in St Paul that the your agency enforce your guideline that no signage will be allowed in the public meeting rooms. It was most disconcerting to have pro mining people in the large hall at the Duluth meeting displaying their signs toward the back of the hall. Following repeated direction by the police in attendance to remove their signs, these people did so for a short period of time and then displayed them as soon as the police moved to a different area. Signage was only to be displayed outside of the entrance to the DECC in my understanding. This could have been easily controlled by a simple announcement in the large hall that anyone displaying a sign will be escorted out of the hall. Rules are only good if they are enforced. The media made sure to have images of these signs in the various papers following the event. This sends a message that it is OK to have a sign and the next Public Comment Period in Aurora could possibly be a sea of pro mining signs. Everything else about the event last Thursday evening was well organized, informative, and beneficial. Please let me know if this issue will be resolved for the next two meetings. Thank you. Jane Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731 218-365-6625

39586

Lisa Fey EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit Please accept the attached letter as my comment on the SDEIS PolyMet NorthMet Project. Thank you. Jane Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

River Point Resort & Outfitting Co. 42884

Lisa Fay, SDEIS Project Manager, MN DNR Kenneth Westlake, US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Michael Jimenez, US Forest Service-Superior National Forest Please accept the two attached letters as our comment on the SDEIS PolyMet NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Thank you. Jane and Steve Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731

42945

RE: Public Comment Submittal: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, PolyMet Mining, Inc. – NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Email directed to: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDIES.drn@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDIES.drn@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDIES.drn@state.mn.us [HYPERLINK "mailto:Westlake.Kenneth@epa.gov"](mailto:Westlake.Kenneth@epa.gov)Westlake.Kenneth@epa.gov [HYPERLINK "mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil"](mailto:Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil)Douglas.W.Bruner@usace.army.mil [HYPERLINK "mailto:MJimenez@fs.fed.us"](mailto:MJimenez@fs.fed.us)MJimenez@fs.fed.us From Jane and Steve Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, Minnesota 55731 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake, Mr Bruner, and Mr Jimenez, Please find attached a crucial and timely letter from Carla Arneson published today in the Duluth Reader and also the Twin Cities Daily Planet in Minnesota. Here is the link from the Twin Cities Daily Planet. <http://www.tcdailyplanet-net/news/2014/03/12/community-voices-it-s-whopper-polymet-s-myth-9938-tailings-seepage-collection> PolyMet's SDEIS has a flawed water flow model. And, now with this latest research of the SDEIS coordinated by Paula Maccabee, WaterLegacy attorney, it is apparent that the SDEIS also has another flaw – water seepage. “The projected seepage from PolyMet’s tailings basin and the Mine Site Category 1 waste rock stockpile has been grossly underestimated. “PolyMet does not propose to line the Tailings Basin, nor is the existing LTVSMC Tailings Basin Lines.” (SDEIS, p.5-161) A proposed tailings basin of some 2,900 acres will sit, unlined, on top of an existing, leaking and unstable, tailings basin. Foolhardy. Ridiculous comes to mind. As WaterLegacy’s attorney Paula Maccabee summed it up, “The SDEIS assumption of nearly perfect seepage collection is the critical foundation upon which all claims that PolyMet might comply with water quality standards downstream of the tailings piles rely. This assumption is unreasonable, unfounded, inconsistent with site conditions and inconsistent with the Modeling Work Plan methodology adopted by PolyMet.” The SDEIS claims that 99-38% of the total seepage from the tailings piles will be collected and treated is reflected in “Table 5-2-2-36 NorthMet Project Proposed Action Tailings Basin Seepage (gpm) During Operations” on page 5-159 of the DEIS. As they have done before, tribal staff questioned whether the claims for capture and treatment of groundwater were realistic in the summer of 2013 when the preliminary SDEIS was issued. Co-lead agencies responded that the same plan of using groundwater containment with slurry walls and permeable trenches had been routinely used for 50 years at various mine and industrial sites. Hundreds of operating systems in place, they indicated, and that “it is typical to achieve greater than 90 percent groundwater capture.” (SDEIS) However, no examples of those “hundreds of currently operating systems” are listed in the SDEIS. As Ms Arneson states in this attached letter: “ it was discovered that the only example the lead agencies had (of field experience with tailing seepage pump-back) was a study to estimate possible seepage collection at the Minntac tailings basin. And records obtained from the US Army Corp of Engineers through a Freedom of Information Act Request indicate that the seepage collection system at Minntac had an approximate return rate of only 50 percent.” 50 percent is sure a lot less than the 99-38 per cent claimed in PolyMet’s SDEIS. Inaccurate, flawed information. And, from those hundreds of operating systems lauded by the SDEIS, only one could be found. Amazing. PolyMet’s Website has a “Water Quality Fact Sheet”. It states the following: “Water control and treatment methods have been used successfully in mining and many other industrial and municipal applications for decades. They will be used at the PolyMet site to meet all applicable water quality requirements.” Deceitful. Lies of omissions. The Public is being sold a “bill of goods”. If this is the best this SD

Alphabetical by sender's first name

River Point Resort & Outfitting Co. 43084

March 13, 2014 From: Jane and Steve Koschak Po Box 397 Ely, MN 55731 Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake, Mr Burner, Mr Jimenez, The Maps used in the SDEIS are flawed. We live at the confluence of Birch Lake and the South Kawishiwi River, and have lived here and operated our two tourism recreational businesses for 38 years. We lie directly adjacent to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). We have been most concerned about incorrect maps being used in this SDEIS for some time. "Maps in the SDEIS released on December 6, 2013 make it appear that sulfuric acid and heavy metal containing mine runoff will drain only into the already impaired Saint Louis River watershed when in fact drainage can go to two watersheds, one of which includes the unspoiled Boundary Waters Canoe Area wilderness. The SDEIS maps draw a much smaller swamp downhill from the mine compared to existing government maps. According to US Government maps, the One Hundred Mile Swamp downhill from the mine is 10-4 miles long and drains to both the Saint Louis and Rainy Lake (BWCA) watersheds but SDEIS maps show a shorter 5-5 mile long swamp that is missing the portion of the swamp that drains to the BWCA. Omitting the portion of the swamp that drains to the BWCA supports PolyMet's conclusion that seepage of mine waste water to the BWCA watershed will not occur. Dashed, teal colored outlines of the One Hundred Mile Swamp on green satellite image maps are difficult to see and it might have been expected that the mapping discrepancy would go undetected in the 90 day public review period. Marking of important map features in such an obscure way may be seen as evidence of intent to avoid connecting an environmentally risky mine with the fragile and iconic BWCA wilderness. A website that provides more detailed information about the mapping issue at www.bwcasulfideminig-org is receiving increasingly serious attention. The website documents that the first incorrect map in the SDEIS appears as Figure 4-2-3-1 on page 472 and that a comparative government map of the swamp area is available at [HYPERLINK "http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer"](http://www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer) www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer. The downstream flow mapping feature of the www.nationalatlas-gov/streamer map was used to show that the eastern portion of the One Hundred Mile Swamp drains via Langley Creek and the Dunka River to the BWCA, and that the drainage will also affect the Quetico Provincial Park along the US – Canada border. Real life understanding of the effect of the proposed mine on the BWCA requires determining the split of waste drainage in the swamp that goes to the St Louis River and BWCA watersheds by hydraulic conductivity testing which has not been done. Ongoing protection of the BWCA requires periodic water testing for mine waste at Langley Creek and the Dunka River which is not provided for in the uncorrected SDEIS." (Before It's News) The Boundary Waters is a designated wilderness area of National Significance. It is the most widely visited park in all the US with some 250,000 annual visitors. Untrustworthy conclusions about sulfide mining pollution from PolyMet's proposed mine can't go unresolved. The incorrect mapping in the SDEIS is a huge issue. This DEIS is flawed and must be rejected. Public Sources: PolyMet Environmental Impact Statement Has Incorrect Maps. Before It's News, St Paul, Minnesota. March 11, 2014- <http://beforeitsnews-com/environment/2014/03/polymet-environmental-impact-statement-has-incorrect-maps-2495246-html> PolyMet SDEIS: Public Comment Jane and Steve Koschak, 3-13-14

RJoa 3951

I have two main concerns about the proposed mine in Northern Minnesota; quality wetlands and truSt First, I don't believe wetlands are replaceable. The wetlands in the proposed mine area are imperative for wildlife of all kinds as well as migrating fowl. It is my understanding that there is proportionally only a small quantity of wetlands in the watershed of the area. Replacing this biologically priceless land with a larger chunk of essentially man-made wetland that has already been robbed of its wealth in another part of the state could never be a "fair" trade. Sub-par is the nicest way to describe this practice. Second, there are stories all over the country of mining companies not doing what they've agreed to do as far as pollution mitigation. They go for years without supervision or inspections from federal or state authorities. When they are finally held accountable they simply say it is too expensive to correct and will cut into profits for shareholders or company owners. They pay a small fine and continue business as usual. Profits are considered a good reason to destroy the health of local people and lands. Thank you, Roseanne Joa 2320 130th Ave NW Coon Rapids, MN 55448

Alphabetical by sender's first name

roadrunnerkappes@netscape.net

36861

I live north of the stock pile ponds in Waassa Township, which has the Embarrass river and the Trimble creek waterways running through them. Living close to both of these water tributaries has me worried to what will happen to the area if this mining project goes through. I will be long gone before any effects from this project, whether negative or positive occur. I am looking more to the future than the present. From reading and researching all the different scenarios that could happen, more negative than positive attributes occur. First off the Polymet Corporation says that they will not pollute the area[,which flows North of their mining operations, which includes the Trimble Creek and the Embarrass River area. This area flows into the Saint Louis River Basin, plus the Partridge River waterway, which flows south, and eventually ends up into Lake Superior.] For a process that can only be (not proved) shown on paper Everything that Polymet assumes is just a projection, and the DNR and the MPCA has to take these projections, and make a decision if it benefits the area for future expansion. Let's look at what Polymet says they will do to our economy\; 200 permanent jobs Just a number. I worked for a iron mining company for 31 years and realize that the 200 job number is probably high and it is probably in the 150 employment range. Remember profit is the goal for any company in order to stay in business. The spin off number of jobs for this project is also a prediction. These are my thoughts. {Aurora, Hoyt Lakes, Babbitt, Biwabik},went through these times before Polymet says they will employee 200 employees for 20 years for the lifetime of the plant which equates to 10 employee per year for the 20 year life of the plant: To the residents of these communities: When you look at the added number of permanent jobs, Which Polymet forecasts, that they will employee [10 employees fore 20 Years A 20 year To the residents of Aurora And Hoyt Lakes. You need to look into the future.Polymet is not the answer Polymet says they will employee 200 permanent employees for 20 years. This equates to 10 employees per year This is a pretty poor number for employment when you look at the number of negative ads/products Sent from Windows Mail

Rob Adams

39149

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public intereSt The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine and Land Exchange as destructive to the public interest and harmful to tribal rights, clean water, vital habitats and the health of future generations. Sincerely Rob Adams 2011 E. 2nd St Duluth, MN 55812 541-683-0851

48086

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National ForeSt PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Pease turn down the PolyMet project. Very truly yours, Rob Adams 2011 E. 2nd St Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rob Adams

48648

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine and Land Exchange as destructive to the public interest and harmful to tribal rights, clean water, vital habitats and the health of future generations. Sincerely Rob Adams 2011 E. 2nd St Duluth, MN 55812 541-683-0851

Rob Davis

18136

This is by far the biggest thing I've ever done. So I won the public speaking lottery tonight. And I was not expecting that. Hi. Good evening. I'm Rob Davis. I might have the easiest name to spell. R-O-B, D-A-V-I-S. There's probably a few other Rob Davises in the crowd. It's good to see you all. I am a business person and an eagle scout and also a Minnesotan. And so I'm speaking from those three perspectives tonight. As a business person, I absolutely appreciate jobs and economic growth. I'm a marketer. I help people tell their stories. And I love the diversities of businesses that we have in Minnesota. And we need to keep Minnesota's economy absolutely strong and growing. I'm also an eagle scout. And as an eagle scout, I learned the value of wilderness and water and air. And I learned the value of quiet places. And if you haven't been to one, absolutely go. It is completely, completely transformative. And also as a Minnesotan I'm proud, I'm really, really proud that we have a crowd like this frankly on a night like tonight. I'm really proud of this state for having such a diversity of growth and ways to build its own economy. And I'm proud of how critical we are about the way that we want to grow. On PolyMet, as a Minnesotan it's a near certainty -- we all have to embrace the facts. And it's a near certainty that there will be millions of dollars of cleanup. That's just a trade off. We're thinking about jobs and we're thinking about how much it's going to cost. Minnesotans, I would challenge us -- I would challenge Minnesotans to say, "There is a different way we can spend that money." There is a different way that we can spend that money. Broadband is coming to Ely next summer. That's what they tell me. And not only that, if you're going to invest millions of dollars in cleaning up over the next 500 years, let's invest millions of dollars creating clean, renewable jobs. Jobs that last 500 years in the state of Minnesota. PolyMet is not a Minnesota company. I get it. That's great that other companies want to invest in Minnesota. But you have to do business the way Minnesotans do business. And we do it the smart way. We don't want something that is going to be here today and gone tomorrow. We want things that last. The Minnesota State Fair is a fantastic tradition that has been around for more than 100 years. There is so many great things that have been around for a long time. PolyMet is not a Minnesota company. It's just not a good deal for Minnesota.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rob Grunewald

47779

March 13, 2014 Dear staff at the Department of Natural Resources: This is my second e-mail with comments on the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. My earlier comments were submitted on January 15, 2014, and are included at the bottom as reference. The EIS should specify what would happen during a large flood. The EIS should specify in detail the impact of a large flood or other extreme weather event on PolyMet's proposed water filtration process. Over a 500 year period there is high risk that an extreme weather event would happen in the proposed mine area, especially with the prospects for increased weather volatility in the context of climate change. As recently as June 2012, 10 inches of rain fell in Duluth during a short time causing a great deal of damage. The staff I talked with at the January 28 public hearing in St Paul noted that a flood of that size would likely overwhelm PolyMet's proposed water filtration system. This would result in toxins spilling over into several water sources. The number of jobs created by PolyMet's mine should not be considered a tradeoff for a clean environment. Minnesota can wait as long as it takes until mining and containment technologies are proven to be effective. Mining jobs are time limited. Whether the proposed mine is started today or in 10 or 20 years from now, Minnesotans will have the same amount of jobs and those jobs will last the length of the life of the mine. In 10, 20 or even more years from now a generation of Minnesotans will be ready to work the good paying mining jobs at this site. The state can and should wait until the sulfide mine water filtration technology has been tested and used in a multi-year project with absolute perfection in another location before trying it in Minnesota. We need time to reduce risks that ultimately the taxpayers of Minnesota would have to pay if PolyMet's proposed environmental clean-up plans fail. Granted as mining technology improves, the number of jobs could be smaller in the future, but in that case the jobs will likely be even higher paying and safer. The EIS should assess the risk and implications for the environment if PolyMet is sold or goes into bankruptcy. Mining companies like PolyMet that get projects off the ground can be bought out by larger multi-national corporations that have less investment in the local community. There is risk that if PolyMet is purchased by a large mining firm that the new owner will not show as much good faith in adhering to promises to safeguard water sources from contamination. The EIS should consider potential mining firms that could someday purchase PolyMet and how environmental clean-up responsibilities would be transferred to these companies. There is also risk that PolyMet could enter into bankruptcy, go out of business and no longer have financial resources to keep the area's water clean. The EIS should spell out contingencies should these economic events happen. A buyout or a bankruptcy has environmental implications due to the 500 years or longer of time required to maintain clean water at the mine site and surrounding area. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these issues. Rob Grunewald 2561 Burnham Road Minneapolis, MN 55416 --- Message sent on Jan. 15, 2014 Dear staff at the Department of Natural Resources: I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. As an economist, I find the PolyMet mine proposal does not meet the cost-benefit test. The costs to Minnesota in the long run are much larger than the proposed benefits of adding jobs to this region in the short run. Furthermore, a deterioration in the water quality and environment generally puts future generations at risk and also other sustainable economic purposes for the area. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least

Rob Kutsi

7358

My name is Robert Kutsi and I have reviewed all of the information. Currently I am serving on the Gilbert City Council and am a father of four. I support the Polymet project. Being a father of four I am very concerned about our land, upon review I feel very safe with the future of Polymet and securing jobs for our future. Thank you. Robert Kutsi Gilbert City Council

Rob Ramer

57283

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rob Simonich

38377

Hi my name is Rob Simonich, I've lived in Babbitt, Mn. my entire life. I went school there, I worked a Reserve Mining while in high school. I belonged to the union, and now I'm in my 25th. year as a teacher at Ely. I've always used the outdoors, and have a cabin in the area. I do not have a problem with Poly Met developing a mine in the area. Based on the impact statement, I have total confidence in Poly Met and our DNR to do the right thing. No one wants to destroy what we hAve That's why we live here. Please let Poly Met continue to do the good work they do to develop a mine here. It would would mean very much to let our schools grow, along with our communities. Please issue the permits, in a timely manner. Thank You Rob simonich, 52 Astor Road, Babbitt Mn. 55706

Robbin Zimmerman

15937

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: We currently live in one of the higher taxed states. Why are we not utilizing public funding to preserve our state for future generations. We don't need businesses coming here and ruining our water and natural habitats. If Minnesota needs more money I would bet a paycheck that there are cleaner, healthier businesses to deal with. We need not be tramps and/or enviromental whores with our decision making - not when it stands to effect future generations so substaintially. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robbin Zimmerman 8716 Midway St NE Blaine, MN 55449

Robby Bragg

40586

Hello, I am writing as a Minnesota citizen speaking out against the Polymet mine. The affects of this mine will be detrimental to not only the environment but will not help the economy or jobs in the long run either. Since the mine is a temporary endeavor so would be the workers' contracts. Unless you are planning on the environmental destruction that would be caused by this mine and the jobs that would come of that. If so, I think that is a pretty hypocritical precedent to set for our children. This mine will not stand, Your Minnesota Citizen

Robert

54862

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ROBERT A BRODIE 14782

I would just like to submit a comment regarding the possible mining operation in Northern Minnesota. I am a member of several environmental groups, and have read with some dismay about the likelihood of the mining operations disrupting the water tables and creating havoc to populations of people and wildlife in the future. It is difficult for me to understand the shortsightedness of these operations. I have read of many mining companies going bankrupt and leaving the states to clean up massive spills, after the companies have made their profits. Our water is a precious unrennewable commodity and the few FULL time jobs that will result in this endeavor will not be worth the likely leakage of heavy metals into the water. It is in the foreseeable future that water shortages will become an economic reality, with talk of getting water supplied to other states from Lake Superior. Really. We should be aware that our clean water is an important source of life, not only for Minnesota's people and environment, but also as a viable economic tool for the future. Our children deserve a healthy life with clean air and water. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Debra Gerads-Brodie, 365 Oak Hill Drive, Red Wing, MN 55066

Robert A Johnson 42629

See attachment

Robert Ambler 42089

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Robert Ambler Minneapolis, Minnesota

Robert and Barbara Baldrice 42829

See attachment

Robert and Kathryn Stodala 57209

Regarding the SDEIS, specifically the Partridge River baseline base flow and the XP-SWMM model predictions, we feel that base flow has been underestimated in the Partridge River by 3 to 4 times. This would mean transport of greater quantities of pollutants. Current base flow projections are outdated and do not align with the rating curve from the new MDNR winter monitoring data or data from the Dunka Rd gauge. Robert A. & Kathryn Z. Stodola 131 N. Hawthorne Rd Duluth, MN 55812

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Bartholomew

18213

Hi. My name is Robert Bartholomew, B-A-R-T-H-O-L-O-M-E-W. I'm from Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota, and I just feel as heartfelt as she does about this mine. So let me tell you what I am. I'm president of the Hoyt Lakes Chamber of Commerce. I'm also a retired steel worker. Thirty-five years I worked in the steel mines up there. I'm also a proud union member for the last 50 years, and I wouldn't trade it for anything. When they started the tac mines in Hoyt Lakes, it was a polluter. Iron mining was not the most kindest to this environment, but through the years and through our union and through people that cared that actually worked at this plant, it got changed. Pollution went down tremendously. I feel we can do the same thing at this new mine. This is up to the people that work there. Do you actually think that people that work there are going to let this mine destroy our area, our environment? No, they're not. You're wrong. I know you have feelings, but that's not the way it's going to be. For the last eight years, I've been wondering what's going on, what's happening. I get three minutes up here. It's taken nine years of my life to decide on if this mine is safe or not. So far it's pointing to yes, it can be safe, and there's policies in place to make sure it is safe. I don't think these three entities that work for us, us, the people of Minnesota, the DNR, the Corps of Engineers, I don't think they have any vested interest in this other than ours, and if we don't have faith in them, what do we have faith in. I can't believe that we can't trust outfits that are designed to protect us; let them go ahead and protect us. Okay. Well, I, for one don't have all the answers about this, and we won't have until we see the operation of this mine in full swing. Too late, maybe? I don't think so. And that can only happen if we believe in our system. And we do. And I do. I believe in this system. They've done their job. Now let's hope we can do ours and put this plant in operation for some honest, good, hard-working people. Thank you.

Robert Baxton

9411

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Baxton 721 East 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Baxton

18739

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Baxton 721 East 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

50812

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Baxton 721 East 9th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Brandon 15748

See attachment

Robert Bruner 33192

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The opportunity for PolyMet Mining Corp. to make some money in the NorthMet mining project is attractive, naturally. Everyone is in favor of more jobs and economic activity. However, it is a forgone conclusion that the project will end up polluting the waters of the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, since Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Reassurances that this will not happen mean nothing once the damage has been done. This ends up being a tradeoff between water quality which serves everyone forever if we protect it, and short term economic gain for a small number. Therefore, I conclude that the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Robert Bruner 1102 N Pleasant St Royal Oak, MI 48067-4332

33203

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, The opportunity for PolyMet Mining Corp. to make some money in the NorthMet mining project is attractive, naturally. Everyone is in favor of more jobs and economic activity. However, it is a forgone conclusion that the project will end up polluting the waters of the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, since Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Reassurances that this will not happen mean nothing once the damage has been done. This ends up being a tradeoff between water quality which serves everyone forever if we protect it, and short term economic gain for a small number. Therefore, I conclude that the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Robert Bruner 1102 N Pleasant St Royal Oak, MI 48067-4332

Robert Bullis 11280

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Bullis 19088 Dodge St NW 19088 Dodge St NW Elk River, MN 55330

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Bullis

18398

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Bullis 19088 Dodge St NW 19088 Dodge St NW Elk River, MN 55330

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Bullis

19007

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Robert Bullis 19088 Dodge St NW 19088 Dodge St NW Elk River, MN 55330 763 441 0565

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Bullis

50517

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Bullis 19088 Dodge St NW 19088 Dodge St NW Elk River, MN 55330

Robert C. Jackson

47356

DNR, I grew up in Minnesota and return every year to enjoy the beauty of northern Minnesota's lake country. This proposal for a first Minnesota open-pit, copper-nickel mine is a big undertaking, and I appreciate the diligence you are using to assess the proposal. That said, the proposal is still a huge gamble. In an operation this complex and long-running, the risks to the immediate and downstream environment, as well as to the people working the mine and processing plant and to the people who live, work, and recreate nearby, stare us all in the face. Complex risk assessments in any human endeavor are rarely one hundred per cent accurate. We here in Washington are spending generations and seemingly endless amounts of money to clean up places like Puget Sound and the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from those complex human endeavors that turned out to have significant adverse consequences. If we must err, let's err on the side of safety and high quality of life. Specifically, in response to the SDEIS, I ask that you please do the following:

- 1) Let the MN Department of Health do a health impact assessment of the proposal. Northern Minnesota babies are already born too often with hazardous levels of mercury in the blood, probably from mothers consuming mercury-contaminated fish. The operation will release mercury into air and water. No containment system can guarantee capturing all of it. Also the risks of lung problems from amphibole mineral fibers released during rock-crushing operations seem unknown.
- 2) Rethink the proposed land swap and mitigation plan. If I understand your video correctly, Polymet's plan is to draw down the groundwater level under 913 acres of coniferous peat bogs and mitigate their activity by restoring wetlands elsewhere; then to trade another pool of lands for ownership of the land on which they own the mineral rights for the proposed mining. Peat bogs are ancient with unique plant communities which cannot be replaced, at least not for thousands of years. Restoring wetlands elsewhere is not a good bargain.
- 3) Add weighted valuation to your overall damage risk strategy of avoidance, minimization, and compensation. In my value system avoidance has a much higher weighted value than minimization. Compensation, no matter what the dollar amount, is a last resort with almost no value compared to the loss or degradation of habitat for threatened animals, numerous plant species including wild rice, human health via air and water quality, and the land itself.
- 4) Make a serious study of tunnel mining as an alternative.
- 5) Don't be committed to saying yes to Polymet's plan. If the cost's are too high, deny the permits. Thank you for considering my concerns, Robert C. Jackson 717-33rd St Everett, WA 98201-

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Chapman

16775

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Craft

39088

---Original Message--- From: bobcraft01@msn-com [mailto:bobcraft01@msn-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 7:09 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Robert Craft 100 King Street West Saint Paul, MN 55107-3656

Robert Cramer

42484

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Robert Cramer 29865 cty 25 Peterson, MN 55962 (507) 875-2313

Robert Davis

40004

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Robert Davis 4127 Colorado Ave S Saint Louis Park, MN 55416-3135

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Devine 4350

As a resident of MN for all but 3 of my 46 years (born and raised here) I expect more of Minnesota State government than the usual DNR 'rubber stamp' of yet another proposal to destroy the wilderness. The DNR should have learned a lesson from the White Bear lake aquifer depletion debacle. They 'rubber-stamped' every request to pump water from that aquifer and the citizens suffered while the wealthy few benefited. Now your commissioner is being sued by the White Bear lake association. This PolyMet proposal will be similarly 'rubber-stamped' by your leadership and no doubt all the public comments will be dutifully ignored as you serve your corporate masters. This will become another Love Canal or Armley Asbestos disaster where the executives walk away with millions leaving someone else to suffer the environmental damage, birth defects and cleanup costs. Please acknowledge receipt of my comment so this can be used as evidence in the coming (hopefully) criminal trial of your negligence. Gratefully submitted December 29th, 2013- Bob Devine Web/Application Developer

Robert E McKlveen 42786

See attachment

Robert E Powless 57269

I would like more information.Dr. Robert E. Powless4911 Wyoming StreetDuluth, MN 55804

Robert E. McKlveen 43049

Dear Mr. Dabney,I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement.In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental and economic impacts.I have been a frequent visitor to the area of the proposed mine for many years, enjoying the natural beauty, pristine conditions, and quiet of the area. My children have attended wilderness camp in the area, I have traveled many times to the Boundary Waters, and I continue to visit the area to enjoy its scenic and natural beauty.Over the course of the last twenty years, I would estimate that my own personal contribution to the local economy through spending on these various recreational activities has been approximately \$100,000. Through that spending, I have supported the local economy and local jobs.The SDEIS fails to adequately and accurately account for the impact that the thousands of people like me have on the local economy, and the harm to the economy if the mine is built under the currently proposed conditions and restrictions. The current SDEIS fails to appropriately quantify the decrease in recreational economic activity that WILL occur if the mine is built. If the waters or air of the BWCAW and the surrounding area are damaged by this mine or its aftermath, fewer visitors (including myself) will come to the area. This would have a significant negative impact on the economy of the area that will outlast the productive life of the mine by decades or centuries. The SDEIS needs to account for this negative impact in a meaningful way.Furthermore, PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to.The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean:The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated.In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site, undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. There is evidence that the current surface and groundwater flows in the Partridge River basin that were used in the SDEIS were flawed. Correction of those errors may significantly impact the conclusions of the SDEIS.The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrongThere are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6.2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment? The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. History tells us that such system failures DO occur, with regularity.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Ellies 4287

I appreciate the hard work that has taken place by all groups involved. I believe that we should now permit this project. Bob Ellies 42410 west sand lake drive Bovey mn 55709

Robert Ellis Dye 39567

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Robert Ellis Dye 1305 Fairmount Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2704 (651) 698-5046

Robert Flynn 33919

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have POLLUTED WATERS IN ALL OTHER PLACES WHERE SULFIDE ORE MINING HAS OCCURRED. NO technology exists to prevent that here in Minnesota. It threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is based on inaccurate data, manipulated by the "researchers." PolyMet mine is NOT in the public interest. That conclusion is quite obvious to all who are not motivated by money and influence. Sincerely, Robert Flynn 3604 14th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-2712 (612) 827-5061

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Ford

16187

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

robert fors

57676

My name is Robert Fors. I live at 16445 Gerdine Path, Lakeville, MN 55068- I am in favor of the mining projects in northern Minnesota. I believe this project will create much needed jobs in the region, provide tax revenues for the state, bring investment dollars into the state, and it will provide opportunities for educated young people to find employment in MN. Sincerely, Robert Fors

Robert Frame

46787

The costs of trying to keep this copper mine (and its openly anticipated expansion) from being hugely damaging to water quality and from causing other environmental degradation is unknown, and unknowable. Therefore, the most stringent review as well as limitations/requirements on the company need to be the guiding principle for the DNR and the whole state. You must absolutely not be cowed into approving the project against realistic evidence and projections, and must be willing if necessary to flatly deny permission. Frankly, it does not help that the industry has been unreliable, even duplicitous, in the paSt (I make no claims about PolyMet's managing company, as I did not research them. But they cannot simply reject the reality of false claims and deliberate environmental damage of others in their industry as not reflecting on them and creating the context for Minnesota's review and decisions.) Robert Frame 2530 Blaisdell Ave, Minneapolis, MN 55404

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Haarman

38790

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Robert Haarman 2503 Brighton Ave NE Minneapolis, MN 55418-3924

Robert Hardman

9983

Jan 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Robert Herling

44923

To Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner, and Ms Fay: I would like you to reject the PolyMet Northmet sulfide mine project based on the extensive risk to water resources and human health in the Lake Superior Basin. PolyMet's SDEIS does not provide a comprehensive enough analysis of the long-standing impacts to clean water, ecological integrity, and human health. In addition, I do not believe that enough consideration has been given to the long-standing economic impacts to Northeast Minnesota, and the state taxpayers at large. While the PolyMet project may increase economic activity in the region, those economic benefits would be very temporary and largely go outside of the state. Meanwhile, the economic risks due to environmental clean-up would be virtually permanent and ultimately rest on the shoulders of Minnesota's taxpayers. Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. Robert Herling 1226 E 2nd St Apt. F Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Hershovitz

18286

My name is Bob Herskovitz, Robert Herskovitz. I am a citizen of St. Paul. I work in historic preservation and I am concerned about irrevocable damage to cultural resources as a result of this project. Some of the cultural resources are very fragile and the damage cannot be undone. For example, if there is a faint historic trail that gets disturbed or destroyed, you can't restore it. It is gone. Like an archeological resource, once it is disturbed, its value in terms of providing data, its value is diminished, if not lost. So, from a professional standpoint, I am concerned that there isn't adequate protection. I'm not sure that it is possible to have adequate protection for some of those lost resources. My other comment is not professional, it is just a personal opinion. It is that this is not really tried and true technology. As a museum conservator, we work on artifacts that are important for us as cultural resources. And what we do as conservators, we try and do so that our actions are reversible. That's the goal. It is an ideal. It is not always possible. That's what I'm concerned about here. It is that these things are even more fragile than an artifact or an object, which can be at least partially restored. I am concerned that the corporation that causes, for example, environmental damage really in the long run is not responsible for that damage and it can declare bankruptcy and walk away, and the citizens of the state are left holding the bag to pay for the cleanup for however many years. If the potential costs of cleanup could be calculated and the company would be willing to put up a surety bond for even 200 or 250 years, 500 years ideally, then the citizens would have some assurance that we will not have to pay for the damage caused in the obtaining of corporate profits; the water quality, the cultural resources, the destruction of land. And those are my concerns.

Robert Hoekstra

34903

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mining cannot be allowed to negatively impact the region's natural resources and public health of the Superior National Forest Sulfide mining in Minnesota threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams. The Arrowhead Region of Minnesota including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness will be adversely effected. The risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations will be significant. Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred, and it is not in the better interests of anybody or anything living in that area of Minnesota to have sulfide mining devastating the region too. Sincerely, Robert Hoekstra 965 Vassar Ave Holland, MI 49423-5304 (616) 394-0684

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Hurt

39378

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Johnson

11946

Feb 14, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Johnson

16122

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Johnson

19510

My name is Robert A. Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And my address, I live at 120 North 42nd Avenue East, Duluth, Minnesota 55804. First of all, when we first heard when Cravaack won over Oberstar, the first thing we heard about was that this proposal of mining up north, we were going to weaken all the environmental standards, and there was a really big push for that, and that worried me right from the start. And then I heard from the Sierra Club that one of the things about sulfide mining is that it will cause problems in breathing for a large part of our area and that more and more people will need inhalers, including our kids. And I use an inhaler right now. Okay. Then from there, as this thing is going on, I'm really worried about our kids' future. The Boundary Waters is just a pristine area, and we know with global warming that 30 years from now, fresh water is going to be a high commodity, and this area, if it was left pristine, could make more money than could ever be done with this mining by keeping the area pristine and keeping it open for people and keeping it as a clean area for our kids growing up. Instead, we're sacrificing our children's future, we're sacrificing the land itself, and we're sacrificing all the wildlife in it. Sulfide mining is a very dirty process, and it should not be done in Northern Minnesota. It shouldn't be done at all. You know, we should save these pristine areas when the climate really gets bad. We don't know what the future holds. There could be a depression in the future. One of the things I heard about this PolyMet thing lately is that they expect the people of Minnesota to pay for the cleanup. Now, how is it that a foreign corporation can come into Minnesota, make profits off our land, leave, and leave us with the cost of cleaning it up? That just doesn't seem right at all. The problem we have is I don't think we have a democracy anymore. We really don't. I don't believe that our representatives actually represent us; I think they represent the corporations. The rich are never going to represent the poor at all, and I think something like this that's going to affect us, the wildlife and our children's future should be voted upon by the whole state. We should take a vote from every person in the state, and we should vote whether we should let PolyMet destroy our environment. I don't think it's right to let a few representatives who can be bought decide our future. I think it's really wrong, and I think it should be stopped, and I can't believe that they're allowing this to happen. It's just ridiculous. That's all, I guess, I wanted to say. But I do believe Minnesota should vote on this and not just a couple representatives who supposedly represent us. Thank you.

Robert Jones

54893

See attachment

Robert Kaiser

13069

I am writing to you my concerns about the proposed Mining Project. What continues to confuse me is the fact that water is the most precious resource we Minnesotans need to cherish and protect, and yet this mining proposal is for an area surrounded by our lakes, rivers, streams, and marshes - the very resource that defines our state more than anything else. How can the MN DNR and the US Forest Service even consider the possibility that such a dangerous proposition for our state would be worth the jobs it could produce. Where is the leadership at the state level that makes it clear that we Minnesotans cannot sacrifice our most valuable commodity at any price whatsoever. We must be constantly reminded of all the water pollution questions that this project proposes, not how much money can be made from mining minerals. And we only need to look to the ongoing drought in the west, and the continued chemical leakage problem in the state of Virginia as sober reminders of how valuable water is to us human beings, and how blessed we are in this state to have such an abundance of clean water. Our water must be forever protected. This mining project will endanger our most valuable resource. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Robert Kaiser 1064 Pleasant Avenue St Paul, MN 55102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Kaiser

39066

---Original Message--- From: meanderlodge@comcaStnet [mailto:meanderlodge@comcaStnet] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 9:47 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Robert Kaiser 1064 Pleasant Ave Saint Paul, MN 55102-3311

Robert Kosuth

57206

Problems:Flaws in the study re water flow200-500 year timeline = total irrationality – similar to nuke waste storageSolution:Sulfide mining is not worth the costRobert Kosuth1224 East 11th StDuluth, MN 55805

Robert Lawrence Dryke

57149

Please reenergize the ground water pollution problems of coal mining operations in KY, WV, PA, VA, NC that shut down because cleanup was ineffective, thus causing uninhabitable lands for humans and species of plant and life matter this is very problematic, has it been corrected by the past profits of coal mining corporations? Will Twin Metals, PolyMet provide continuous insurance, bonds and monies for the future problems and effects the ore processing causes that are unknown? Clean water for delusion is not the solution for controlling pollution.Robert Lawrence Dryke4827 Howard Green RdDuluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Lohman

18265

Robert Lohman, Motley, Minnesota. Over the years there have been a lot of really bad plans presented in Minnesota by corporations, by government agencies, sometimes by individuals. 30 some years ago, 33 years ago now, I was working with a lot of other people in stopping nuclear waste from being buried in old granite quarries. A lot of people came out, and it took a long time, but that plan was never implemented. Then maybe six or seven years later, the State of Minnesota came up with the idea of setting up a hazardous waste site somewhere. And at that time 11 counties, they wanted to be that particular location. And again, a lot of people came out, spoke out time and time again, and finally after about three, three and a half years, that program was dead. Now, there have been a lot of other potentially disastrous plans presented. But I think the PolyMet mining proposal ranks right up there with having a hazardous waste site and it is pretty close to having a nuclear waste site in Minnesota. I can't understand how anybody is willing to put Lake Superior, the Boundary Waters wilderness, various wetlands, plants and animals at risk. For what? 350 jobs, 500 jobs for 20 years? Another thing I can't understand is why would we even be talking to PolyMet, who has never operated a plant? To me, that's like if you need an operation and you are talking to your doctor and he says, "Well, actually, I've never done an operation like that before." And you say to him, "Hey, that's no problem. Give it a shot. Let's see what happens." That's what we are doing with PolyMet. I was also thinking about Glencore (phonetic). Apparently, Glencore is the corporation that has the money. They also have Tony Hayward as their Chief Executive Officer. You probably remember Tony, he was CEO of British Petroleum during the great oil spill of the Gulf of Mexico. And he famously said at one point, "You know, I'm really tired of this oil spill thing. I want to get my life back. I've got a lot of other things to do." So, we're inviting corporations like this into Minnesota and we are going to take their word for the fact that they have state-of-the-art technology and nothing is going to happen? However, with bisulfide mines all over the world, bad things have happened. The environment has been wrecked all over the place. So my hope is, I don't think these hearings will do anything. There is so much money involved, I think -- I think this project will be approved, and once it is, there is probably six or seven other projects in the wings that will come forward. And once you approve one, it will be a lot easier to approve the other half a dozen. My only hope is that a lot of people come to northern Minnesota and they come to PolyMet's corporate office in the Twin Cities and they just keep coming until the thing is stopped. Stop the mine from hell. Hallelujah.

Robert Mahutga

39891

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Robert Mahutga 379174 County 1 Eagle Bend, MN 56466

Robert McCaa

58019

No copper mining near Minnesota Lakes. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Robert McKlveen

9305

18388

Please see the attached document.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert McPherson

40117

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Robert McPherson PO Box 2212 Tofte, MN 55615-2212

Robert Meyer

14681

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Nanti

7376

I am writing in support of the PolyMet project in northern Minnesota. I know, personally, many of the principal people involved with the development of the project and believe that they would not be involved with a project that would jeopardize the very environment in which they live – and more importantly, where I live; a stone’s throw from the St Louis River, upon whose headwaters the project will be located. I am writing in support of the environmental review process in place that is evaluating the project, ensuring that the project will comply with existing regulations. Minnesota, for many years, has been a leader in protecting its environment. I have found the SDEIS process, although lengthy, to be a sound and detailed process, based upon scientific principles and not prone to political maneuvering. I think the people of Minnesota should rest assured that their environment will be protected. Many opponents of the project have used the transgressions of previous mining ventures in other locations to impugn the reputation of both PolyMet and the regulating agencies. I am confident that the agencies will evaluate this project on its merits alone, and not engage in “punishing the son for the sins of the father” or finding it guilty by association to secondary parties. We, as a society, have learned from past mistakes, and are technically more sophisticated than 50 or 100 years ago. The technologies proposed in the project will allow us, as a society, to have the minerals we need, and protect our environment. I wanted to comment a bit on the economics of PolyMet to the region. I realize that this is not pertinent to the SDEIS or the work of the agencies. However, given what I have seen in the public hearings regarding this project, it is evident that the topic is important to others who may have some sway going forward. Much has been made of the boom and bust cycle of mining, and it has been put forth as a reason not to do more of it in northern Minnesota. I think it’s important to remember that all industries experience this issue. We have seen it in housing just recently. We have seen it in autos and steel and other manufacturing over the past 30 years. The Twin Cities area was, at one time, a hub of milling, railroads and farm implement manufacturing. Industries that faced decline and replaced with high-tech and medical. Yet, I would venture to guess if someone like John Deere wanted to place a facility there and employ 400 people the people of the Twin Cities wouldn’t tell them, “No thanks, we’ve experienced this boom and bust before – not interested”. The Iron Range is first, and foremost, a mining district. Its location and small population does not support a vibrant service economy or service industries, which can be done anywhere and tend to gravitate to large population centers with amenities. Tourism has been put forth as a way to diversify the economy, but wages and benefits in this industry pale in comparison to the compensation in the mining sector. A person with a mining career will easily make above \$50,000/year with full benefits. I seriously doubt that most people in tourism are making this. No resort owner can afford to pay someone that kind of money to bring out breakfast or change the bed sheets. I was an employee at LTV when it closed in 2001- I was fortunate to land in a comparable career. Most of my co-workers were not so lucky. And I can tell you they were not excited about their financial future as they investigated employment in the area outside of mining. Diversification is an admirable goal, but not at the exclusion of present economic realities. PolyMet is presenting the area with the opportunity for 350 living wage jobs. The very sort of jobs the country has been talking about and looking for. I realize this is an environmental issue at this point. But it should not be forgotten that there are people in this and people matter.

Robert Nobrega

40824

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Robert Nobrega 441 Montana Ave Davenport, FL 33897-5627 (401) 521-7171

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Puls

41603

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Robert Puls 133 3rd Ave SW Apt 616 Hutchinson, MN 55350-2471 (320) 587-8055

Robert Risch

44099

One of the biggest concerns that I personally have with the PolyMet proposal relates to sulfide mining's real potential to create long term pollution as waste materials are exposed to water over the years. This will happen both from rain water and from the mine being located in an extremely high, water-rich environment. Financial assurances, to deal with this long term reality, would have to extend beyond the lifetime of anyone alive today. To my knowledge, no financial assurance, of this open ended duration, by a corporation, has ever been enacted and/or is still successfully being carried out. To believe that Glencore / PolyMet would be the first corporation to stand behind their financial commitment, beyond their abandonment of their active mining, is but wishful thinking. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Robert Risch 2870 Hwy 61 Two Harbors, Minnesota 55616 218-348-6284

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Rodenz

16830

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Rodenz 150 5th Ave SE, Apt 4 Spring Grove, MN 55974

50164

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Rodenz 150 5th Ave SE, Apt 4 Spring Grove, MN 55974

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Rydell

16215

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Schmitz

16653

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Schmitz 7961 15th St N Oakdale, MN 55128

50036

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Schmitz 7961 15th St N Oakdale, MN 55128

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Schmitz

50037

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Robert Schmitz 7961 15th St N Oakdale, MN 55128

Robert Sothern

38720

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Robert Sothern 1903 Selby Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-5945 (651) 644-5438

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Stevens

16722

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Stevens 4267 diamond dr eagan, MN 55122

50086

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Robert Stevens 4267 diamond dr eagan, MN 55122

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Stodola 54835

See attachment

Robert Tammen 54840

See attachment

Robert Taylor 41945

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Robert Taylor Saint Paul, Minnesota

Robert Thomas 3452

I encourage you to prevent the Poly Met mining operation. Damage to the water and the soil and the atmosphere would result from this type of mining. Its impact on the environment would be catastrophic and the cost of the damage would be extremely high. Theodor Thomas 20 Exchange St E, Apt A1107 St Paul MN 55101-5228

Robert Tipping 43010

Comments on the Northmet SDEIS are in the attached document and copied in this email. Sincerely, Bob Robert G. Tipping 1837 Berkeley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105 With regard to saline groundwater, the SDEIS states "The concern for the NorthMet Project Proposed Action is whether excavation of the East Pit and West Pit could penetrate zones of saline or briny groundwater or otherwise draw these waters to the surface, thereby increasing the salinity of the West Pit water, which is proposed for treatment at the WWTF" (SDEIS 5-113). While the impact of saline water on the chemistry of the mine pit is a concern, the presence of saline water has broader implications regarding the modeling characterization of the Duluth Complex in the SDEIS as a homogeneous low-permeability hydrogeologic unit. Saline water often is encountered at depths greater than the proposed mine pit depth throughout the Canadian Shield. It is also known to occur near the land surface in areas where structural and hydraulic conditions allow for it. In Minnesota, this occurs in places along the North Shore, but also has been found within the Arrowhead interior along contacts between intrusive (dikes) and host rocks, and in or near contacts between rock units. Measured chloride concentration in water samples is a good tool for identifying saline waters; near-surface waters have concentrations typically less than 10 mg/L. Concentrations above this level, even as low as 50 mg/L can indicate some admixture of saline water. Comparing the ratio of chloride to bromide in water can help distinguish between higher chloride concentrations due to some contribution from a saline source, and chloride from anthropogenic sources. The conceptual hydrogeologic model presented in the SDEIS of the mine, plant and tailings basin site, particularly with regard to solute transport, would be improved with an inventory of chloride to bromide ratios for surface water and groundwater. This inventory should include sampling from discrete intervals in long open holes. Elevated chloride concentrations have been encountered in both groundwater and surface water at and near the site (SDEIS 5-113; Barr, 1976). The presence of some admixture of these waters in the near surface (less than 500 feet) indicates there may be hydraulically active fractures in the bedrock.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Tomassoni

18259

I am Robert Tomassoni from Virginia, Minnesota. I'm formerly from Eveleth and a lifelong Iron Ranger. I worked for United States Steel for over 35 years and have seen unbelievable changes in those years. I am proud of my mining past and understand and know the history of the Iron Range and mining. I know what we can do and what we can't do. I consider myself an environmentalist. I believe in protecting and safeguarding our environment. I have read the Environmental Impact Study and truly believe in my mind, heart and soul that we can mine these precious minerals in a safe and environmentally sound manner. The other part of my comment is to tell you about the men and women that work for PolyMet. I have worked with a majority of them. Joe Scipioni, Jim Tieberg, Paul Brunfelt, Dave Draves, Latisha Gitzen and the DeVaneys. They are all professional, dedicated, hard-working individuals that I have known and trust. They are second, third and fourth generation Iron Ranger and miners. They are honest people with high integrity that I fully trust and respect. These same people are the leaders and pillars in our communities that live on the Iron Range. They are raising their children and grandchildren on the Iron Range. They love northern Minnesota. I know they would never do anything to endanger our environment and the wonderful way of life in northeastern Minnesota. The PolyMet plan is built on the latest science, mechanics and world-class engineering. We can build a world-class mining facility in northern Minnesota. We can mine copper, nickel, gold, and other precious metals better than anyone else in the world and we can do it safely and in an environmentally friendly manner. Help Minnesota grow. Help the Iron Range grow good paying jobs for future generations of miners. Help make PolyMet a reality. Go PolyMet. Thank you.

58158

I worked for US Steel for over 35 years! I know mining as a wage employee and as a manager. I've seen unbelievable changes in those years. All for the better for workers and the environment. I've read the EIS and believe with our caveat knowledge which includes Engineering in all degrees of Engineering! I consider myself an environmentalist. I believe in protecting and safe guarding our environment. We have the knowledge and know how. The experts have reviewed this permit and we can do this properly. Enough is enough. Let's move forward to protect our country, to create good paying jobs while mining these minerals in a safe and environmentally safe mine. We can do this right. We are a world class mining operation at Polymet.

Robert Topliff

9497

Dear Lisa Fay: As someone who has always appreciated the environment that we are blessed with here in Northern Minnesota, I am most concerned about losing that, should things go wrong with the Polymet and other possible projects. We share the Great Lakes with all of our neighbors, and do not have the right to contaminate any of them, nor the surrounding waterways. Without usable water for human consumption, we are nothing, and the economy is worthless. Unfortunately, history does NOT show these types of projects in a good, non damaging light. This is why we look with a critical eye, and are not so easily buying their promises, which in the past have been broken, and the areas left to try and clean up the damage. Lake Superior is sacred, and we cannot take the risk of contamination again. Thank you for your consideration. I hope and trust that the DNR will consider these points. Sincerely, Faye A. Topliff

9504

Dear Lisa Fay, As a native of Minnesota (over 70 Years), and having traveled extensively, I have grown to appreciate what we have in Minnesota, a better environment than a lot of other places. I have worked with others to correct the Silver Bay Taconite tailings in the lake issue and other regrettable environmental fiascoes in other parts of our country and World Wide. I would ask you and the rest of the DNR personnel who are working on this issue to consider the following. "What if we are WRONG on this issue." "What if any damage is catastrophic and CANNOT be corrected or reversed." What ever is done here affects everything downstream. Consider the Mississippi rivers change from the Headwaters down. Final comment, we need clean water and clean air to survive. Sincerely, Robert D. Topliff

54149

I do NOT! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert W Trevis

4710

Although I am personally environmentally oriented, I am not opposed to the PolyMet mining plans, so long as there is continuous oversight by State of Minnesota employees during construction of any retention/holding water bodies, as well as continued inspection/oversight on a weekly basis so long as the mine operates. Due diligence on the state's part should allow the northeast region of the state to recover somewhat economically. Thank you. Robert W. Trevis Eagan, MN

Robert Walker

18218

My name is Robert Walker, and I live in Oakdale and I've been a resident of Minnesota for the past 40 years, and one of the resources we have in this state is very valuable and is becoming more valuable through the world is relatively clean water. Lake Superior is the largest body of fresh water in the world, and we need to protect that water, and the way we can do that is to make sure that we develop our economy in ways that will not pollute that water, and there hasn't been a sulfide mine anywhere that hasn't had the problems that so many others have spoken about here, tonight, and I think it really -- the SDEIS addresses some things and points out things that are an issue, but it doesn't give solutions in there. Treating the water for 500 years? That's not a realistic possibility, and we need to be assured ahead of time that anything of this nature will not pollute that lake and the other waters in that area because water is something we cannot live without. That's all I have. Thank you.

Robert Walsh

16177

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robert Warhol

16264

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Robert Watson

13597

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, More industrial pollution of our environment is not the answer. Clean water is not a negotiable commodity. Just look at the disaster in West Virginia. People may want the "benefits" they believe that come from certain industries but the damage can be very long term and costly in terms of clean up, if at all possible. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Sincerely, Mr Robert Watson 3501 Marwick Dr Plano, TX 75075-6224

Alphabetical by sender's first name

roberta cassidy

16496

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, roberta cassidy 3405 west 49th street minneapolis, MN 55410

49955

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, roberta cassidy 3405 west 49th street minneapolis, MN 55410

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roberta Dale

57963

Though a few jobs will be gained in the short term, the long term consequences for water quality and wildlife are far more critical issues. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Roberta E. Newman

40408

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Roberta E. Newman 300 Monte Vista Ave Mill Valley, CA 94941 USA

Roberta Haskin

40017

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Roberta Haskin 9641 Vincent Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55431-2458 (952) 836-6586

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roberta Hodgdon

16134

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Roberta Mistretta

19945

Hasn't history taught money hungry grabbers that this is the ONLY home we hAve This will RUIN our ground waters, you KNOW it but continue to PRETEND there is nothing to be concerned about. I thought Minnesota was better than that. Roberta Mistretta 3954 Maple Drive Barnum, Mn 55707 _____ HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>"avaSt Antivirus protection is active. _____ HYPERLINK "<http://www-netzero-net/.refcd=NZINTISP0512T4GOUT2>"Fast, Secure, NetZero 4G Mobile Broadband. Try it.

Roberta Nye

35280

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I am concerned about this project's potential impacts on the Great Lakes region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Deny any such permission to mine in this area. Sincerely, Roberta Nye 6239 S Nashville Ave Chicago, IL 60638-4111 (773) 586-0000

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roberta Otto 54748

See attachment

Roberta Ryan 44692

Hello. I've been exploring the mining proposal as a project for one of my college classes. After reviewing much of the available information, I'm vehemently opposed to the project. While economics are important, this endeavor simply isn't worth the possible risks. No matter how tight regulations are or how careful everyone is, it's impossible to control everything all of the time. I'm not willing to gamble Minnesota's wildlands for profit and prosperity. I hope the state isn't, either. A heartfelt thank you to those taking the time to review these comments. You are very much appreciated. Roberta Ryan 310 139th Ave NW Andover, MN 55304

Roberta Tietge 42688

See attachment

Robin Bunney 9592

After attending open houses in Duluth and Aurora, I support this project, as well as the process that got us to this point. The information tables really helped put the process into layman terms I was impressed by the depth of research. This project should move forward Those who feel more time is needed to understand project, should have taken the time to go, listen, read and be truly informed. We can, and will do this right. Scott M. Bunney 2445 Echo Trail Ely, MN 55731 218-410-2219

Robin Grinnell 40164

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according to the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr Robin Grinnell 211 Woodhaven Ln Mankato, MN 56001-5786 (507) 934-0916

Alphabetical by sender's first name

robin hensel

12947

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

robin hensel

17099

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, robin hensel 807 first st s e little falls, MN 56345

50369

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, robin hensel 807 first st s e little falls, MN 56345

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robin Peterson 54511

What measures will be taken to assure that wildlife, both aquatic and land animals will not be exposed to the by products of this mining process? Mercury, sulfur, etc!

Robin Poppe 38906

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Robin Poppe 3249 Sandy Pines Rd Barnum, MN 55707-8766

42769

See attachment

Robin Raplinger 40459

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. The Cooperating agencies have been correct, as one co-lead agency MDRN now recognizes, in their objection to relying on the deficient and misleading reliance on XP-SWMM model used to extrapolate flow data. This model is flawed, as direct observation shows. The SDEIS must be reworked and revised concerning this aspect. Sincerely yours, Robin Raplinger 916 17th St N Virginia, MN, MN 55792

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robin Raplinger

43019

Greetings, Please find attached my comments on the PolyMet SDEIS. Robin Raplinger 916 17th StN Virginia,MN 55792 218-741-3569

45883

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. I am not against mining. I am not against construction jobs. I am against tax payers funding cleanup costs of corporations. The proposed PolyMet project's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) tells that mechanical water treatment is part of the modeled project and that it is to last 200 years for the for the mine site and 500 years for the plant site. They are uncertain how long this water treatment would actually be needed, but it is stated that "PolyMet would be held accountable to maintenance and monitoring required under the permit and would not be released until all conditions have been met." SDEIS 3-2-2-3-12 or p.3-124 (SDEIS pdf p. 285) In a following section 3-2-2-4 Financial Assurance, it is explained that "financial assurance instruments covering the estimated cost of reclamation" is required. An estimation of 120-170 million dollars at closure and 3-5-6 million dollars per year after closure. All of the hundreds of millions of dollars of financial assurance are to be fully valid, binding, and enforceable under state and federal law and not be dischargeable through bankruptcy. How could such an estimate of costs ever be accurate and guaranteed for 200-500 years or more. We have no idea what changes in law and the economy could take place in 200-500 years. PolyMet does not have the resources to guarantee those immense liabilities and could be described as a "shell corporation" when the major investors, including Glencore, enjoy that protection. What this proposal asks you to accept is 20 yrs of 200-300 jobs and promise that PolyMet will fund everything for 200-500 yrs. Could anybody believe PolyMet or their "financial assurance" will be around hundreds of years after the mine operation, and its value, is gone. This externality, the cost of reclamation as well as health and environmental degradation, will likely be borne by future generations and their grandchildren, great grandchildren and so on for many generations if proper steps are not taken now. Please require Glencore is liable through written documentation to the same degree , reference in the above paragraphs, as Polymet. . Sincerely, Mr Robin Raplinger 916 17th St N Virginia, MN 55792-2137

Robin Stark

5969

I attended the first of three hearings that are set up to address the EIS for the Polymet Project. I stand behind and trust the state and federal agencies that are involved in preparing this document. We all know how strict the state of MN is. I am concerned about our environment, who isn't. I, however, do know a few of the people who are instrumental in this project, and they themselves have families to be concerned about. I believe and trust that they themselves would not support this project if they felt their future families would be hurt. We need the jobs, the economic growth, and spin offs from this project. I say let's go forward and permit this project. - Robin Stark, Realtor, Licensed in Minnesota Village Realty Inc. 4325 E 9th Ave Hibbing, MN 55746 218-263-8877 HYPERLINK "<http://www.villagerealty.us>"www.villagerealty.us Robin's cell 218-969-4048

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Robin Vora

21380

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the PolyMet NorthMet Mining Project and the associated Land Exchange. I own properties outside Aurora and Ely, Minnesota that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposal. No mitigation or pollution control measures are perfect. My property on the St Louis River may be directly impacted by any water pollution. First of all, I don't believe the short-term economic benefits, including possibly increased valuation of my property near Aurora, justify the potential long-term adverse impacts to the environment. I am not convinced that over time water quality will be protected. Increased aluminum, lead, mercury, copper, cobalt, nickel and sulfate concentrations in wetlands, including lakes, rivers and groundwater are unacceptable. Besides damage to water quality, the project would result in: net loss of forest, natural wetlands, and wildlife habitat; direct harm to rare plants and their habitats; loss of areas of high biodiversity significance, reduced carbon sequestration and increased carbon emissions; and air pollution. The EIS does not address mitigation of reduction of lands available to tribal members to hunt, fish and gather, or how adverse environmental effects may be exacerbated by potential climate change. It is unlikely that proposed mitigation measures will be 100% effective. The long-term public benefit of these lands would be reduced significantly by this project. The amounts of insurance and the reclamation bond are inadequate. The mining company must have sufficient insurance and a large enough bond to cover all potential accidents, repairs, insufficient mitigations measures, and site restoration when mining is completed. The EIS has an inadequate range of alternatives. There must be other practical alternatives that reduce impacts on wetlands, forests, and wildlife habitats. The proposed land exchange with the Superior National Forest is not fair to the taxpayer or the resource. Besides contributing to the environmental problems I list above, a near 1:1 land exchange is not justified. Lands used for mining are worth far more in dollars than forest lands. Government policies require land exchanges be of lands of equal value, not equal area. The EIS needs to include a real and comprehensive economic analysis of land values. The Superior National Forest should gain many more acres from the land exchange than proposed or the mining project should be reduced significantly in size if transferring only 6,722 acres from private to public ownership. For example, I recall a land exchange in the 1990s in which LTV Mining provided the US Forest Service with about 5,000 acres in exchange for 40 acres within the LTV mine. The proposed PolyMet land exchange does not serve the public interest. I urge the federal and state authorities to reject the EIS and the project. If an unfortunate decision is made to go ahead with the project, it must include a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan that focuses on the environmental concerns I listed and has trigger points to halt or shut down the project when environmental consequences become unacceptable by exceeding prescribed thresholds. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Robin Vora 1679 NE Daphne Dr Bend, OR 97701

Robyn Dochterman

40016

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Robyn Dochterman 16277 Quality Trl N Scandia, MN 55073-9723

Rod Fisher

42273

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I have been in and around the BWCA many times. I am a chemical engineer that understands the potential economic value and potential environmental costs of such operations. This is simply not worth the risk to such an important region. Please reject the polymet mine. Sincerely, Dr Rod Fisher 16820 S Shore Ln Eden Prairie, MN 55346-3639 (952) 913-8095

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rodd Ringquist

16117

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Rodger and Kathryn Ringham

43008

Attached are my comments. Thank you, Rodger Ringham Minneapolis and Lutsen

Rodger F Ringham

54512

See attachment

Rodney Bleifuss

46884

Just say "NO". There is no way to justify this development based on current studies. The potential environmental impacts simply outweigh the economic benefits to Minnesotans. Meredith G. Bleifuss 20839 North Mishawaka Shores Drive Grand Rapids, MN 55744 218-326-4282

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rodney Monson 20172

I have lived in the Duluth area all of my life, 73 years. As I travel around the country and see all of the economic expansion, new businesses, new buildings, new housing, new schools and new roads being built. I wonder why is it that in all my years living in Minnesota, I have never seen that kind of prosperity and economic progress. I am in favor of the Poly Met Mining project becoming a reality. What an opportunity for the State of Minnesota to show us Minnesotans and the rest of the country that we are indeed interested in bring good pay jobs to our State. If the Poly Met Mining project it is rejected, I will most definitely have the answer to my question. Rodney Monson 4313 Lavaque Road Hermantown, MN 55811

Rodney Olsen 57281

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

Roger A Morrison 52295

Roger Morrison 2900 14th Street SE Austin, Minnesota 55912 March 12, 2014 To: NorthMetSDEIS.dnr (HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) As a lover of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area (BWCA), I have made many trips to the BWCA to canoe, fish and be in the most beautiful natural environment that I have encountered. I think what impressive me the most is the lack of motorized transport in this area, it makes it pristine like no other place I have been. Know this is a fragile ecosystem I am worried about the possible impact on the BWCA posed by mine drainage at the PolyMet's NorthMet project. The data I have reviewed from PolyMet's shows that water that will be discharged from the project site would not enter the BWCA lakes or streams In my review of the government maps of this area it shows a need to determine the actual effect of mine drainage into the waterways on the edge of the Boundary Waters. The proposed mine site is uphill from the One Hundred Mile Swamp, which drains into the BWCA watershed. There is a lack of testing and research to on the part of PolyMet to show that water entering One Hundred Mile Swamp will not then flow into Rainy Lake and the BWCA watershed. This is evident by the authors of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) using incorrect maps which contradict the government maps along with omitting sections of the One Hundred Mile Swamp. I also have concerns that there is little or no assurance that PolyMet LLC has the financial resources to ensure that any damage done to the environment will be adequately and properly cleaned up. For these reasons I think that PolyMet needs to complete a new SDEIS using the correct maps and the project should not be allowed to progress until the new information can be reviewed. Additionally PolyMet must ensure they are completely vested in all cleanup related cost if there were to be some accident or issue. Very Respectfully, Roger Morrison LTC Roger A. Morrison 11th BN 95th RGT OES Work: 507 437 - 5768 Cell: 507 219 - 8194 AKO: HYPERLINK "mailto:roger.a.morrison4-mil@mail.mil"roger.a.morrison4-mil@mail.mil work: HYPERLINK "mailto:ramorrison@hormel-com"ramorrison@hormel-com

Roger and Maxene Linehan 54662

See attachment

Roger B Carlson 10312

I support mining in NE Minnesota When I was a child the mines were booming, lots of work for everybody. Now the Range does not have enough jobs to keep the young people in the area and culture they know and love. Keep the Range unique and safe and healthy and prosperous, Minnesota too. Go forward with the proposed Polymet Mine If the minerals are not taken now it seems to me that some future generations will Have to extract the mineral so why now., why not us. If Science can land a satellite on a Comet Science should be able to keep the water clean Roger B Carlson 14072 Dellwood Road Stillwater MN 55082 651 271 9116 or Box 682 Eveleth MN 55734

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Bergh 42585

See attachment

Roger Clemence 57956

The contamination will last forever (if the past tells us anything). Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Roger Dahlin 47181

Mar 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. As a harvester of wild rice for more than thirty years, I have personally observed the sensitivity of that species to changes in water conditions. Research has demonstrated that wild rice is negatively affected by even mildly elevated levels of sulfide in the waters in which it grows. The region surrounding the proposed PolyMet mine has many lakes and streams in which wild rice forms the basis for rich aquatic ecosystems and provides an important food source for many waterfowl, including swans, geese, and several species of ducks. Significant damage to stands of wild rice in this area would profoundly impoverish habitat for many other species, constituting a tragic diminution of biological diversity. Aside from the environmental damage which would occur as a result of harm to wild rice, there is a notable cultural consideration to be made. Native Americans living in areas where wild rice grows have for many centuries harvested and eaten it. After being parched and hulled, the grain keeps for long periods of time, which makes it an important food for surviving long northern winters. The harvesting and processing of wild rice has long been integral to the hunting/gathering culture of northern woodlands tribes. Many continue to practice it, as do other Minnesota residents. The potential for damage to this natural crop represents a threat to both native cultures and natural harvest traditions of many others. I am not satisfied by assertions that water polluted by the proposed mining will be treated to meet strict quality standards. Such assurances mean nothing when something goes wrong and contamination spreads. Such things do happen. I'm not willing, without much more convincing evidence that any such accident will be immediately contained and its effects negated, to tolerate the risks to our environment and heritage that an open pit sulfide mine would bring to northern Minnesota. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Roger Dahlin 1533 Gilmore Valley Rd Winona, MN 55987-7610

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Dahlin

48567

Mar 12, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. As a harvester of wild rice for more than thirty years, I have personally observed the sensitivity of that species to changes in water conditions. Research has demonstrated that wild rice is negatively affected by even mildly elevated levels of sulfide in the waters in which it grows. The region surrounding the proposed PolyMet mine has many lakes and streams in which wild rice forms the basis for rich aquatic ecosystems and provides an important food source for many waterfowl, including swans, geese, and several species of ducks. Significant damage to stands of wild rice in this area would profoundly impoverish habitat for many other species, constituting a tragic diminution of biological diversity. Aside from the environmental damage which would occur as a result of harm to wild rice, there is a notable cultural consideration to be made. Native Americans living in areas where wild rice grows have for many centuries harvested and eaten it. After being parched and hulled, the grain keeps for long periods of time, which makes it an important food for surviving long northern winters. The harvesting and processing of wild rice has long been integral to the hunting/gathering culture of northern woodlands tribes. Many continue to practice it, as do other Minnesota residents. The potential for damage to this natural crop represents a threat to both native cultures and natural harvest traditions of many others. I am not satisfied by assertions that water polluted by the proposed mining will be treated to meet strict quality standards. Such assurances mean nothing when something goes wrong and contamination spreads. Such things do happen. I'm not willing, without much more convincing evidence that any such accident will be immediately contained and its effects negated, to tolerate the risks to our environment and heritage that an open pit sulfide mine would bring to northern Minnesota. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Roger Dahlin 1533 Gilmore Valley Rd Winona, MN 55987-7610

Roger F Heegaard

54793

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Garton

21699

Mar 5, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Not only does the proposed PolyMet mining project present serious environmental risks to the ground water and overall ecosystems of the northeast part of Minnesota, this project will increase the amount of pollution that is added to our atmosphere through coal generated electric consumption. In addition to securities and protections for Minnesota's ground water and ecosystems that are in jeopardy as a result of this project, PolyMet should be required to present a means for offsetting all of the additional coal generated electricity that they will consume. This means could be through contribution to the Conservation Improvement Program (CIP) fund, or through direct deployment of renewable energy generation such as solar or wind power. We must insure that this project is in the best interest for all of Minnesota before it is allowed to move forward Letting a small few compromise the natural beauty and ecosystems of our state for their personal profits and leaving the tax payers holding the bill for the cleanup efforts is not an option. Please consider all aspects of this project and how it will impact Minnesota in the coming centuries. Sincerely, Mr Roger Garton 33650 190th St Akeley, MN 56433-8448

Roger Heegaard

40672

To whom it may concern, I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the Polymet Mine project. Sincerely, Roger W. Heegaard President Enova Illumination 1839 Buerkle Rd Saint Paul, Minnesota 55110 Office: 651-236-8859 Mobile: 612-205-2226

Roger Hiller

40825

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Please protect our wilderness area and our waters. We have heard before, the promises of containment, and we know from experience what happens. Sincerely, Mr Roger Hiller 1794 Van Buren Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-1731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Johnston

16098

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Roger Klisch

15352

Dear DNR, As a citizen of Minnesota who uses the BWCA annually, I am opposed to mining in the area. We need to keep what little is left of the natural world pristine and available for wilderness experience. We cannot put our water resources at risk, as this mining operation would surely do. Thank You, Roger Klisch 1180 Norell Ave Stillwater, MN 55082

Roger Meyer

47301

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The environmental impact of the mine and the long term economic impact of such an operation require that the PolyMet mine not be allowed. The current and future citizens of Minnesota have the right to clean water and a sustainable economy. The extraction of resources will cause environmental damage during extraction and leave the citizens of Minnesota monitoring and/or cleaning up the site for centuries after operations cease. This has not been proven to be possible for the duration required by this mining operation. The short-term economic gain from this project does not come close to off-setting the short-term environmental impact and the long-term risk. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Roger Meyer 1692 Dayton Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-6104

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Murawski 2258

From: Motel Ely [mailto:info@motelely-com] Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:19 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Yes to mining Ms Fay, I received an email from the Friends of the Boundary Waters asking me to send an email against mining. They are claiming 20 years of mining and 500 years of clean up. I believe they are full of BS. We are in total agreement to mine and believe we can have both, clean water and jobs. We are dying up here. I don't understand why they think they know more than the experts. People will follow anyone if they are spewing what they want to hear. Thanks, Deb Roger and Debra Murawski Motel Ely – Budget Host 1047 E. Sheridan St Ely, MN 55731 p: 218-365-3237 f: 218-365-3099 e: HYPERLINK "mailto:info@motelely-com"info@motelely-com w: HYPERLINK "http://www.motelely-com/"www.motelely-com

Roger Skraba 18311

Roger Skraba, S-K-R-A-B-A, Slovenian, from Ely, Minnesota. I rise in support of this SDEIS. And I do that as a wilderness guide that makes my living in the wilderness. I need that in order to survive in Minnesota because there's so many jobs here. Not. What I want to speak to about the tourism, because we've always gotten along and we always will get along, we just have to tolerate each other. And as mayor of Ely I used to have to listen to both sides and come to a decision. And if I pick one side and say, "The anti-mining people are absolutely correct and the mining people are wrong," I'm wrong. You have to look at it from both sides. There is a solution. And one of the solutions is -- and I think all of us here -- and I appreciate what this document is, is a science document. I don't have the knowledge to make these decisions that regulatory agencies do. I'm trusting them. If they come out and say "It can't be done. The numbers can't prove it." Then it can't be done. And we'll wait for another day when people are smarter and there's another process. As of right now the process that they applied for and are being scrutinized on, if it happens, it happens. It's not something that our passions can make it happen either way. The science is going to solve this problem and we have to trust that science. And I trust the process. Whether it supports my beliefs or not, that's here nor there. But as a wilderness fishing guide, I am not concerned. I trust that the mining, when it happens, is going to be done properly. And if it's not, then I'm out of a job. So I rise in support. One issue -- the other thing I wanted to discuss a little bit was the mercury content. The number is 1.3 nanograms. And one of the concerns I have about that is -- again former mayor -- we have a wastewater treatment plant and we have to be concerned about our mercury that we put into the water. And I'm always kind of wondering about the stuff in the air. How do we measure that it comes from foreign countries or from ourselves? And how does that go into this EIS? And I didn't catch it all. I don't know how that is measured. But I think we need to all look at that. And if guys already did the math on it and did the science, I appreciate that. It's something that I'm concerned about. That maybe the standards that we set for ourselves are so high that it's not attainable. And I'm not saying that we should allow mercury. I'm saying we need to look at where is the point source. If it is coming from the air, then we have to take that into account and not just the point source. I truly believe that the process that we're going through right now is something that I can support. And I hope we all can get together and find a common thread for all of us. Thank you.

Roger Strand 7352

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade. Not surprisingly for this type of mine, the PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. Just for openers, it fails to adequately address dangers to workers' health and to the citizens of the affected area who look to our State Agency leaders to protect the source of their drinking water. I'm a retired physician. I was born, raised, and spent nearly all of my working life in Minnesota. It is my chosen water-filled habitat. I just read a news article about a serious local drinking water problem in West Virginia. It is apparently just one of a long list of health problems in that state which can easily be traced to a long-standing culture of lax pollution control of industry and mining operations. Well, this is not West Virginia. I like to believe that we, our children and our grandchildren can expect better treatment from our elected and appointed leaders in Minnesota. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny the permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Roger W. Strand, M.D. Roger Strand 20901 Hwy 71 NE New London, MN 56273

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roger Thoma 42046

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I am a resident of Ohio and I am concerned about the possibility of increased open pit mining in the Minnesota area, specifically the plans for the PolyMet project. I have worked in the environmental field for over 30 years as a fisheries biologist for the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) in the capacity of Environmental Scientist. Most of my work for OEPA focused on environmental quality in Lake Erie where I studied the Lake's fish communities and the impacts of pollutants on their structure, physical health, and tissue contamination. I have since retired. In Ohio we endeavored to reduce the levels of contaminants in our fishes for many years, requiring dischargers of mercury to reduce and eliminate any mercury in their effluents and air releases. We have a long way yet to go. Currently all fish species in all waters of the State are listed for consumption restrictions due to the pervasive nature of mercury pollution in our area. This pervasive condition is the result of air deposition derived from air discharges in states west of Ohio, such as Minnesota. It will not be possible for Ohio to meet the requirements of the USEPA as long as air born mercury is transported to our state. As long as such conditions continue Ohio will be in Non Compliance for all of its waters. This is, as you know, a violation of law. It is my understanding from a review of available information that the state of Minnesota has not yet established compliance with its mercury discharge regulations and that many of its mining operations are exceeding their permit limits for mercury. For Ohio this is an unacceptable proposition. Minnesota is contributing to the damage of Ohio's environment and disenfranchisement of its people to clean waters and edible fish as required by the Clean Water Act and its legal permutations. As part of my duties at OEPA I participated in the International Joint Commission's (IJC) Lake Erie LaMP process as a member of the Ecosystems Objectives subcommittee. Our subcommittee clearly indicated that tissue contamination in Lake Erie's fish community has to be eliminated and that a zero discharge of toxic chemicals and tissue contaminating materials be achieved. The activities of Minnesota, by failing to enforce its own laws, is a clear violation of the objectives put forth by the IJC. Minnesota is a member of the IJC and has agreed to cooperate with the other members in achieving their goals. For these reasons I am requesting the state of Minnesota place a moratorium on all future permits requested in your state until full compliance with mercury discharge regulations is achieved. I specifically request the permit for the PolyMet open pit mine not be approved. Sincerely yours, Roger Thoma 3015 Creekside Dr Westlake, OH 44145

Rolf Carlsen 45432

Hello. Please add me to the long list of those who think this mining proposal is not in the long term interests of any MN resident. It is a short-sighted proposal with huge long-term problems for the residents of this state. Thanks for listening - I hope you make the right decision and stop this proposal in its tracks. Rolf Carlsen

Roma Leuty 7207

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would end up like the Reserve Mining debacle that we had to deal with. It took years to stop the dumping of tailings in Lake Superior. This mine has the potential to be much serious. STOP the rape of our environment. Roma Leuty 161 Ave NW Andover, MN 55304 763 434 3295

Rome Hutchings 10918

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not ever be built. Sincerely, Mr Rome Hutchings 13633 Ferman Ave NW Clearwater, MN 55320-6125 (763) 878-1694

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rome Hutchings

24395

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rome Hutchings 13633 Ferman Avenue NW Clearwater, MN 55320

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rome Hutchings

40810

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rome Hutchings

49515

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Rome Hutchings 13633 Ferman Avenue NW Clearwater, MN 55320

Romola Newport

40404

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Romola Newport 5 Cardwell Street Greymouth, NZ 7802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Bergh 7346

I attended the Duluth meeting on 1-16-14- I was impressed with the thoroughness of the material presented. All of my questions were answered. The project has great merit and I feel the changes to the environment will not be harmful to the effect as to stop the project from proceeding. We need the plant and the good it will create. Thank you, Erick Bergh

15643

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Jodie Bergh Duluth,MN

15655

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented adequately addressed the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Quinten Rimolde, 4507 Kruger road, Duluth,MN 55811

15656

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Michael Bergh 424 EAST 9th St, Duluth,MN 55805

15657

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Mary Rimolde 4507 Kruger Rd Duluth,MN 55811

15658

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Randy Bergh 424 E 9th st, Duluth,MN 55805

15660

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Eric Bergh 715 N. 20th Ave west, Duluth,MN 55806

15661

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Edwyna Bergh, 114 N. 25th Ave West, Duluth,MN 55806

15664

I attended the meeting on polymet , I think the study and plans presented covered the environmental concerns. I hope the permits are issued soon so the people of MN can start reaping the benefits. A study should be made about the costs of all this delay. Kathy Bergh 114 N. 25th Ave West, Duluth,MN

42586

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Bergh 43712

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. State and federal regulations will ensure the measures and controls will protect the environment. Time and money is wasted with this long delay in allowing permits. The only winners are the lawyers and mining competition from other areas. Polymet is a win win for MN and the Nation. Delaying only wastes our money an resources. The biggest complainers are also some of the largest polluters.

Ron Brodigan 39798

March 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay; Our response to the PolyMet Draft Environmental Impact Statement is attached to this email. Respectfully, Ron and Judy Brodigan
1350 Snowshoe Trail Isabella, MN 55607 218-365-2126 Steve and Cindy Brodigan 2159 Brinker St Chanhassen, MN 55317 952-470-0072

Ron Deike 12056

Extraction industries routinely use bankruptcy to avoid obligations to fund environmental clean up. The example of Freedom Industries (supporting coal mining) in West Virginia is pertinent. Immediately after their chemical spill which fouled drinking water for hundreds of thousands, Freedom Industries declared bankruptcy and skipped out on Congressional hearings - completely irresponsible and completely predictable behavior. This is exactly the behavior we can expect from a copper miner in Minnesota. This project should not go forward because the state and the taxpayers will be stuck with the clean-up bills. Assurances from extraction industry companies are worthless as has been demonstrated time and time again. Ron Deike 792 26th ST NE Rochester MN 55906

Ron Dicklich 18156

My name is Jesse Johnson. J-E-S-S-E, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. Ironworkers Local 512. I cede my time to Ron Dicklich. RON DICKLICH: My name is Ron Dicklich, D as in "Don," I-C-K-L-I-C-H. I am executive director of Range Association Municipalities of the Schools. That's 25 cities, 15 school districts, and 10 townships in the taconite (inaudible). Right in the heart of where all the mining is taking place, which has taken place for 125 years. And we've already been mining in the Superior National Forest for 125 years. My organization represents that area. And we've been on record in support of this project in 2007 by saying that we were for a safe, scientific process that will create a project that meets the standards that are set in Minnesota statute. PolyMet Mining has never once come to try to change anything. And although it has taken a long time, and what has impressed me in all my years in public office is they have never come and tried to have anything changed. They may not be happy, but they just go and keep doing more. And actually the process has been good. This will be a very clean project because of the long process it's taken. We've always supported that. I've been a county commissioner. I've been a state senator. I've been the mayor. I've been a school board director. Always working with the companies to make sure the process worked. I went to the Minnesota Senate in 1981. Every taconite plant in Minnesota was built without an EIS. And we said that can't be right. As political leaders on the Iron Range, we worked together with our agencies, the agencies like the PCA and the DNR, which we totally trust with this process, to make mining and other industrial development safe. The environmentalists worked with us. I had 100 percent rating with the Sierra Club. Now they call me a polluter because I'm for a company that can meet the standards that we set. And as it turns out, they said that they were for clean development. That wasn't true. They're for no development. And they proved it by coming in on this project when it's very certain that this company can meet all those standards. And so I want to thank our agencies for working as hard as they did and for making the process as long as they can and covering, uncovering every aspect of this project. And just one last thing. When I talked to the environmentalists about the things that we would be mining for making our cell phones and everything else, I said, "So tell me, you would rather have these mined in countries that have no environmental protection?" And they go, "As long as it's not in my backyard." Shame on you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Holch 39851

Comments For The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the State and federal environmental review of the proposed PolyMet Mining Inc. project Dear Board Members, In my opinion, threatening permanent and pervasive damage to the Boundary Waters is tantamount to threatening the heart and soul of Minnesota. This is unconscionable but not the worst outcome this plan could cause. If you wanted to pollute the North American Continent, there is no better place to start than despoiling the area that is in question. That is because this proposed mining area sits at the beginning of three major continental watersheds: Mississippi drainage to the Gulf St Lawrence drainage to the Atlantic Hudson Bay drainage to the Arctic Ocean. Sulfides that leave here can pollute the lion's share of our nation and Canada with acid waters and leaching heavy metals for 500 years. Our oceans are already becoming more acidic every year. Is this a prudent way to provide 300 jobs for 20 years. Ron Holch <http://conscienceandcommons.blogspot.com/> _____ HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

Ron Lawrenz 18224

My name is Connie Grundhofer, G-R-U-N-D-H-O-F-E-R, and I'm giving my time to Ron Lawrenz. Good evening. My name is Ron Lawrenz, R-O-N, L-A-W-R-E-N-Z. I believe it was Yogi Berra who said, "It's like dij`vu all over again." We visited this and spent a great deal of money evaluating the potential to do copper-nickel mining as part of the environmental quality board's regional copper-nickel study back in the 1970s. I was a researcher for the DNR and hired to analyze plants and animal tissues as part of that larger study. Some of the issues are different, such as the impacts of smelting. And after all that time, we just witnessed the smelter-devastated landscape at a (inaudible) in Ontario. On the other hand, some of the concerns remain unchanged like the impact of sulfides mixed with water, what happens to the ecosystems in those conditions. I know technologies have changed, but I hope that someone has blown some dust off that old study and gone back to look at what we did back then, because we didn't mine copper-nickel after that study was done. I know part of that study (inaudible.) In the same context, my first job with the DNR has led to a 13-years career with the Fish and Wildlife Division. A good part of that was spent in the environment as environmental use specialist, DNR research coordinator and (inaudible.) I am trained and degreed in special biology and luminology and aquatic biology and a specialty in paleolimnology, which is using lake waters to look at the histories of lakes, so I've done a little historical work on lakes. I'm reminded of another favorite quote by Huxley, and it says, "Our only gauge for the future is studying the past." That reflection is of little comfort to the context of our current discussions, and I'm unaware, as many have pointed out, there's been a sulfide mining effort anywhere else that has not polluted the environment. That's my gauge for the future. Many of those issues linger today. I've seen mines on the Row River, gold mine, sulfide mines and they're still leaking today after 100 years. Thankfully, they're smaller than the mines proposed here. This debate has a very strong emotional component, and I understand the fight for jobs. I would argue that we need to focus on tangible issues; selling, trading land for fragments of lands in 900 places, trading wetlands, rather than unique ecosystems. Not understanding the hydrology. I did the hydrology on a lake up there, Thrush Lake, and let me tell you it was very difficult, if not impossible to understand the fragmented nature of the bedrock up there. I'm opposed to this project based on potential impacts, and I suggest that we not approve this EIS. Thank you.

42953

Dear Ms Fay, I have attached my comments concerning the NorthMet SDEIS. I would like to have them included as part of the comment record for this project. Thank you, Ronald William Lawrenz 5717 22nd Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55417 Phone: (651) 399-4385 E-mail HYPERLINK "<mailto:lawrenz@q-com>"lawrenz@q-com

Ron McGriff 13950

I have grave concerns about the proposed copper-nickel mining operation in NE Minnesota. All mining activity of whatever kind has some impact on the environment, human and animal species. I can not see any amount of "protective" or "repair" dollars that will be truly effective for an operation whose processes and waste have the potential to impact nature for 200 to 300 years. This proposal should be rejected for the health of our area and the planet. A relatively small number of long-term jobs can not justify it. Ron McGriff 3102 413th Ave NW Braham, MN 55006

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Miles

38457

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This open-pit sulfide mining proposal needs swift and categorical rejection because of its scientific short-sightedness and negative fundamental energy direction. It exists in conspicuous, diametric opposition to the expressed wishes of most Minnesotans and Americans, except for those profiteering industry corporados without environmental ethics and vision. Apparent local support is typically-, pneumatically-based on, and artificially-amplified by, the full pockets of deceptive speculation and empty promises of quick-boon, short-lived jobs - the stuff of politics, but not science.. Denying this proposal deserves bold Executive leadership in PUBLIC and environmental interests, leadership with the courage to avert projecting current ecocidal directions into our, and our progeny's, already-fragile future, Current public interest leaders' legacy for quality of life is defined by this decision. To not reverse known attendant directional consequences, including those further threatening global water inequities and accelerating climate degradation, in denial of facts totally underscored by ALL science beyond short-term economics, as well as by common observation, would be a dereliction of leadership and oversight of irreversible planetary consequences. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streaMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Miles

49128

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This open-pit sulfide mining proposal needs swift and categorical rejection because of its scientific short-sightedness and negative fundamental energy direction. It exists in conspicuous, diametric opposition to the expressed wishes of most Minnesotans and Americans, except for those profiteering industry corporados without environmental ethics and vision. Apparent local support is typically-, pneumatically-based on, and artificially-amplified by, the full pockets of deceptive speculation and empty promises of quick-boon, short-lived jobs - the stuff of politics, but not science.. Denying this proposal deserves bold Executive leadership in PUBLIC and environmental interests, leadership with the courage to avert projecting current ecocidal directions into our, and our progeny's, already-fragile future, Current public interest leaders' legacy for quality of life is defined by this decision. To not reverse known attendant directional consequences, including those further threatening global water inequities and accelerating climate degradation, in denial of facts totally underscored by ALL science beyond short-term economics, as well as by common observation, would be a dereliction of leadership and oversight of irreversible planetary consequences. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand

RON PETERSON

4013

“The emperor has no clothes.” The fact that no leaders, especially the DNR Leaders, Governor Dayton and our Congressmen and Senators, are not speaking out boldly against such an incredibly bad idea for the state of Minnesota and all it's citizens fits that description perfectly. Based on the facts this plan will: #1 Destroy thousands of acres of beautiful, sustainable forest – forever. #2 Create a relative few, hundreds, of direct jobs for Minnesotans which mostly will be the lower end of the pay spectrum for only a few decades. The highest end jobs come from outside the state and country. #3 Trade the value of Minnesotans or in other words OUR LAND, and mineral wealth of precious metals for a few decades of jobs while exporting the profits to foreign companies. #4 Billions of dollars, not to be under estimated, and State Expense of time for: A. Hearings and reviews B. Legal Work C. Monitoring, testing and Policing of the sites D. Cleanup and treatment of downstream and underground water from pollution and the cost of damage to fisheries E. State invested cost for road upgrades and maintenance F. Inevitable Litigation G. Loss of recreational attraction and jobs for the tourist industry H. The future loss of jobs and recreation of a local recession when production ends I. The greatest “ The theft of what we could have left for our grandchildren to enjoy and for their quality of life” For this we get a few hundred jobs over a short few decades - and endless damage. The American Indians were cheated and abused but they negotiated a better bargain than this. It's time for our leaders who work for all the citizens of the state not just a few, to realize the damage this will do and that they are without any clothes. Let them know, please. Ron Peterson 25736 Quinlan Ave Lindstrom, MN 55045

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Scherle 58185

My name is Ron Scherle. You want my statement. I am for PolyMet Mining to come here and stay here and to proceed forward. Yes, that's it. That's basically all. I think a person has to show when they come to these meetings how many people are for it and how many against it. And you will see the people for it far outnumber the people against.

Ron Shoden 42853

Dear Lisa: I am writing to you in regards to PolyMet Mining, Inc., NorthMet Project. Although I have not read the entire EIS, I have been following closely along with this project since the beginning. If the federal & state agencies are satisfied that PolyMet has complied or have exceeded with state & federal regulations pertaining to the EIS, and give their blessing, there is no reason why the Polymet Project should not proceed and begin the permitting process. I have attended most of the public comment period meetings and have also kept in close contact with PolyMet officials throughout these several years. PolyMet has worked very hard on the second EIS draft and I believe the draft is totally compliant. PolyMet employees and their investors have shown great patience over these many years and should be commended. Obviously, the economic impact PolyMet will have on local, state and even national levels will be tremendous and much needed as we continue to climb out of this recession. Finally, I know and trust Polymet officials; if they believed the project would have a negative impact on the environment, they would not proceed. Several officials have lived in the area their entire lives and raised their families. It is time to put our trust in the state and federal agencies who have worked extremely hard on this document. It's time to move forward and get the PolyMet Project producing!! Very Truly Yours, Ron Shoden General Manager Viking Explosives LLC 218-263-88456 x 303

Ron Sternal 18222

My name is Ron Sternal. I'm a third-generation Minnesotan, and a retired Wall Street executive. Sternal is spelled S-T-E-R-N-A-L. You've all heard that the -- Northern Minnesota's home to one of the largest copper deposits in the world. It's not. It doesn't even come close. At peak production, this mine will produce 72 million pounds per year. The largest copper mine in the United States, which doesn't even make the list of the top 10 mines in the world, is the Morenci Mine in Arizona and that produces 1 billion pounds a year or 13.8 times more than the mine -- proposed mine in Minnesota will. If the price of copper stays high, and currently it's dropping, the price is down 10 percent for the year and many analysts say the super cycle for copper is over and prices will be going lower, but if the price is right, the major benefit to be derived from the PolyMet project, besides the hoped-for financial return to its owners, are the hoped-for jobs it will produce. The public discussions over the last few weeks have established if the mine is built, there will be 360 jobs for 20 years, plus an uncertain, but large amount of land, air and water pollution that the SDEIS is supposed to quantify. The SDEIS addresses environmental risk. An equally great risk is organizational risk. Can we trust PolyMet. But it was not PolyMet we need to trust. It is Glencore Xstrata. Glencore Xstrata is the primary owner of PolyMet and as the research firm, Stifel Nicolaus states, Glencore Xstrata will buy the rest of PolyMet when all the permits are in place. So who is Glencore Xstrata and can they be trusted. Glencore Xstrata is a Swiss-based firm known for its ruthlessness. This is the fourth largest mining company in the world. It controls 50 percent of the world's copper through its ownership of 100 mines around the world and its commodities trading operations. Glencore Xstrata's CEO is Ivan Glasenberg, who prides himself on extracting maximum profits from its overseas holdings. Under his leadership, Glencore Xstrata has run a long list of labor and environmental abuses, including 58 mining fatalities between 2008 and 2010, over twice the number reported by any other mining company over that period. Just in 2012, the environmental and labor record includes dumping raw acid into waterways in the Congo; Failure to provide a vapor barrier to prevent acid mist from descending on 3,000 people in Zambia; Utilizing child labor as young as 10 years old at mines in the Congo; and causing environmental damage at the McArthur River Mine in Australia. Then (inaudible) talked with the local unions to address the issues. There are number of -- can we trust these people to do it right in an area of (inaudible) in Northern Minnesota? I think not. But wait. Maybe we'll get lucky and they'll sell the mine to the Chinese as they are selling the mine in Chile. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Ulseth

18341

Good evening. My name is Ron Ulseth, Grand Rapids. That is U-L-S-E-T-H. It is on the screen (indicating). I am an engineering educator and have been educating the youth of northeastern Minnesota for more than 20 years. In fact, I have many of my graduates in this room tonight, and hundreds of them are working in this region right now, as stewards of our northeastern Minnesota region. Every day as I'm teaching the future engineers, we look to have them consider three things. And one is to develop a robust scientific knowledge and understanding of engineering principles. And the second is to become critical consumers of information. To try and sift through the emotions that are heavy on any issue, like the one we have here (indicating), and also try and sift through statements that perhaps are misleading. The third thing is we ask them to develop what we call an engineering intuition. It is based on those first two. It is to take the sound principles of science and engineering and your critical ability to think, to then be able to develop a way to make good decisions that have been put in front of you. 40 years ago, when I was growing up in rural Blackberry, Minnesota, on the wall we had a rotary dial phone and we had a party line. Now, here we are, 40 years later, and look what the technology has done. I can be flying in an airplane across the world and talk to my grandchildren back here in Minnesota. The technology growth has been incredible. Speaking of those grandchildren back here in Minnesota, tonight I had to take a night off from helping my son build his house where my grandchildren will grow up and live in this region. So, it is with this emotion of knowing that my grandchildren are going to have to live here and with this engineering intuition that I have developed over 25 years of practice and in teaching others to practice, that I used my intuition to look at the science. And my intuition tells me that I believe, as I have read the EIS, and it tells me to believe what I have seen. It is not based on any other emotion than my intuition in looking at the scientific principles and any information put before me. And as has been stated before, I have my intuition that tells me to give great trust to the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Natural Resources and others who will issue the permits and who will be the regulatory agencies. Thank you.

Ron Wetzell

18261

My name is Ron Wetzell. Someone pretty smart once said, "Underneath complexity lies simplicity." But it is also the case that simplicity can precede complexity, as in Occam's razor, O-C-C-A-M, apostrophe S, R-A-Z-O-R, as in the principal of parsimony, as in, "Keep it simple, stupid." With respect to the proposed PolyMet Mining Project, the obvious and simple answer can be found both before and after complexity. The answer is that it is immoral and unethical of us to encroach upon, to mortgage, to pilfer our children's rightful heritage to a clean and healthy environment for our benefit of a few hundred jobs for 20 some years. It is flat out wrong. History is replete with example after example of our making deals of short-term gain for a distant cost. The "Buy now, pay later." Isn't that pretty much how we have financed our last two wars? "Let the kids pay for it." How is that deficit looking for us these days? Oh, never mind, the kids will take care of that. Throughout history we have asked what can we take and what can we use from our environment? Even after our grudging acknowledgment that global warming does exist, are we not yet able to ask what does our environment need from us? We all bemoan the failure of persons and organizations from taking responsibility for problems they create. Aren't we called to stand up here and to witness to our deepest values? I retired from county government coming up to four years now, after a 30-year career. I once had a button that I never had the courage to wear in public. It read, "Trust me, I work for the government." That is even funnier today than it was several years back. To that I would ask, do any of us have greater reason to have faith in a business or company than we do our own government? Help me remember how well the state bailout of Northwest Airlines went, some number of years back, in which they promised to build and use maintenance facilities in Duluth. As I am able to remember, oh, not so well. It would be one thing if that experience were the exception. But we all know so well that is a rule. Seriously, what entity do we know that we can trust for 200 years? For 500 years? The answer regarding this project is not complex. It is pretty simple. The pinch is that it calls us to have courage to walk the talk of our deepest failures. We have here the opportunity to be who we say we want to be. We need to say no to this project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ron Wetzell 58172

Someone pretty smart once said, “underneath complexity lies simplicity.” But it is also the case that simplicity can precede complexity as in Occam’s Razor, as in the Principle of Parsimony, as in Keep It Simple Stupid. With respect to the proposed Poly Met Mining Project, the obvious and simple answer can be found both before complexity and after complexity. That answer is that it is immoral and unethical of us to encroach upon, to mortgage, to pilfer, our children’s rightful heritage to a clean and healthy environment for our benefit of a few hundred jobs for 20 some years. It is flat out wrong. History is replete with example after example of our making deals of short term gain for a distant cost: buy now, pay later. Isn’t that pretty much how we have financed our last two wars? Let the kids play for it. How’s that deficit looking for us these days? Oh, never mind, the kids will take care of that. Throughout history, we have asked, “What can we take and what can we use from our environment?” Even after our grudging acknowledgement that global warming does exist, are we not yet able to ask, “What does our environment need from us?” We all bemoan the failure of persons and organizations from taking responsibility for problems they create. Aren’t we called to stand up here and to witness to our deepest values? I retired from county government coming up to 4 years now after a 30 year career. I once had a button that I never had the courage to wear in public. It read, “Trust me. I work for the government.” That is even more funny today than it was some years back. To that I would ask, do any of us have greater reason to have faith in a business or company than we do our own government? Help me remember how well the State bailout of Northwest Airlines went some number of years back in which they promised to build and use maintenance facilities in Duluth. As I’m able to remember – ah, not so well. It would be one thing that experience were the exception, but we all know so well that is the rule. Seriously, what entity do we know that we can trust for 200 years, for 500 years? The answer regarding this project is not complex. It is pretty simple. The pinch is that it calls us to have courage to walk the walk of our deepest values. We have here the opportunity to be who we say we want to be. We need to say no to this project

Ronald Bendis 33421

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Sincerely, Ronald Bendis 433 Pleasant St Woodstock, IL 60098-3238

Ronald Harris 35110

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ronald Harris 2802 50th St S Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494-7171 (715) 421-4113

Ronald Iannelli 38486

My name is Ron Iannelli. I live at 307 SW 10th Ave Grand Rapids, MN 55744- We moved to Grand Rapids from the Twin Cities in 2003- I feel the MPCA, DNR and the State have enough safeguards in place to allow this project to go forward Thank You Ron

Ronald L Pearson 54714

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ronald Palosaari

2738

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Until Polymet can show us places where this type of mining has not resulted in seriously polluted water and land, MN SHOULD NOT be a test case. No matter how much money is set aside we can not know if it is enough. Also set aside money will become a political football until some or much is gone. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ronald Palosaari 6222 Quinwood Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-6345 (763) 577-1944

51926

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Until Polymet can show us places where this type of mining has not resulted in seriously polluted water and land, MN SHOULD NOT be a test case. No matter how much money is set aside we can not know if it is enough. Also set aside money will become a political football until some or much is gone. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ronald Palosaari 6222 Quinwood Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-6345 (763) 577-1944

Ronald Pearson

43061

March 4, 2014 Ms. Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St. Paul, MN 55116
Mr. Douglas W. Bruner Regulatory Branch, St. Paul District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 180 Fifth Street East, Suite 700 St. Paul, MN 55101-1638
Mr. Tim Dabney Deputy Forest Supervisor U.S. Forest Service Superior National Forest 890 I Grand Ave Place Duluth, MN 55808
Subject: Comments re PolyMet Open-Pit Sulfide Mine & Mine Wastes Plan SDEIS
Dear Sirs and Madam, I have worked as an environmental health professional for 30 years. I have a Master of Science degree from the University of Minnesota in Environmental Health with an emphasis in environmental toxicology. I am also a Certified Industrial Hygienist. I have grave concerns regarding the likely emissions of mercury from mining operations. The US EPA's review of the draft EIS raised many objections to insufficient characterization of uncertainty and risks from mercury. In my review of the Supplemental Draft EIS, I do not believe these have been adequately addressed. Specifically:
• Section 5.2.2.3.4 states "Mercury was not included in the GoldSim model, as insufficient data and a general/lack of definitive understanding of mercury dynamics prevented modeling mercury like the other solutes." This is unacceptable.
• A footnote to Table 5.2.2-50 states "Volatilization rate is estimated based on the low end of the range of values discussed in Section 6. 6.2. 3. 7 of Poly Met 2013 i." Why is this allowed?
• The SDEIS states "There are several factors that appear to influence mercury methylation, including total available mercury, organic carbon, temperature, micronutrients required by sulfate-reducing bacteria, sulfate loadings (over the range for which sulfate may be a limiting factor for sulfate-reducing bacteria), and certain hydrologic conditions. The NorthMet Project Proposed Action is expected to have little or no effect on most of these things, but the effect on two of these, sulfate concentrations and hydrologic conditions, warrants further discussion. These two potential effects are discussed below." How can a claim like "... is expected to have little or no effect on most of these things ..." be allowed to stand without detailed substantiation of each? Why has the Minnesota Department of Health not been involved in a quantitative health risk assessment? I believe this is a critical step to ensure an objective evaluation of public health risk. From a practical standpoint, I believe the 'alternatives analysis' provided by Polymet is grossly insufficient. I've worked with numerous metals recycling facilities on environmental issues in my professional career, and it is incomprehensible to me that this type of mining continues, when there is more than enough of the metals that Polymet seeks to mine available through recycling. The EIS must provide a thorough analysis of alternatives to this mine. Lastly, I would like to state the obvious, even ludicrous assumption- that we can have any degree of certainty about what is going to happen 200 years from now. The only thing we know for sure is that the BWCA will still be here in 200 years. Polymet and its successor companies (or their 'financial assurance') - not too likely. Please reject the Polymet SDEIS. Sincerely, Ronald L. Pearson, M.S., CIH 1903 Pinehurst Avenue St. Paul MN 55116
CC: The Honorable Mark Dayton, Governor of the State of Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ronald W Faulkner

57277

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever.

Ronald W. Stromsness

45036

Dear dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources; I am 66 years young and been around the barn a few times. I find it whelming the number of people that are sticking there heads in the sand and are in favor of this ill-advised fiasco. To agree that PolyMet can be believed in any way shape or form on whatever proposal they come up with and then astoundingly agreed to by any department is a crapshoot at beSt Well before the attempt is made to extract any materials from the land in Northern Minnesota, I suggest we wait until they have a few more notches in their stick, proving this can be done with minimal harm not only to the environment but to human safety as well. Lets not forget who we are dealing with here. One percenters and politicians. And lets face it, greed is high on the liSt I say this because I believe the minerals they recover will be sent overseas for processing where decent wages and environmental laws are non-existent. When and if we ever do this mineral extraction lets do so when we, the good old US of A can process the materials with good wages, strong environmental and human safety laws to protect not only us but our world. We already have problems with mercury and acid precipitation here in Northern Minnesota. Lets not exacerbate to those problems we currently seem to want to do nothing about. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion. Cordially, Ronald W. Stromsness

Ronna Hanson

41934

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Ronna Hanson 65 W Chisholm St Duluth, MN 55803-1505 (218) 724-7139

Ronnie Puckett

54110

I do not believe the PolyMet mine is a good idea until it has been proven safe and clean and Minnesota should not be the testing grounds for this. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rory Cardinal

10859

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Rory Cardinal 5660 156th Ln NW Ramsey, MN 55303-6101 (651) 795-1204

10861

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2) Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3) Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Rory Cardinal 5660 156th Ln NW Ramsey, MN 55303-6101 (651) 795-1204

11444

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Rory Cardinal 5660 156th Ln NW Ramsey, MN 55303-6101 (651) 795-1204

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rory Cook

57961

Please protect Minnesota lakes. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Rory Scoles

18114

My name is Rory Scoles. I am from Finland, Minnesota. I own and operate a downhill cross-country ski and snowboard shop. I want to talk about trusting our officials in these processes. That we are all kind of putting our eggs in that basket as far as our government entities keeping an eye on our environmental quality. I watched the openly allow corporations to violate their water permit down the river for 10 years. Yeah, the review looks great. I want to trust the DNR, the agencies to do their job. I personally watched in my area them not do their jobs. We're all human and make mistake. Our job is to hold people accountable when (inaudible) flood. I do not see those types of events included in these environmental processes. That's one of the biggest oversights. All this will be in the ground for 100 years. Our kids and grand kids are going to be here and deal with this planet we live on. (Inaudible) dealing with extremes. If you can't wake up to that fact and look at what is happening on the planet, seeing the records broken on a monthly, daily basis, your priorities mixed up. I have two sons and lot of talk about progress and how wonderful progress is. On one hand it is a double-edged sword. We need copper for devices. I have a smartphone. I don't have electricity in my house. And how many of you people have kids or grandchildren that spend time in front of these screens. That's what this copper is going to China to make the devices to be sold back. (Inaudible) spend less and less time with us. I'm not going to allow that to happen. Thank you.

Rosa Arsiaga

40268

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Rosa Arsiaga 2217 S 7th St Abilene, TX 79605 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

rosae brown

42505

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, rosae brown 170 good counsel drive mankato, MN 56001

Rosalie Parranto

39581

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Rosalie Parranto 4851 Richard Ln Eagan, MN 55122-2784 (612) 452-4897

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rosalie Stefanich

16631

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rosalie Stefanich 313 2nd. Ave S. Long Prairie, MN 56347

50019

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Rosalie Stefanich 313 2nd. Ave S. Long Prairie, MN 56347

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rosanna Walker

39739

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. I do not believe any possible benefits for PolyMet outweigh the possible negative impact on Minnesota's environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Rosanna Walker 1551 Belsly Blvd Apt 313 Moorhead, MN 56560-6165 (218) 766-9813

Rosanne E. Fischer

23550

Dear Public Representatives: I write to you today concerning PolyMet Mining Inc.'s proposed NorthMet project to be located in northeastern Minnesota, near Hoyt Lakes and Babbitt, as well as mining proposed by Twin Metals. My ancestors on both my mother's and father's sides came to Minnesota in the 1850's and generations of our family have enjoyed Minnesota's high quality of life ever since. This is our home. Seven generations of our family have been born and buried on this land. The Anishinaabe have been here eons longer and remain to this day as well, no thanks to many US government policies. My husband and I summer on the shores of Farm Lake in Ely, Minnesota where we are privileged to occupy a lot with a simple log cabin. We are grateful every day (even in the prolonged sub-zeros of this winter) for the beauty and spirit of this land where we were born and raised. We look forward to growing old together as our children and grandchildren flourish here as well. We have been closely following the proposed mining projects of Polymet and Twin Metals with open minds. After careful reading and thoughtful discernment on the various sides to this issue, we must now step forward to declare our opposition to the sulfide mining proposed. Our opposition to this type of mining is for the following reasons: Northeastern Minnesota is a jewel, not only for the state of Minnesota, but for the entire nation. We have carefully protected our natural resources in the past and must continue to do so for future generations. Minnesota is known for its water - its 10,000 (12,000) lakes - and must continue to protect its water for all times, especially as lack of clean water is becoming an increasing concern for all living things in our world. The land of Superior National Forest has been purposefully set aside in public trust and should remain so. The acid mine drainage from sulfide mining kills fish, wildlife and plants and irreparably damages the wild rice harvest and way of life. A mere 20 years of copper mining will require centuries of water treatment and entails much greater environmental risks than the taconite mining of the past. A look at mining history, shows that mines in Colorado, Montana and South Dakota have gone bankrupt and left tax payers to clean up the terrible environmental messes they left behind. They will never be the same. Computerized projections do not trump real mining history, which shows that sulfide mines produce polluted drainage. period. The US Environmental Protection Agency presented mining as one of two top dioxin producing industries in the nation (The Washington Post, 1/5/12). In 2010 metal mining was responsible for 41% of all toxins released into the environment. Mining by-products such as arsenic, manganese, thallium and mercury increase risks of cancer and other illnesses, developmental and neurological damage in human persons. Our neighbors in Wisconsin have put a moratorium on new sulfide mines in their state until the mining industry can demonstrate that a mine has operated for 10 years and closed for 10 years with no acid mine drainage. We need to follow that wise path. It is time to just say "no" to corporate interests which bring excessive income to a few at the expense of quality of life for many and the future of life on our planet. Sincerely, Rosanne E. Fischer 10540 Raven Loop NE Foley, MN 56329

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rosario Greenwood

18239

My name is Rosario, R-O-S-A-R-I-O, Greenwood, G-R-E-E-N-W-O-O-D. I come here to tell a story that I would like -- that sets a precedent what makes me talk here so those things will not be repeated here. In my country of origin, Peru, South America, there is an old mine called Yanacocha, Y-A-N-A-C-O-C-H-A, Yanacocha. The company that owns that mine, basically, is Newmont, Newmont Mining Corporation from Colorado. To today, exportation earns them maybe \$7 billion -- until now, they earn maybe \$7 billion. Unfortunately, the idea was that they bribe the people, and they got the concession to develop there, to exploit the mines. It is the second largest in the world and maybe the first one in whole Latin America, the biggest. They're supposed to -- originally they say that it was going to be environmentally friendly, that they were going to help the people create jobs, lift up the city. They promised everything good for the people over there. Unfortunately, it's been totally the opposite. The lake that they use for developing in the process of the gold, the lake has been evaporated. People don't have water. There is contamination all over. Beautiful pristine areas, vegetations totally contaminated, toxic pollutants. The kids have wounds, lacerations all over their bodies. And of course, the Newmont Corporation which is based in Colorado, here, easily they get their money, and they didn't even care. Thousands of people have been demonstrating there, and of course, they took reprisals against those leaders and one of them was killed, one or two people, I think. The reason why I'm talking is because I don't want those things to be happening over here in such a beautiful area in the Boundary Waters and I don't know, there are more things that I should talk about but I don't know what else to say. Thanks you. Not only is the Newmont Mining Corporation from Colorado, but also is the World Bank International Finance Corporation that wants to benefit from that, and one Bentura, owners from Peru, B-E-N-T-U-R-A family. It's important that my comments are heard because that mine is where the treasure -- the Inca treasures were hidden in Peru and at that area, and of course if the people over there were respected but not killed because now the people are fighting for whether they have water or gold. What is more important? The people are trying to survive now. They want water, not gold. Now, they want to open another mine that is called Conga, C-O-N-G-A, Conga, and the people are fighting, but you know bribes, corruption, maybe they want to go ahead, want it or not, and people are afraid that the same thing is going to happen and the destruction of the lovely area, not only in vegetation, farm, fauna, flora, you know, the whole ecological disaster. They promise that they are going to be environmentally friendly, but totally the opposite has happened, and the people live in misery, not even in human but substandard means of life. Who cares? Nobody cares. Contamination with mercury and other many horrible chemicals, you know.

Rose Carlsen

45334

I live in Minneapolis and visit the north shore of Lake Superior as often as possible to enjoy the beauty, the hiking and ski trails, the boundary waters wilderness as well as local restaurants and art venues. I think the Polymet mine proposal is a bad idea for the state of Minnesota and that region in particular. The short term long range impact on the environment including the moose population, water quality for wild rice, and the surrounding boundary waters wilderness area to name just a few would be dire. Any project that requires a 100 year or more clean up plan is ridiculous to even consider. In order to move forward at all a rigorous and thorough study of environmental impact needs to be completed. If mining must occur the idea of an underground mine with the tailings being reburied in the mine should be considered. Thank you. Rose McManus Carlsen

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rose Doran

40297

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Rose Doran 635 foote ave Duryea, PA 18642 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rose Hood

38941

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rose Knopff

16218

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

20077

Feb 27, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Rose Knopff 2523 Brenner St Saint Paul, MN 55113-1002

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rose Knopff

40010

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Rose Knopff 2523 Brenner St Roseville, MN 55113-1002

40279

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Rose Knopff 2523 Brenner St W Roseville, MN 55113 US

Rose Line

54227

Dear Ms. Fay, I am a student of Humboldt High School in Saint Paul. I would like to inform about the problem with the polymet mine doing. Why would you let the company to mine in an area that would impact our whole environment? The company is not trustable. This project can generate a pollution for centuries and will poison our pure boundary water to a sulfuric acid. As a student of an environmental school, I am concerned about the safety of our environment. Because the map on the polymet is wrong and this is giving the company taking advantage on mining a huge area. This needed to fix and giving people the right map. I hope you will make the right decision and I appreciate your help. Sincerely, Rose Line 461 Maryland Ave W 101 Saint Paul, MN 55117

Rose Lo

38798

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Rose Lo 5308 Highland Rd Minnetonka, MN 55345-5629

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rose Olszewski

28182

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Please don't allow this. Lake Superior is a glacial lake, its waters are too cold for the wildlife to recover quickly. Also it would break my heart to lose this iconic place to pollution. My family served at KI Sawyer and Lake Superior is one of my first childhood memories. I know the economy is poor, but allowing this would only make the areas around the lake poorer. Once a land is tainted it takes decades for it to recover. There are better ways and you have the power to insist on better. Sincerely, Rose Olszewski 1514 Yorkshire Dr Apt 3 Howell, MI 48843-1051

Rosemary Johnson

7386

I have not heard any discussion of requiring polymet to dispose of tailings other than storing them on the surface. Why not deposit them in some of our abandoned open pit iron mines or underground mines. The tailings could no longer create surface water problems and storage problems would be solved. I know that this sounds simplistic but some variation of this idea might be feasible. As it stands I definitely oppose the mining. We could very well be left with a badly damaged environment and huge storage costs when the mining company pulls out or becomes insolvent. Teddy Roosevelt had the foresight way back then to protect land from ever increasing development. Certainly we could do likewise today when there is so little undeveloped land left. Sincerely, Darrel A. Johnson Eveleth, Minnesota

46496

Lisa Fey, EIS Project Manager, I understand that PolyMet's chief investor plans to sell copper concentrate to China. That means that we here in Minnesota will be putting our water quality etc at risk to benefit one of our most challenging and dangerous rivals. I'm all for more jobs and opportunity for young people in our area. I am against a project that has the potential to spoil the very things that many of them want to stay here for. In the end the MDNR will be blamed for anything that goes wrong with this project ["the DNR approved it"]. They all have an out but you do not. Sincerely, Darrel A Johnson 405 N Van Buren Ave Eveleth MN 55734

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rosita Aranita

15886

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. I insist that this I'll thought out SDEIS be rejected for all the reasons stated above. Sincerely yours, Rosita Aranita 1440 Randolph Ave #305 St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rosita Aranita

19050

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. We are the government ultimately and we the citizens will be the ones to suffer the dire consequences of a rushed assessment and implementation. I support all the reasons and recommendations previously laid out. Sincerely yours, Rosita Aranita
1440 Randolph Ave #305 St Paul, MN 55105 651-276=4765

Ross Anderson

39714

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams, and public health across the Arrowhead Region. In my job as I dentist, we have to deal with mercury issues. Some science tells us that mercury exposure from fillings is ok because it is such a low dose exposure of elemental mercury. However, mercury is a known neurotoxin and highly regulated pollutant. We use amalgam separators to remove as much mercury as we can from our waste water, and then have the contaminant disposed of properly. Dentists continue to use less and less mercury containing fillings because we know mercury is a known toxin. Adding mercury and arsenic to our waters through a large mine is irresponsible. The notion that the contamination from something as large as a sulfide mine can be treated and contained is asinine. I use science to my advantage all of the time with materials I use. However, we do find that our predictions about materials can be wrong no matter how good the scientific method was. Using Minnesota and its citizens as another mining experiment is not appropriate. I don't feel the science or technology is advanced enough to successfully complete this mine without adversely affecting public health and the environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Ross Anderson 4550 London Rd Duluth, MN 55804-2340

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ross Anderson 48877

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams, and public health across the Arrowhead Region. In my job as I dentist, we have to deal with mercury issues. Some science tells us that mercury exposure from fillings is ok because it is such a low dose exposure of elemental mercury. However, mercury is a known neurotoxin and highly regulated pollutant. We use amalgam separators to remove as much mercury as we can from our waste water, and then have the contaminant disposed of properly. Dentists continue to use less and less mercury containing fillings because we know mercury is a known toxin. Adding mercury and arsenic to our waters through a large mine is irresponsible. The notion that the contamination from something as large as a sulfide mine can be treated and contained is asinine. I use science to my advantage all of the time with materials I use. However, we do find that our predictions about materials can be wrong no matter how good the scientific method was. Using Minnesota and its citizens as another mining experiment is not appropriate. I don't feel the science or technology is advanced enough to successfully complete this mine without adversely affecting public health and the environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Ross Anderson 4550 London Rd Duluth, MN 55804-2340

Ross Peterson 14948

My opinion on copper mining in Minnesota. HYPERLINK "https://docs.google-com/a/flaschools-org/document/d/1WKji-3_LLQXmEcE0lZt3e2qLdMISWe3BIVmUKQB1Jl0/edit.usp=drive_web" Copper Mining, Ross Peterson

Ross Phanning 42667

See attachment

rowlandg 43338

I'm sure Polymet (a Canadian company) wants us to get in line so they can exploit our minerals. Just like another Canadian company wants to exploit their nasty oil and build a pipeline across America. They should ruin Canada before coming down here. Then maybe the environmental message will sink in with them. What's the rush. Those minerals have been in the ground for billions of years and they only get more valuable. Add the unnecessary risk to the environment - I don't think this needs to happen any time soon. There's plenty of Canada for them to ruin while they wait. Thanks, F. Rowland Gosling White Bear Lake, MN

Roxana Huggins 25111

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest On top of that, this is a foreign company with their sites on destroying public land and polluting public water belonging to the citizens of this country. We need to stop allowing destructive multinational interests from profiting off our lands, whether its gas, oil, coal or mining. the devastation it leaves behind for future generations to clean up while losing so much more. Sincerely, Roxana Huggins 4948 W Hardy Rd Tucson, AZ 85742-4118

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roxanne Boyle

40335

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Roxanne Boyle 8710 23rd Ave Adelphi, MD 20783 US

Roxanne Fairbanks

39476

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Roxanne Fairbanks 1038 Campbell Ave Detroit Lakes, MN 56501-3202 (218) 841-4701

Roy D Erickson

3667

Mn. DNR, The cost/benefit from hard rock mining and the resulting tailings management are diffidently not worth the costs. Please protect Minnesota from long term environmental damage. Reject PolyMet and other harmful mining operations in Minnesota. I own property just North of Boulder lake which is North of Duluth. I will fight against this wrong thinking mining proposal as long as I am alive. Roy Erickson 3868 97th Lane NE Circle Pines, Mn. 554014 Roy Erickson Sr. Imaging Equipment Specialist, Imaging Engineering Services Fairview Health Services Minneapolis, MN 55414 Phone: 612- 273-5798 Email:rericks1@fairview-org The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, including 'protected health information'. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy and delete this message from any computer and contact us immediately by return e-mail.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Roy D Erickson

47022

From: Erickson, Roy D Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 11:27 AM To: 'NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us' Subject: Poly Met Dear State of Minnesota Citizen Representatives IE DNR, Please consider the cost – benefit before proceeding with this gamble. What are the worst case scenarios. What are the plans in case those scenarios happen. What is the record of these kinds of mines. Would it be logical to put a 2 year moratorium in place so that these many questions could be answered with certainty. I am a land owner North of Duluth and recreate in the BWCAW often. Are these mining jobs worth threatening the BWCAW. Most Sincerely, Roy Erickson Address: 3868 97th lane NE Circle Pines, Mn. 55014 The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, including 'protected health information'. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy and delete this message from any computer and contact us immediately by return e-mail.

47026

Dear State of Minnesota Citizen Representatives IE DNR, Please consider the cost – benefit before proceeding with this gamble. What are the worst case scenarios. What are the plans in case those scenarios happen. What is the record of these kinds of mines. Would it be logical to put a 2 year moratorium in place so that these many questions could be answered with certainty. I am a land owner North of Duluth and recreate in the BWCAW often. Are these mining jobs worth threatening the BWCAW. Most Sincerely, Roy Erickson The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, including 'protected health information'. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy and delete this message from any computer and contact us immediately by return e-mail.

Roy Maki Jr.

4354

It is important to me personally and I believe to all the people that live in northern Minnesota to help develop industries. People and the environment can co-exist together with industry as a means to support communities and families. I have seen industries develop new ways of controlling their impact on the environment, while supporting the communities they share space with. As an example of change, I can say with great surety that communities, people and industry have taken responsibility for their impacts on the environment in a responsible way, when that impact has become known. I have lived to see this personally and bring your attention to the St Louis river as an example of positive change. During the years previous to the 1970's the strategy for dealing with waste materials was to dump them directly into the St Louis river. Everybody did so. The general public, the city of Cloquet, all industries located along the St Louis river systems did so and at the time was considered a valid way to manage waste materials of every kind. There was at one time, township place's to dump residential garbage, this was done in an uncontrolled environment and just about any dip in the land scape would do. I believe that was a common practice just about anywhere in the United States. Here we are today, awareness and knowledge have increased substantially across the states; industries and municipalities, the general public, all of us have taken responsibly for what we do regarding our impacts to the environment. We also have a successful history of environmental stewardship and industrial development right here in the wood city of the north Cloquet, Minnesota. I bring Potlatch Corporation, now Sappi into the lime light as an example. While permitting the new expansion of the paper mill, Potlatch re-wrote the standards for that industry based on the available technology at the time back in 1990- The paper industry has gone through extensive change over the last 20 years and continues to do so. The point I am making is that this industry was successful in achieving environmental stewardship, while supporting the community it does business in. People have the right to exist, to seek the American dream of home and family, self-sufficiency. I believe industry has stepped up to the plate and done what was required based on the knowledge and awareness at the time, has taken responsibility, by taking the appropriate actions for positive environmental stewardship. I very much support PolyMet's development of mining operations. Roy Maki Jr Cloquet, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Rozanne Screven

24638

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please protect the beautiful wilderness areas we are privileged to have in Wisconsin and the Great Lakes region. Say "no" to the Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land would open the way for the PolyMet Mining Corporation's NorthMet mining project. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. This project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health are too serious to risk for the temporary profit-making it could produce. Those risks include degradation of water quality, dangers to human and animal health, and loss of life sustaining wetlands. Please protect our land and our waters from poisonous pollution. Sincerely, Rozanne Screven 3357 N Humboldt Blvd Milwaukee, WI 53212-1737

Rudy Perpich

2905

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We shouldn't even consider a project with a 500 hundred year pollution monitoring requirement. It is ludicrous. If the mining companies work with the U of M and other universities to develop ways to safely contain the pollution, then the permits can be issued. Otherwise, with current technology, acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Rudy Perpich 12000 Marion Ln W Apt 1322 Minnetonka, MN 55305-1305 (952) 593-0680

52048

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We shouldn't even consider a project with a 500 hundred year pollution monitoring requirement. It is ludicrous. If the mining companies work with the U of M and other universities to develop ways to safely contain the pollution, then the permits can be issued. Otherwise, with current technology, acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Rudy Perpich 12000 Marion Ln W Apt 1322 Minnetonka, MN 55305-1305 (952) 593-0680

Russ

20044

Minnesotans have proven that we can responsibly mine and protect the land.. Move forward with PolyMet.. Russ

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Russ Erickson

7198

Dear Ms Fay, Poly Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: We are seeing the effects of Frac sand mining in WI and MN. The industry showed up without warning. The effects have impacted the locals and the larger public without any oversight via the government local or state. It would be fair to say they were blindsided by the mining concerns. Truly the mining company's don't care how it effects the locals or the environment. It would be fair to say the same is true of the mining companies that want to get at the ore in northern MN. There should be a moratorium on the permits until the government dedicates real money towards establishing strict studies and develops MN mining rules that guarantee a zero tolerance for pollution issues. They mining company should be required to restore the land and water quality back to original. Profits should be Escrowed until the mine has closed. Guarantees must be made to the public that continual environmental monitoring be done. That monitoring shall only be done by a citizen approved impartial company with their own financial records monitored by a state auditor to assure the public there is no manipulation of the data. The costs to the state for the continuous monitoring and oversight and auditing shall be borne by the mining company. There should be consequences and fine schedules established prior to any permitting. Make it clear to any mining concerns that MN means business - that the MN laws have teeth. The state should act to protect and defend the environmental concerns of the citizens of the state. It should not be easy for the mining company to extract the ores from MN land. It would be better that the state take the stand that makes it clear to any mining concerns that there will be costs and to doing mining in MN. It should make it clear that the corporate officials will be held personally responsible in any legal negotiation with MN. Make it so any mining company that wants to do business in MN will think twice before signing any agreement with MN In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis, MN 55409 612 823-1228

20038

PolyMet Mining Comment Thursday Feb 27th 2014 1) Regulation – It should be made a requirement that only non-partial government regulated third party firms will be allowed to do the monitoring of the environment testing. 2) The enforcement and fine structure should be in place and have real consequences for all of the corporate executives involved in the mine. That includes PolyMet , Glencore Xstrata and any future owners or corporate concerns. 3) The definition of what constitutes a failure of the environmental issues should be laid out and made clear for both the mining companies and the citizens of the state. Thanks - Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis MN 55409 612-823-1229 HYPERLINK "mailto:russee4@msn-com"russee4@msn-com

20039

PolyMet Mining Comment Thursday Feb 27th 2014 1) Will you require the corporate partners of PolyMet in the mining company (Glencore Xstrata) be required to sign the permit and share in the mines potential future liabilities. 2) Will any liabilities be attached to future purchasers of those companies. The issue here is that at no point should the state and the taxpayers be left holding the bag for environmental cleanup. 3) The permit should only be let out to a company that can prove through past mine site demonstration that they can mine without damaging the environment. Thanks - Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis MN 55409 612-823-1229 HYPERLINK "mailto:russee4@msn-com"russee4@msn-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Russ Erickson 20040

PolyMet Mining Comment Thursday Feb 27th 2014 1) List and detail the forecast costs of all the environmental clean-up issues 500 years into the future. 2) List the enforcement methods - fines – fees – legal expenses - executive jail terms for failure and list the moneys escrowed by the mining company to be set aside to meet these expenses. I work for an environmental services firm. If we were to be found at cause for a pollution event there are specified fines and jail terms in place. No less should be required as a compulsory prerequisite to doing business in Minnesota. Thanks - Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis MN 55409 612-823-1229 HYPERLINK "mailto:russee4@msn-com"russee4@msn-com

20041

PolyMet Mining Comment Thursday Feb 27th 2014 1) Will the wetlands be replaced. 2) Will the moose and other wild life endangered by the loss of their habitat be relocated. 3) Will the quality of the land swap be of equal value. 4) Will the peat lands be moved and reestablished as it takes thousands of years to develop them. 5) Will the mine pits be filled in after completion of the mining to restore the landscape. 6) Have the lands involved in the land swap been established and judged to be of comparable quality. 7) Will they add to the area adjacent to the superior National ForeSt Thanks - Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis MN 55409 612-823-1229 HYPERLINK "mailto:russee4@msn-com"russee4@msn-com

20042

PolyMet Mining Comment Thursday Feb 27th 2014 1) Will the bedrock underneath the tailings locations be studied for cracks and fissures. Will the cracks and fissures be grouted. 2) Will all the acidic waters coming off the tailings piles be captured and run through the RO process for the full 500 year projection of pollution contamination (not just 200 years). Will the mine be required to fund this operations cost of the ground water cleanup and pumping of 10's of millions of gallons a year through Reverse Osmosis filtration for 500 years in advance of the permit being issued. 3) Will the mine be responsible for 100 year overtopping rain events. 4) Will the state code that requires the mine to be left maintenance free at mine closure be upheld. This is a potentially negative economic issue that in the long run will outweigh any short near term jobs and economic issues. Thanks - Russ Erickson 3915 Grand Ave South Minneapolis MN 55409 612-823-1229 HYPERLINK "mailto:russee4@msn-com"russee4@msn-com

russ mattson 26920

Russ Nolan 43852

Please, please, please do not approve this. Without being coy or flippant it just doesn't make sense to approve something that will poison our water for 500 years or even 200 or even 100- On the face of it this does not pass the common sense teSt I am against this. Russ Nolan 1077 Co Rd 30 SE Delano, MN 55328 rnolan@frontiernet-net Ph: 612-251-3599

Russel Remmen 54133

I support the environmental laws of Minnesota and the Federal government, which means no water pollution, no air pollution, and no ground polution. ABOUT POLYMET MINING Don't let money destroy our natural resources!! Air, land, water. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Russell Hobbie 43051

2151 Folwell Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55108 January 28, 2014 Tim Dabney US Forest Service, Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Ave. Place Duluth, MN 55808
Dear Mr. Dabney: We are writing to express our concern about the possibility of sulfide mining in northern Minnesota and particularly the draft environmental impact statement that is now open for comment. We have been going to the BWCA since 1961—first by ourselves, then with our children, and now our children are taking our grandchildren. Our love for the BWCA has led to our purchasing a cabin on Burntside Lake. We feel we have made and are continuing to make significant contributions to the economy of the Arrowhead. Here are four of our concerns: 1. We Minnesotans are not used to hard rock mining, and many of us do not appreciate how harmful the sulfuric acid from the tailings will be. We need to recognize the fact that grinding the rock into small particles increases the surface area exposed to water. For example, rock 100 meters on a side, when ground to the size of baby powder (10 micrometers) will have increased its surface area by a factor of 10 million. We have already seen this in "mine slime," in our taconite mines, but it does not leach acid. Slime from the proposed mine would leach sulfuric acid. The acid will be spread to places where it will do damage by the water that is already flowing through the existing tailings basin. 2. The number of new jobs that is projected is actually small compared to the number of existing mine jobs in the Arrowhead. 3. The short term effects will include excessive noise from drilling and blasting. 4. The profits will go to people outside Minnesota, and probably in other countries. The profits from tourism remain in the community. We hope you will take these facts into account as you evaluate the EIS. Sincerely, Cynthia A. Hobbie Russell K. Hobbie

Russell Knuti Jr. 9534

Please accept my letter of approval of the draft EIS for the Polymet project. Thank you for your time. Rusty Knuti.

Russell Martinez 54228

It has come to my attention that the SDEIS made are wrong. PolyMet re-drew the maps. They have left out half of the one hundred mile swamp. That leaves the BWCA completely unprotected from the acid mine drainage. Governor Dayton needs to address the MN DNR to do their job and tell PolyMet to provide a correct environmental impact statement that has financial information, has the correct geography in maps, has correct hydrology studies. I would like the maps in the SDEIS (Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement) to be corrected. Measure the percolation rate through the swamp. Sincerely, Russell Martinez 286 Winifred St. Paul, MN 55107

Russell Palma 58134

As a scientist I am both appalled and incredulous that this project is even being considered. The potential impact on future generations is incalculable. It is ludicrous to think that any company can plan for hundreds of years of remediation, or that they have the financial wherewithal to cover all contingencies. Polymet is most likely to follow a well-worn path of extraction and abandonment as evidenced by Superfund sites all across the western US. I sympathize with the need for jobs in northern MN, but there must be some line in the sand where the cost to the earth and future generations is simply too great to justify the risk. The state could better allocate its resources by using the money it would spend to protect ground water for hundreds of years by using it to retrain miners and other Minnesotans for jobs of the future, rather than the extractive past.

Ruth B Agar 57926

Do NOT do any copper mining near MN lakes. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ruth Bartling

41137

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ruth Bartling 4300 W River Parkway #341 Minneapolis, MN 55406

41139

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory." The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Ruth Bartling 4300 W River Parkway #341 Minneapolis, MN 55406 612-729-1619

54782

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ruth Brooker

41632

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

42480

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Ruth Brooker 3253 Humboldt Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3329

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ruth Dantuma 39980

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Ruth Dantuma 59 Irvine Park Saint Paul, MN 55102-2553

Ruth E. Ulvog 33758

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. Sulfide mining will threaten wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred, world-wide. Specific areas include but are not limited to the Republic of Congo on the African continent; Northwest Queensland, Australia; areas of Manitoba, Canada; Coastal Bristol Bay, Anchorage, in addition to internal areas of Alaska; the States of Maine, Wisconsin, California, Nevada, as well as both Upper and Lower Peninsulas of Michigan. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health: including but not limited to risks to water quality and loss of wetlands. Wildlife species will be harmed by declining habitats due to cumulative impacts from mining; particularly heavy metals and runoff. Of particular concern are the declining moose population and the threatened lynx. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ruth E. Ulvog 9350 Ranchview Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-4472 United States Sincerely, Ruth E. Ulvog 9350 Ranchview Ln N Maple Grove, MN 55369-4472

Ruth Gedge 40312

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Ruth Gedge Bretton Peterborough, ot PE3 GB

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ruth Hruby

16129

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ruth Lindh

373

Dec 10, 2013 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

42742

See attachment

Ruth Mason

58018

The quality and short term gain of jobs does not balance the long term destruction of water, land, habitat and quality of life. Many of Polymet's statistics & data are questionable as to accuracy. Please do not allow this! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ryan Birkenholz

6131

I fully support the PolyMet project. The extensive regulations and controls they must go through provide a reasonable assurance that environmental impacts will be kept to a minimum. I plan to be at the public meeting in St Paul on January 28 in support of the project. _____ Ryan Birkenholz, P.E. | Sr. Project Engineer | Golder Associates Inc. 1751 West County Road B, Suite 105, Roseville, Minnesota, USA 55113 T: +1 (651) 697-9737 | IP Phone Ext. 69501 | D: (651) 697-9737 | F: +1 (651) 697-9735 | C: +1 | E: [HYPERLINK "mailto:Ryan_Birkenholz@golder-com"](mailto:Ryan_Birkenholz@golder-com) | [HYPERLINK "mailto:rbirkenholz@golder-com"](mailto:rbirkenholz@golder-com) | [HYPERLINK "http://www.golder-com/"](http://www.golder-com/) www.golder-com This email transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. Electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration, and incompatibility. Accordingly, the electronic media version of any work product may not be relied upon. Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Ryan Bradley

40421

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Ryan Bradley 13 Laurel Hill Rd Unit B Greenbelt, MD 20770 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ryan Christopher Alger

43456

Dear, Lisa Fay, EID project Manager and staff For the last four summers I had the privilege to work as a canoe guide and outfitter in the Boundary Waters. The outfitter and resort where I worked was located on Birch Lake outside of Ely. Birch Lake and the surrounding area is currently being explored for future development of non ferrous mineral resources by Twin Metals. River Point Resort and Outfitting where i worked in located only a few minkes from both the Spruce Road deposit and the Birch Lake deposit, given this proximity hive experienced first had the effects of exploratory drilling let alone an actual mine are already having on the surrounding environment and the federally protected wilderness. One of the most nocitable side affects of the drilling is the excessive noise pollution. Particularly in the winter when sound travels much further. One of the issues with the current NorthMet SDEIS that i've recognized is the inaccuracy of the projected levels of noise pollution and the GIS models used to estimate them. I have a bachelors degree in geography and several years of experience using GIS systems and while examining the SDEIS i noticed the metopes used were not adequate and didn't factor in the changes in winter. I would also recomend using more accurate data on the actual nose levels themselves as the ones used are simply not realistic in my experience with Twin Metals. The amount of noise generated and how it affects wildlife should also be looked at closer. One of the other weakness in this document is the protection against catastrophic environmental events. As the climate changed the frequency of the 100 year and 500 year storm events will increase resulting in much for intense precipitation events in the area. The SDEIS does not adequately project the possible damage and risk of a spill, leak, or overflow from containment ponds. The mine must be designed to withstand at least a 1,000 year rain event without risking pollution. The DEIS does not adequately factor in the long term affects of climate change. Sincerely, Ryan Alger 2805 Thomas Ave APT F. Eau Claire, WI, 54703

Ryan Gaffke

6139

Primary Messages •I support PolyMet Mining and believe they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. •I trust the multiple State and Federal Agencies involved in preparing the document. •This SDEIS demonstrates that PolyMet can develop this resource in a sustainable manner and there are logical, engineered solutions proposed for potential impacts. Economic Impact and Jobs •PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our mining economy. •PolyMet will contribute to the local and state economy at a time when we really need the jobs and economic benefit. •PolyMet can produce these metals in an environmentally sound manner and create hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. •Enough is enough; let's get on with permitting this mine. We want jobs. •PolyMet will provide millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support our communities and educational system. Ryan Gaffke 124 Amund Dr Proctor, Minnesota 55810 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Ryan Heule

3273

To whom it concerns, With the Duluth Complex formation being this large, it will be mined sooner or later and the area could use the economic impact. My questions/comments are mainly to do with reclamation and waist water since I live down stream in the watershed. After this project does go end of life who will be responsible to post shutdown monitoring of the tailings basin and pit water in the event Northmet is no longer around. Does the financial assurance take into account inflation in the event this mine operates beyond its 20 year life. I just want to make sure there is enough funding to do the reclamation of the site and enough funding in the event of an unexpected major environmental disaster to do the environmental clean up. From what I have read and the presentations that I have seen put on by SME I feel this project will be positive addition to Northeast Minnesota. Ryan

Ryan Hicks

24591

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please don't. Sincerely, Ryan Hicks 647 E 14th St New York, NY 10009-3101

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ryan Hunter 43223

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ryan Hunter 27 Mill Ave Whitefish, MT 59937

Ryan L. Burke 43968

Dear Lisa Fay, I am writing you today to ask that this proposal be rejected on the grounds that it puts all Minnesotans at risk. We have never had mining like this in our state and there is an exceptional amount of evidence that it will cause irreversible environmental degradation. The people of Minnesota need sustainable investments that will bring us ahead, and not destroy our water systems and the Northern economy. These companies do not have the state's best interest, nor do they plan on making long-term investments in our people. Please reject this mine and the many other proposals that will come. Minnesotans deserve better. cheers, Ryan Burke 2329 Pillsbury Street, Saint Paul, MN 55104 University of St Thomas, MN Class of 2016 605-929-4438 Students for Justice and Peace Leadership Board Green Team E-Board Student Assistant OSF Library Peace - Pax - Paz - Lapè - ?????? - ????? - Paix - ??;?? - Vrede - ????? - Pace

Ryan Mc Bride 32225

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I would like to comment on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I do not believe that the possible contamination of Lake Superior, and hence the entire Great Lakes waterway, and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is worth the minerals gained via mining in these areas. I am greatly concerned about this project's potential impact on this region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Ryan Mc Bride 62405 County Road 7 Elkhart, IN 46517-8950 (574) 862-1389

Ryan Patron 41994

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ryan Patron Baxter, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ryan Sbol

15889

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Ryan Sbol 2009 E 86th st Bloomington, MN 55425

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ryan Sbol

40319

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

S Grenzow

41673

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, S Grenzow 2283 Hiram Dr Wheaton, IL 60189-8911

Alphabetical by sender's first name

S. Alexandra Leary

52194

To whom it may concern, There are many aspects of this proposed mine project I find of concern. But there is one that is overwhelming importance and that is the discrepancy in the mapping supplied by Polymet. The map the Polymet mine people have offered in their paperwork doesn't encompass the entirety of the 100 Mile Swamp as is indicated on government maps. I believe this is an intentional misrepresentation by Polymet of the SCALE and NATURE of the 100 Mile Swamp which encompasses wetlands and ephemeral wetlands. This mapping discrepancy should have been one of the first things on which the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources demanded clarification from the Polymet organization in the early years of development of the EIS. To add to this issue of what surface waters are contested as being potentially subject to pollution, the hydrology of the area is not well understood other than in the vaguest practicable terms. There is also no sign Polymet intends to add hydrology protections to its management of the site by drilling test wells to test for seepage at set distances from the site. Once pollutants like sulphuric acid begin to slowly seep into the 100 Mile Swamp, the ecological security of the nearby Great Lakes is no longer. At that point, we can only recognize that they should be renamed the Great Leaks. The nature of the Great Lakes fishery will change for aeons and the use of the Great Lakes as a source of fresh, potable water will be compromised for two countries if the impossible nature of the reality of a 500-year remediation plan is ignored. There are several unique environmental threats posed by this copper/ nickel mine that do not seem to be addressed in the EIS. The mine itself is a threat not only to Minnesota bodies of water but potentially to international waters, ie, the Great Lakes. Despite all their planning and promises of extreme measures, contaminated wastewater treatment lagoons may overflow or may crack over time as has happened w/countless cement lagoons of similar design. Many CAFOs have experienced leaching of animal waste into aquifers once there is deterioration of their manure lagoons. Chemical contamination lagoons in such an ecologically sensitive area w/such a high water table would be subject to extreme of temperatures from the freezing and thawing and I cannot imagine these lagoons would hold up over a 500-year remediation period. There is no reality in this EIS to the suggestion this company is intent on allocating financial resources for the expected 500-year remediation period, never mind if they've made any effort to scale up their remediation efforts if there is any leakage over time that begins to infiltrate the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. There are significant advance steps which should be taken prior to permitting going forward. Taking into account the discrepancies between what I consider to be the legitimate mapping of the 100 Mile Swamp and the maps redrawn by Polymet, I believe we must conduct baseline hydrology mapping of the 100 Mile Swamp, the Dunka River and other flowage in the Rainy Lake watershed so we have a clear understanding of subterranean water flow and just how quickly we are risking pollution seeping into the Great Lakes. If the hydrology studies show that Polymet is unwilling to TRULY PROTECT the Rainy Lake watershed and the Great Lakes by drilling test wells for pollution tracking and is otherwise unprepared to handle subterranean pollution, then the permitting process should be reconsidered. There has never been a company whose environmental responsibilities have outlasted the company for the length of time required by the remediation of the amount of tailings produced by this mine. Considering this mine site will be an environmental threat that has to be overseen for a 500-year remediation period, we have not considered what that means legally in terms of entailing this company and any other company that subsequently purchases the Polymet compa

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sally Bujold

4861

Dear State Representatives, Committee Members, and Civil Servants— Thank you, for your considered thinking regarding Minnesota's resources and the sustained well being of Minnesota's children and grandchildren. I find the balanced, reasoned, respectful document below, truly expresses my thinking. I appreciate the time you give to reading my thoughts. Duluth-Superior Friends Minute on Copper-Nickel Mining in Northern Minnesota As Quakers, we are called to live simply, to care for the creation, and to husband resources. In light of that calling, we have been concerned to understand the implications of copper-nickel mining proposed for northern Minnesota by PolyMet, Twin Metals, and other corporations. Our research leaves us deeply troubled. Traditional mining in this state has been very different from the copper-nickel mining now proposed. Iron ore deposits in northern Minnesota were so rich that originally iron was, essentially, just scooped out of the ground; the copper-nickel deposit, by comparison, is exceptionally poor. About 99% of the rock from which the metals must be extracted would be waste, and much of it would have to be ground to the consistency of powder. This waste rock bears sulfide. Sulfide-bearing rock exposed to air and water yields sulfuric acid, producing forms of pollution (including mercury, arsenic, lead, and other toxins) that, according to PolyMet's own documents, will last at least 500 years. Proponents of copper-nickel mining argue that our current way of life demands these metals, that opening these mines will provide high-paying jobs, and that new tech-nology will prevent pollution. All of these claims weaken drastically when scrutinized. Yes, our current way of life requires copper; however, since copper scrap already provides half of US annual demand for that metal and the US provides 23% of the world supply of recovered copper, recycling holds tremendous potential for fulfilling most of this nation's needs. Given the devastation that copper-nickel mining commonly leaves in its wake, we are also led to question the wisdom of our current way of life. The argument that copper-nickel mining will boost the regional economy seems a half-truth at beSt Typically, mining companies import their expertise from elsewhere; only half the jobs promised by the mining companies are apt to go to local residents; the highest-paid positions will be taken by outsiders, who will leave the area once the mine has been exploited. Mines are also subject to shutdowns when market prices drop. The metals extracted from these mines will likely be exported; the profits will go to share-holders around the world rather than the residents of northern Minnesota. History predicts that once these mines are exhausted, their owners will declare bankruptcy and absolve themselves of responsibility for damage left behind. The argument that new technology will prevent pollution is little more than wishful thinking. Sooner or later, copper-nickel waste rock creates acid mine drainage, which often eats its way to ground water. New technology remains experimental, untested on an industrial scale, while exploratory drill sites in northern Minnesota are already leaking acid. Even if technology can be developed to treat copper-nickel pollution effectively, who will pay for, operate, and maintain this technology twenty-four hours a day, day after day for 500 years or more. Corporations come and go; so do governments. We understand the hunger for jobs in northern Minnesota, though people have lived here for thousands of years without depending on paychecks from multinational corporations. Over the past two decades, while the mining workforce shrank, the economy diversified and grew less vulnerable to the boom-and-bust cycle of the mining industry. We support continued diversification. We support selective, sustainable-yield logging and the development of value-added forest products. We s

Sally Drew

27782

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have canoed in the Boundary Waters a number of times and explored the shores of Lake Superior. Both are national treasures. I do not understand how the federal government can allow mining activities in national forests. Was not this land put aside so that this would not happen. Is sulfide so rare that it is worth endangering the wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams in this area. I cannot imagine that this activity is warranted. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Sally Drew 333 W Main St Madison, WI 53703-2777 (608) 251-3406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sally Fineday

9625

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sally Fineday 28890 Connection Drive SE Pennington, MN 56663

18513

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sally Fineday 28890 Connection Drive SE Pennington, MN 56663

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sally Fineday

50595

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sally Fineday 28890 Connection Drive SE Pennington, MN 56663

sally furness

57685

PolyMet is aware of local environmental concerns, and is taking state of the art precautions to assure that these concerns are satisfied. The contribution to state and local economies will be substantial. Sincerely, David D. Furness

Sally Munger

18132

Good evening. I'm not standing here to speak as a technical expert on the SDEIS. There are many people who have spoken on that tonight, but I'm speaking as a person who is very concerned about what we have when the copper-nickel mining comes to Northeastern Minnesota. I'm the proud daughter-in-law of Willard Munger, the long-time chair of the House Natural Resources and Environment Committee who is largely responsible for the strong environmental regulations we have in place in Minnesota today. I wish Willard were here tonight to lend his voice in opposition to this proposal. Why do I say that? Willard knew that clean water is the key to life and fought his whole legislative career to keep our waters safe and clean. More and more, we are seeing how precious a resource clean water is as areas of our country and around the world experience water shortages. Why would we want to take a chance on this process when we are in a water-rich area and the report itself says that remediation will be needed or could be needed for 500 years. That alone makes no sense. Add to that that copper-nickel mining has never been done anywhere without significant environmental damage. Let me say that again. Copper-nickel mining has never been done anywhere without significant environmental damage. The immediate response to that has always been, "That was using old technology. We have something new." Now, that new thing is reverse osmosis. Before we take one step to do this, I ask that it be proven that this process will work on the scale that will be needed. In other words, prove it first. I understand that jobs are needed on the Iron Range. Are the jobs that will be created livable-wage jobs, and how long will they really last? Is this really the answer? I've heard it said that the NIMBY principle, not in my backyard, is coming into play here. I am glad people are saying not in my backyard. This is everyone's backyard, and we are right to want to keep it safe and pristine. In my family of origin, we had a saying. If you have to ask the question, you already know the answer. The answer in this case -- is that Northeastern Minnesota is not the place to do this type of mining.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sally Rauschenfels

44096

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources I am against copper sulfide mining in northern Minnesota and believe your SDEIS does not sufficiently deal with extremely concerning issues to me and many other concerned organizations. I am a Duluth and Ely resident. My family has lived in both places for generations. I have also recently experienced 3-5 years of unemployment by my husband, so know well the difficulty in living in a region that provides little economic opportunity. However, despite my desire for well-paying jobs here, I am smarter than to be seduced into the clutches of this slick Polymet project public relations campaign and resulting incomplete SDEIS for the greedy gain of a few dozen unsustainable jobs. The SDEIS provides no detailed definition of what financial assurance funds will be placed in trust to ensure that water flowing from the waste piles and tailings ponds will be treated and maintained for the required hundreds of years, and that contamination episodes can be cleaned up in the highly predictable event that the company goes out of business soon after closure. The hydrologic model for the water moving through the mining and processing site dramatically underestimates the volume of water passing through, and the rate it moves across and under the waste containment sites. Thus, this crucial predictive tool greatly understates the risk of significant acid rock drainage impacts to surrounding wetlands, groundwater, the Partridge and St Louis Rivers, and ultimately Lake Superior. Please don't leave these serious report deficiencies to be resolved "later." Don't make residents, taxpayers and other agencies responsible for dealing with negative water impacts down the road from this project. This revised version of the project has not been improved enough to assure that the mine's waste and the laws and variables of nature can now be managed so as to avoid major pollution for the indefinite future, beyond a time when our present regulatory systems may even be functioning. All the states which have already suffered acid mine drainage from sulfide mines have underestimated the pollution that would be generated and have grossly inadequate funds escrowed for this task. Polymet has not convincingly demonstrated their ability to operate and close this mine without saddling Minnesota taxpayers with extraordinary cleanup costs and northeastern Minnesota citizens with harm to our water resources and risk of negative impacts on our health. Unlike ferrous mining, Polymet's open pit sulfide mine operation has significantly greater potential to pose human health risks through contamination of drinking water and fish, seriously degrade the St Louis River, destroy wild rice and irreplaceable wetland habitat, and harm the lake that holds the world's fresh water. The fact that our Minnesota DNR is even considering putting at risk our 10% of the world's fresh water for short-term economic gain is sad and shameful. If this project is approved and built, I will seriously consider leaving Minnesota - that's how betrayed I will feel living in my beautiful state and northwoods home for allowing such a devastating event to happen here. Sincerely, Sally Rauschenfels 1026 S. Lake Ave Duluth MN 55802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sam Bircher

52502

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404 " Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation " wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect " wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Sam DiVita

44760

To Whom it May Concern I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed Northmet mining project for Northern Minnesota. I disagree with how the current (Supplemental) Draft EIS disregards the concerns of the Fond du Lac and Grand Portage Tribal Governments, the 1854 Treaty Authority, and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission. I also believe the some of the maps in the draft are incorrect. Specifically, the map of the One Hundred Mile Swamp. I do believe that runoff from the project will enter the BWCAW and impact our waterways and wilderness areas in Minnesota. The maps are not correct and therefore the environmental impact statement is inadequate until the maps are corrected to show the real details of the area. Please consider the facts and inconsistencies of the proposed project and deny permits. Protect our land, waterways, wildlife and recreational opportunities .and importantly, our need for clean drinking water. Respectfully, Sam DiVita 2063 Ames Ave Saint Paul, MN 55119

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sam Ilstrup

40101

From: samjodi@runestone-net [samjodi@runestone-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:43 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR)
Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Sam Ilstrup 12352 175th St Barrett, MN 56311-1167

Sam Johnson

38440

To whom it is of concern: I wish to register my opposition to the copper-nickel mining as proposed. Since this involves sulfide rich ore and the best of projections indicate that this type of mining cannot be done without long-term risk to groundwater contamination, I believe the plan to do such mining at key headwater sources is impractical and ill-conceived. I have seen the effects of other types of mining in the mountains of Colorado where discharge from the mines runs a poisonous orange and in Kentucky where coal mining has poisoned water. Since this state so heavily relies upon water and is a source of the Mississippi, I urge the rejection of plans for this mining. Sam F. Johnson 1504 Parmeadow Drive Northfield, MN 55057

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sam Linder

40229

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404" Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest. PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation" wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please:

- Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance.
- Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS.
- Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses.
- Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin.
- Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands.

Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to

Sam Steinberg

43579

To whom it may concern: After attempting to read the PolyMet EIS and faltering after only a few pages, I realized that I didn't need to continue for one simple reason. If 2200 pages are required to explain exactly how this project can be safely implemented, then there must be tremendous potential for negative outcomes. The simple solution is to prevent any of those outcomes by stopping the project before it starts. Let me pose a hypothetical: If you purchased a toy for your children and it came with a 2200 page manual describing exactly how your children should use it to prevent injury, would that be encouraging. Probably not. You'd probably assume, as I have done with the PolyMet mining project, that the only reason such assurances are needed is that the product is inherently dangerous. Assuming that my hypothetical isn't convincing, look west to Holden Village to see the legacy a copper mine can leave. That mine has left a scar on the face of one of the most pristine and beautiful wilderness areas in the world. Let's not allow PolyMet to do the same thing to our wilderness areas. Thank you for your time. Sam Steinberg Prior Lake High School Science Teacher

Samantha B. Singer

6025

Full Name: Samantha Irene Balmer Singer Legal Mailing Address: 305 N 12th Ave E, Apt C, Duluth MN 55805 Comment: I do not understand why plans for this mine have come so far even with the company, Polymet stating themselves that they are certain the mine will cause pollution to the water supply requiring hundreds of years of water treatment. There is absolutely no way they can deliver on a promise to treat the water until it is no longer polluted.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Samantha Bauer

44071

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, I am writing to you as a future landowner in an area that is likely to be negatively altered by the proposed PolyMet sulfide mining site. My family owns a summer camp for children with special needs, and it is located on land between Ely and Isabella, MN. Someday, I will be co-owner of this land, and I look forward to being able to continue the tradition of helping children to understand and appreciate the Great North Woods. I am deeply concerned that PolyMet, a company that has never before operated a mine, will not be able to follow through on their claims to not pollute, and that it will be my generation that has to pay the price – in superfund taxes, and by losing priceless wilderness. I know that jobs have to be created, but I would prefer to see efforts channeled towards lasting jobs, not positions that will be cut as soon as the mine is either shut down or done providing copper. This copper, incidentally, will be sold to China instead of used in the United States, which I also object to. PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement talks about using 'reverse osmosis' on the water to keep pollutants from leaching into the aquifer and the Lake Superior Basin, but the science isn't sound. Even if reverse osmosis did work, 99% of what the mine is going to produce will be waste products. Is that 1% of copper-nickel needed so badly that we can afford to overlook the potential damage that could be done to more than 8,260 acres of St Louis River watershed. Open-pit mining like this has been done in more arid climates, and pollutants have still found their way into water. That threat will only be more potent in our water-rich environment. As a future landowner, I have been following this issue with interest, and have been wading through PolyMet's smokescreens of misinformation to get to the scientific facts at the heart of this proposal. I would like to request that action be taken against the PolyMet plan, in the form of postponement until a better plan can be developed that captures and controls runoff pollution from the mine. I would also like the plan to address the care of workers, as PolyMet's financial backers have a history of human rights violations. Sincerely, Samantha C. Bauer Samantha Bauer 6406 Bear Lane Duluth, MN 55803

44073

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, I am writing to you as a future landowner in an area that is likely to be negatively altered by the proposed PolyMet sulfide mining site. My family owns a summer camp for children with special needs, and it is located on land between Ely and Isabella, MN. Someday, I will be co-owner of this land, and I look forward to being able to continue the tradition of helping children to understand and appreciate the Great North Woods. I am deeply concerned that PolyMet, a company that has never before operated a mine, will not be able to follow through on their claims to not pollute, and that it will be my generation that has to pay the price – in superfund taxes, and by losing priceless wilderness. I know that jobs have to be created, but I would prefer to see efforts channeled towards lasting jobs, not positions that will be cut as soon as the mine is either shut down or done providing copper. This copper, incidentally, will be sold to China instead of used in the United States, which I also object to. PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement talks about using 'reverse osmosis' on the water to keep pollutants from leaching into the aquifer and the Lake Superior Basin, but the science isn't sound. Even if reverse osmosis did work, 99% of what the mine is going to produce will be waste products. Is that 1% of copper-nickel needed so badly that we can afford to overlook the potential damage that could be done to more than 8,260 acres of St Louis River watershed. Open-pit mining like this has been done in more arid climates, and pollutants have still found their way into water. That threat will only be more potent in our water-rich environment. As a future landowner, I have been following this issue with interest, and have been wading through PolyMet's smokescreens of misinformation to get to the scientific facts at the heart of this proposal. I would like to request that action be taken against the PolyMet plan, in the form of postponement until a better plan can be developed that captures and controls runoff pollution from the mine. I would also like the plan to address the care of workers, as PolyMet's financial backers have a history of human rights violations. Sincerely, Samantha C. Bauer Samantha Bauer 6406 Bear Lane Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Samantha Henderson

54339

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager I think that this mining project is a good idea. There are many reasons why I support this project. First of all, I think that we all use products everyday that we wouldn't have if these metals weren't made available. I think that the project proposer is going to be responsible and minimize the effects of water pollution and air pollution. For example, PolyMet has come up with air filters that can help filter during rock crushing and processing. They are also going to use energy efficient equipment and processes. To minimize water pollution they propose to have liner systems to prevent chemical from seeping into the ground. They will have groundwater containment systems to help control the wastewater. The project proposer will also minimize the effect on the animals too. PolyMet will use old mining sites to plant new vegetation on. They will keep the invasive species under control in these areas. They will also put back some nutrients in the soil that are needed for the land to have growth again. Polymet will have to remove some wetlands, but they will be replacing them elsewhere. They will try to work around them the best that they can. To conclude, I hope that you will take some of these reasons into account. I think that that plan is good and I think that we could really benefit from this. From, Samantha Henderson, 8th grade student at Southwest Junior High

Samantha Henningson

47706

Hello, I am getting this in under the wire, and for that I apologize. This mining proposal should not go forward I understand there are jobs at stake, and that the minerals being mined are in demand. But these are short term considerations. The landscape and waters of Minnesota are forever, and I do not believe for one minute that PolyMet will pay to remedy problems that this is created - in either the short, or more importantly, long term. Thank you for your consideration. Samantha Henningson 1235 Lafond Avenue St Paul MN 55104

Samantha Urbanski

41842

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Samantha Urbanski Wheaton, Minnesota

Sami Dix

42055

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Sami Dix Savage, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Samuel Crook 32548

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I know all my spiritual friends keep talking that we are due to enter a golden age, but all I can think is it must be something that is going to happen after a mass extinction, and the planet is terraformed. Fracking around the new madrid fault, coal waste, and now this. The Koch brothers already have a coal waste mountain right over us south of Chicago. You guys have all the power, and your main focus is how to keep the corporate money flowing in. I sign a gazillion petitions, and it seems everyday your trying to do something else awful. I pray to God that he must know what is happening here, and all I can do is keep pleading/yelling at you guys to stop them from destroying the planet. I remember in the Bush admin. they were saying Jesus was coming back soon, so it didn't matter what they did, because God was going to wave a magic wand and make everything better. Of course there is the concept of tribulation, but they think they're going to be pulled up into heaven, and escape from all this hell they are creating on earth. To the rational mind this is insanity, and I find it hard to disagree. Doesn't God want us to try and keep from destroying the earth. Are you going to bet the future our children and grandchildren will have to deal with, on what many would consider infantile obsessions with power and money. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Samuel Crook 930 Erie Ave Logansport, IN 46947-3514

Samuel Welle 38792

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Samuel Welle 5325 13th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-1842

Samuel Yannerilla 27835

Thank you for your e-mail and taking my comments into consideration. Respectfully, Samuel M. Yannerilla On Mar 4, 2014, at 9:59 AM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Sandi Paavola 42663

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandra Berg Dickson

42264

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, The very thought that we would take a "chance" on polluting our presteen northland for jobs that will last less twenty years over pollution that could last over five hundred years totally baffles me. What is more important to all living beings than our water supply. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Berg Dickson 4813 Greenhaven Dr Saint Paul, MN 55127-7069

Sandra Carr

40300

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sandra Carr 4207 236th St SW E302 Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandra Carr

40323

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sandra Carr 4207 236th St SW E302 Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043 US

Sandra Fantz

38592

Mar 5, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The boundary waters in Mn is a national treasure and should be protected not ruined. We cannot buy that kind of environment and it is inappropriate to mine near it and destroy it. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Fantz 288 Starcross lane Jasper, GA 30143

Sandra Johnson

39612

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Miss Sandra Johnson PO Box 147 Little Falls, MN 56345-0147 (952) 693-5662

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandra Knoche

57280

Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was "inadequate" and the sulfide mine project would be "environmentally unsatisfactory. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn't analyze the effect of pollution on workers' health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn't explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet's destruction of wetlands. It doesn't examine the effect that PolyMet's sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever.

Sandra Lien

40024

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Lien 629 5th Ave S Hopkins, MN 55343-7711

41705

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Lien 629 5th Ave S Hopkins, MN 55343-7711

Sandra Materi

42012

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Materi 1600 W Odell Ave Casper, WY 82604-4778

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandra Penning

42427

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sandra Penning 2170 Wellesley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1233

Sandra Pontes

40422

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sandra Pontes R. Visc. Porto Seguro, 1237 Sao Paulo, ot 04642000 BR

Sandra Reuther

21202

Reading the facts on the Copper/Nickel Mining seem to me to leave little room for debate. A. No example of a Copper/Nickle mine that has not contaminated water. B. Sulfuric acid produced with negative effects on soil and plants. C. Never before tried in MN. D. Mine Co. leaves the mess to the local community. Reading on I note this Co. has never operated a mine before; it is not an American Co. and the parent Co. has a record of tax evasion and numerous fatalities. It is ridiculous to mine in the Superior National Forest a location set aside for wildlife, and for generations to come as a area of beauty and nature for all to enjoy. There is not one positive reason to want this mine in MN. How is it possible to contaminate water, air, land and negatively impact wildlife areas in return for 350 jobs and 20 yrs of production. This then requiring a 200 to 500 year clean up, if cleanup is even possible. Water, Land, Nature are the three most important qualities that any state has, to ruin them would leave the next generations a state with problems much more serious than jobs. Without clean water and food tradition is negated. Please consider Common Sense ahead of Greed and keep Minnesota a state where future generations can live in peace with nature. Sandra Reuther, past president, LWV Brainerd Lakes Area 29790 Lake shore Dr Breezy Point, MN 56472
HYPERLINK "tel:218%20831%202909"218 831 2909

42870

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandra Severt 39756

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Sandra Severt
150 E Burnsville Pkwy Apt 305 Burnsville, MN 55337-7572

Sandra Wagner 54842

See attachment

Sandra Zaninovich 40327

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sandra Zaninovich 1670 Manning Ave Los Angeles, CA 90024 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandy Bergeron

39346

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Sandy Hotvet

41999

I am a concerned citizen who has lived in Minnesota for 75 years and who enjoys the wonderful outdoors that our state has and must continue to protect for generations to come. PLEASE, help to maintain our wilderness, lakes, and wetlands by not allowing PolyMet to mine in northeastern Minnesota. Sandy Hotvet 26420 Edgewood Road Excelsior, MN 55331

Sandy Loney

14840

Ms Fay, As a science teacher I am contacting you to plead that you stand up for our fresh water, forests, and American Indians of Minnesota. There is so much to lose with this project.. Why would we risk having anything happen to our Superior Nat'l forest and fresh water supply. We have a national treasure ~~ are we willing to gamble with it.. What if we lose and there is an accident. There are several reasons to say no to this proposed land swap. Why would we want to swap out high quality land for lower quality lands scattered around. What is the benefit for Minnesota. There is NONE. Why would we allow ANY corporation with a notorious environmental record anywhere near Minnesota water. Again . What is the benefit for Minnesota. There is NONE. Will you be able to sleep at night when an accident happens. Do the right thing Stand up for Minnesota and say NO to Polymet. The short term jobs aren't worth it. Don't sell out the state for the rest of us. Do what's right for Minnesota. Sandy Loney Science Teacher Brainerd Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandy Loney 14841

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: As a science teacher I am writing to ask that you reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project. I am asking that you reject the land exchange. No way should mining waste be happening near our national treasure ~ clean fresh water. That would be very short sighted thinking on everybody's part. PolyMet's main investor is known around the world for being a major polluter. Why would we risk doing business with this company. Are you really willing to risk our water. Will you be able to sleep at night if/when an accident occurs. Please say no to this ludicrous idea. Thank you in advance. Sandy Loney Science Teacher Sincerely
Sandy Loney 5730 Birchdale Road Brainerd, MN 56401 2184546678

51071

Mr Dabney, As a science teacher I am contacting you to plead that you stand up for our fresh water, forests, and American Indians of Minnesota. There is so much to lose with this project.. Why would we risk having anything happen to our Superior Nat'l forest and fresh water supply. We have a national treasure ~ are we willing to gamble with it.. What if we lose and there is an accident. There are several reasons to say no to this proposed land swap. Why would we want to swap out high quality land for lower quality lands scattered around. What is the benefit for Minnesota. There is NONE. Why would we allow ANY corporation with a notorious environmental record anywhere near our Minnesota forests and water. Again . What is the benefit for Minnesota. There is NONE. Will you be able to sleep at night when an accident happens. Do the right thing Stand up for Minnesota and say NO to Polymet. The short term jobs aren't worth it. Don't sell out the state for the rest of us. Do what's right for Minnesota. Sandy Loney Science Teacher Brainerd Minnesota

51072

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: As a science teacher I am writing to ask that you reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project. I am asking that you reject the land exchange. No way should mining waste be happening near our national treasure ~ clean fresh water. That would be very short sighted thinking on everybody's part. PolyMet's main investor is known around the world for being a major polluter. Why would we risk doing business with this company. Are you really willing to risk our water. Will you be able to sleep at night if/when an accident occurs. Please say no to this ludicrous idea. Thank you in advance. Sandy Loney Science Teacher Sincerely
Sandy Loney 5730 Birchdale Road Brainerd, MN 56401 2184546678

Sandy Lucas 40987

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Sandy Lucas 1315 Bayard Ave Saint Paul, MN 55116-1641 (651) 895-4502

Sandy Sterle 15965

Please see attached Word Document.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandy Stoffel

15427

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sandy Stoffel

44248

Mar 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The matter isn't "if" the water will be polluted, but "when" it will be polluted. With moose deriving not just water but also food from the waterways around the NorthMet project, moose will be negatively affected by this mine. To date, there hasn't been one sulfide mine or open-pit mine that hasn't polluted the waterways. Such as the Dober mine that has killed off all aquatic life in a 7 mile stretch of the Iron River and the 10 mile stretch of the Brule River. A study done on open-pit mining practices, while all projects reviewed stated that it wouldn't pollute, over 76% of the time it did. Along with that, 89% of these mines polluted when it was stated that it was "completely safe". This has caused entire ecosystem to be destroyed in the states of Montana, New Mexico, and Nevada due to the sulfide mining contamination of thousands of waterways. Also, when these mines contaminate, it is up to the taxpayers to fend for the tens-of-millions-of-dollars bill because some of the mining companies filed for bankruptcy. This mining practice is too dangerous for Minnesota and definitely too dangerous for northeastern Minnesota. Tourists bring \$1-6 billion in revenue per year in the arrowhead region. They travel from around the world to fish and camp in the pristine waters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. What's going to happen to that revenue when the fish are killed off and the waterways are too toxic to swim or even camp nearby. That \$1-6 billion is going to go to a place where the state proves that it cares about the environment. Sincerely, Ms Sandy Stoffel 7655 Saint Croix Trl S Hastings, MN 55033-9494

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sanela Arnautalic

16281

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Sanford Taly

39992

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Sanford Taly 5645 Star Cir Excelsior, MN 55331-8403

Sanjay Kuba

54681

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Santiago and Laurie Sovell-Fernandez 43323

To Whom It May Concern, I respectfully submit the following comments on the PolyMet mining proposal in northeastern Minnesota: I question the accuracy of the modeling used to predict the impact of the project on both ground and surface water quality and quantity due to data limitations. More data is needed to make an accurate assessment of potential impacts in these areas. I strongly question the conclusion of the SDEIS on potential sulfate and mercury pollution impacts to water resources within and near the project area. Interactions among these water quality constituents are complex and many questions remain about the necessary rules and enforcement required to adequately ensure protection and nondegradation. Finally, on a broader, more holistic level, I believe we must take a precautionary stance on a project of this nature and magnitude. If a true Cost Benefit Analysis was conducted, would 20 years of extraction and a few hundred short term jobs outweigh the cost of (at least) 500 years of pollution clean up and health impacts of which we can not know. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, Laurie Sovell 240 W George St Saint Paul, MN 55107

Sara Anderson 57254

Like in the past, mines similar to the proposed Polymet, have contaminated the earth, environment, water and presumably people and creatures [ILLEGIBLE] near the mines and along waterways connected or within proximity. What effects does this have on human and animal life, since NO testing has been conducted on cancers, illnesses, water pollution linked to human/animal life indirect correlation to the proposed mine? Sara Anderson 1801 Superior St Duluth, MN 55812

Sara Barsel 43009

DNR: Attached to this message, please find formal comments on the PolyMet NorthMet Project SDEIS. Please send me a brief E-mail confirmation that: · you received this message and could open the attached files, and · this message and comments were received before the comment period deadline. Thank you,
Sara Barsel, Phd sara.barsel@q-com

43012

DNR: Attached to this message, please find formal comments on the PolyMet NorthMet Project SDEIS. Please send me a brief E-mail confirmation that: · you received this message and could open the attached files, and · this message and comments were received before the comment period deadline. Thank you,
Sara Barsel, Phd sara.barsel@q-com

43016

DNR: Attached to this message, please find formal comments on the NorthMet, or PolyMet, Project SDEIS. Please send me a brief E-mail confirmation that: · you received this message and could open the attached files, and · this message and comments were received before the comment period deadline. Thank you,
Sara Barsel, Phd [HYPERLINK "mailto:sara.barsel@q-com"](mailto:sara.barsel@q-com)sara.barsel@q-com

Sara Bible 41967

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sara Bible 3014 Brunswick Ave S Saint Louis Park, MN 55416-2046

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sara bocklund 41940

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, sara bocklund marine, Minnesota

Sara Brice 44540

The resources aren't going away, they are safely stockpiled for the future when their worth will be exponential. Leave it there. Sara Brice 702 Aldrich Dr Northfield MN 55057

Sara Bristol 41826

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Sara Bristol Minneapolis, Minnesota

Sara Darby 24013

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Years ago, I went on an extended canoe trip in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It was a wonderful experience, and I had never before seen such a pristine, beautiful wilderness environment. Sulfide mining, and any other kind of mining, simply should not be allowed in or near this beautiful area, or anywhere near Lake Superior and its headwaters. The risks to the environment, wildlife, and public health are too great to allow any kind of mining. Thank you for your attention to and serious consideration of my concerns regarding this critically important matter. Sincerely, Sara Darby 100 Park Ln Apt 212 Contoocook, NH 03229-3139 (603) 746-1217

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sara Haase

19298

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Sara Haase 2264 320th St E. Northfield, MN 55057

Sara Harrison

39737

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am gravely concerned about the long-term impact of Sulfide mining outside of the BWCA. I would like to know exactly how you plan to hold PolyMet accountable financially for a 500 year window of time, for any adverse environmental impacts from sulfide ore mining in the proposed area. There is no record of any company staying intact for that kind of time horizon. What evidence do you have that they have the commitment or the financial reserves to back-up their promises for this extended period of time. This in my mind is a delusional premise to believe they can actually deliver on this kind of time horizon, or even that they have any genuine intention to do so. So how do you 'trust, but verify' on this kind of proposal. As well, what level of pollution are you going to deem 'acceptable,' in terms of runoff into adjacent rivers and lakes. What impact will that run-off have on fish, birds, wild rice, and wildlife in the region. How large of an area will the mining impact. What protections will be put in place to ensure that heavy metal contamination does not occur in the watershed surrounding the mining site. What level of ongoing monitoring will the DNR and EPA have. What regulatory teeth will you have to hold PolyMet accountable. Unfortunately, the national and state trends have been to 'relax' environmental regulations, in favor of promoting a business- friendly environment. So, tell me, who will make sure we do not end-up with a 500 year window of unregulated pollution from this proposed mine. I would like to know who will sign their name to that pledge and back it up with the best environmental monitoring available now and in the future. Please do not sell out this region to the highest bidder with the best sales pitch. Thank you, Sara Harrison I The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Sara Harrison 4536 Aldrich Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-4840 (612) 827-8018

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sara Harrison

48883

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am gravely concerned about the long-term impact of Sulfide mining outside of of the BWCA. I would like to know exactly how you plan to hold PolyMet accountable financially for a 500 year window of time, for any adverse environmental impacts from sulfide ore mining in the proposed area. There is no record of any company staying intact for that kind of time horizon. What evidence do you have that they have the commitment or the financial reserves to back-up their promises for this extended period of time. This in my mind is a delusional premise to believe they can actually deliver on this kind of time horizon, or even that they have any genuine intention to do so. So how do you 'trust, but verify' on this kind of proposal. As well, what level of pollution are you going to deem 'acceptable,' in terms of runoff into adjacent rivers and lakes. What impact will that run-off have on fish, birds, wild rice, and wildlife in the region. How large of an area will the mining impact. What protections will be put in place to ensure that heavy metal contamination does not occur in the watershed surrounding the mining site. What level of ongoing monitoring will the DNR and EPA have. What regulatory teeth will you have to hold PolyMet accountable. Unfortunately, the national and state trends have been to 'relax' environmental regulations, in favor of promoting a business- friendly environment. So, tell me, who will make sure we do not end-up with a 500 year window of unregulated pollution from this proposed mine. I would like to know who will sign their name to that pledge and back it up with the best environmental monitoring available now and in the future. Please do not sell out this region to the highest bidder with the best sales pitch. Thank you, Sara Harrison I The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Sara Harrison 4536 Aldrich Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-4840 (612) 827-8018

57993

We cannot afford to accept monitoring & clean-up of 500 years of water quality, protection, post-PolyMet mining! Water is life period! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Sara Hill

39474

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As you revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Proper site management should be part of the cost of business, not a cost to taxpayers in Minnesota. Jobs are not a profit to Minnesota if Minnesota needs to pay any site maintenance or clean up. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Sara Hill 1198 James Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-2919

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sara Mairs

43851

Hi, My name is Sara Mairs and I have lived in Minnesota most of my life. I spent my formative years paddling the pristine waters of the BWCAW with YMCA Camp Widjiwagan. I continue to travel every year to Ely with my family to paddle those same waters, and watch the same wonder and magic in my own children as I experienced myself. There are so few pristine wilderness areas left in our country and in the world. Doing anything for short term gain that would put this resource at risk is beyond my comprehension. I STRONGLY oppose copper sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. Beyond the potential contamination of the water of this amazing wilderness area, there is a long history of negligence on the part of mining companies, and I do not trust the integrity of any mining company to follow through on efforts to prevent known and unknown problems from occurring. The only way to ASSURE the health and safety of both the ecosystems and the residents of this area is to NOT mine in the first place. Thank you for listening. Sara Mairs 1407 Arona Street St Paul, MN. 55108

Sara Moen

17011

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sara Posluszny

40092

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Sara Roberts

33526

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I made my first canoe trip in the BWCA in 1966 and have made lots of others since then. I am 70 years old and will be returning to canoe and camp in this beautiful wilderness this AutguSt This is a precious area that must be protected for all time so that my grandchildren and others' grandchildren can know wilderness and wild things. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt Sincerely, Sara Roberts 5490 Caddis Bnd Apt 204 Fitchburg, WI 53711-7163 (608) 273-1114

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sara Roberts

38749

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Sara Roberts 5490 Caddis Bend Apt 204 Fitchburg, WY 53711 608-273-1114

Sara Skalle

58061

I'm opposed to this mining project. The long-term loss, damage and sacrifice outweighs the short-term benefits. I grew up in Northeastern Minnesota and treasure it. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Sara Wright

41984

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Sara Wright Roseville, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Alexander

10398

To whom it may concern, I would like to submit comments proposed PolyMet mining proposal for northern Minnesota. Here are a few of my concerns regarding the proposed mining project and the impacts that it would have on the native environment of Minnesota: 1) There does not seem to be enough information and consensus on the likely impacts of sulfide mining on the environment. In a similar case in Wisconsin, the state decided that they would wait for another mining project to be initiated with no environmental impacts before agreeing to start one. This would be the first sulfide mining project in Minnesota, however other similar projects have all had issues with water contamination. To date, I do not believe there are any cases of sulfide mines that have operated without significant environmental impacts. 2) PolyMet does not seem to have a very clear proposal for dealing with containing waste created as part of the mining process. Sulfide mining leads to lots of waste, such as tailings and run-off. Piling the tailings does not seem to be a practical or aesthetically sound solution. Run-off is going to be incredibly hard to contain, because it can easily seep into the groundwater and then lead to contamination of surrounding ground and surface waters. Thousands of acres of the Boundary Waters watershed would be affected, influencing many people's enjoyment of these native areas, and destroying them for generations to come. 3) PolyMet has promised to be responsible for all clean up necessary due to this mining proposal. However, the lifespan of the project is 20 years, and wastewater and other treatments could take over 500 years. There is no way that PolyMet can agree to and promise to be responsible for that length of time, as it is well over a human lifespan. This would then fall to the state, and future generations would have to pay for clean-up for years. These are only some of the considerations that must be taken into account when reviewing the DEIS. Thank you for your work on this issue, and I hope that we can protect Minnesota's native environment for years to come. Sarah Alexander 681 Birch Lane South Shoreview, MN 55126

Sarah Betzler

38211

Hello, I would like to register a comment about the proposed Polymet Mine in northern Minnesota. I grew up in Minnesota and plan to return in a few years; my roots and family are on the Iron Range and North Shore. I urge you to reject the proposed mine. There is a place, in our government, for encouraging resource extraction and job building - but there is also a place for allowing such opportunities to pass when they would do more damage than good. Some resources are not possible to extract without risking significant, expensive, and long-lasting damage to local economies; as a culture, we do not have a strong record of resisting temptation, and the consequences when we fail are frequently borne by the very people that we imagined would profit. Please consider that when chemical contamination and spills affect water resources in this less-than-wealthy area, and when ecotourism is reduced because of the water contamination and spoiled vistas, and when the mine closes and jobs disappear again, the residents in this region will be worse off than they are now. The mining-town story is common enough to be a cliché: people scrape by on low-paying, dangerous jobs, enduring inevitable chemical spills and pollution, watching the wealth generated by the mine get funneled off to company executives. When the mine is worked out, the jobs disappear and leave these communities worse than before the mine arrived. Regulation, job safety improvements, and promises by Polymet may soothe some worries, but I don't believe we have the rules or the enforcement capacity to solve most of these problems Northern Minnesota needs jobs, but it doesn't need these jobs: please don't make them go through this again. The behavior of other mining companies causes me to doubt that Polymet will really take care of these people and clean up their mess. Please don't trust them to do the right thing - as our state government, it is your job to distrust those that might take advantage of us and our resources. It is rare that a government acts that way, but I believe Minnesota has the potential to break the pattern. Thank you, Sarah Betzler

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Blum

19082

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Sarah Blum Sarah Blum 4017 14th Avenue S. #10E Minneapolis, MN 55407

Sarah Butler

40830

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Sarah Butler 19 South St Apt 3 Brighton, MA 02135-5168 (617) 733-9463

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah E. Reed

43571

Dear MN Department of Natural Resources, I've spent the last several months reading through the Northmet environmental impact statement (EIS) and relevant literature and thinking as critically as I can about whether the project is a good idea for Minnesota. While I understand the arguments on both sides, I've finally come to a conclusion that I stand behind 100%: Moving forward with the PolyMet project (and copper mining in Minnesota in general), would be a terribly misguided and devastating mistake, both environmentally and economically. There are many weaknesses in the scientific and economic analyses for the PolyMet EIS (including inadequate statistical and spatial analyses, failure to address model limitations, poor literature review and vague economic projections). While I did not have the time to write up a thorough assessment of the deficiencies, I introduce a few of them below. I grew up on the Iron Range, about 30 miles away from the proposed PolyMet site. Taconite mining is a core part of my identity. My father and grandfather both spent decades of their lives working for Minntac and Reserve Mining Co., respectively. I completely support safe and manageable modes of mining. Taconite mining put food on the table every day of my childhood and a summer job at Minntac helped me pay for college. I'm very grateful for the opportunities that mining made possible for me, and I want similar opportunities to be available to my niece and nephew and future generations. But sulfide mining, in my estimation, is drastically different from and much more dangerous than taconite mining. I think a 2008 US Fish and Wildlife-commissioned study of mining operations with acid-forming minerals best sums up why moving forward with the PolyMet project would be a foolish and short-sighted decision.

http://www.pebblescience-org/pdfs/Final_Lit_Review_AMD.pdf They studied the environmental impact statements and outcomes of hundreds of sulfide mining operations and found the following: "Based on review of the acid mine drainage literature it is clear that severe world-wide ecological consequences, especially for aquatic resources, have resulted from mining ore deposits with acid-forming minerals. Accurate prediction of the onset and aggressiveness of low-quality acidic water discharge is perilously difficult using the best available science. [Emphasis mine] Multiple complex geochemical, biological and hydrologic factors create a daunting task for mining engineers to profitably recover mineral resources while preventing discharges of metals and acidity to surface and ground water." I know there are many economic challenges in northern Minnesota and I don't have the perfect answer but I think there are other options that can bring numerous, skilled jobs to the Iron Range for the long term and won't threaten to turn the state's freshwater ecosystems into Superfund sites. Instead of mining, one possibility is mineral reuse and recycling. The current percentage of copper supplied by recycled materials is approximately 30%. That percentage is expected to double in the next several decades. In other words, most of the world's copper supply will soon be derived from copper recycling. Why not be forward-thinking and build copper (and other precious metal) recycling facilities in northern Minnesota. These could supply quality jobs for an indefinite amount of time with a drastically reduced level of environmental risk. I implore you to reject the PolyMet EIS. PolyMet has simply failed to establish that its project can adequately mitigate the extensive and well-known risks associated with the mining of ore deposits with acid-forming minerals. Please do not risk adding northern Minnesota to the long list of acid mine drainage disasters. Kind regards, Sarah Reed, Phd University of California – Berkeley Environmental Scientist with specialties in soil science and spatial analysis

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Hayes

9660

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sarah Hayes 1055 Agate Street St Paul, MN 55117

18530

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sarah Hayes 1055 Agate Street St Paul, MN 55117

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Hayes

50606

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sarah Hayes 1055 Agate Street St Paul, MN 55117

Sarah Heggestuen

9559

Reluctantly, I say no to the nickel copper mine. It threatens the wild rice, the water supply for 60,000 people. The jobs today are not worth the risk tomorrow. Residents, taxpayers, and our beautiful environment will suffer if there is contamination. As we saw in the aftermath of the recent spill in Virginia, the company can quickly declare bankruptcy and the cost of cleanup - if cleanup is even possible - will be left to taxpayers. It is not worth the risk. Vote no, please. Sarah Heggestuen

Sarah K Poznanovic

54687

See attachment

Sarah Kutzke

43840

Good afternoon, Let's not add any mining operations in Minnesota. Minnesota is such a beautiful place. Ruining Minnesota's natural beauty and resources would be a huge mistake. Keep Minnesota beautiful and clean, please. Thank you, Sarah Kutzke, born and raised in MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Malick

38456

Dear Lisa Fay, I am strongly opposed to the copper, nickel, paladium, and gold mines propped by Twin Metals and Polymet that would be located south and west of Ely, Minnesota. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is America's most visited wilderness area and one of the oldest designated wilderness areas in the nation. Despite what proponents of the copper-nickel mines say, creating new mines within 50 miles of Ely would be extremely detrimental to our local economy. The mines will not only be an eyesore, they will also increase rail and truck traffic, which would negatively affect tourism in the area. The noise from drilling and moving material destroys the wilderness experience on the southern end of the Wilderness area near Spruce Road and Birch Lake. Most importantly, there is no evidence that our most precious resource, the interconnected system of pristine waterways, will adequately be protected. Acid mine drainage in our waters is unacceptable. Sulfide-bearing rock brought to the surface will turn into sulfuric acid and leach into our waterways, resulting in irreparable damage to our biotic community. **DO NOT ALLOW ANY HARD ROCK MINING WITHIN 50 MILES OF ELY MINNESOTA.** Thank you, Sarah Malick 56 W. Shagawa Road Ely, Minnesota 715-410-2941 <http://graphics.hotmail-com/greypixel.gif> "Seek first to understand, and then to be understood" -Steven Covey

Sarah Martin

28015

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Sarah Martin 6141 Corntassel Ln Roanoke, VA 24018-5623 (540) 774-6176

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Moore

16273

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Sarah Musgrave

44687

The wetlands that will be removed are not replaced in the same watershed and the whole issue is not addressed and seem of little concern to everyone. The wetlands serve as a way of cleaning the water directly flowing into Lake Superior. Removing the wetlands will cause increased pollution into another great natural resource. Also the vast amount of water needed to mine will cause damage to the ecosystem. Because of climate change it is creating draught or flooding conditions. The chance of pollution flowing to the surrounding area because of extreme weather is likely to occur. At other times it could cause water shortages. Sarah Musgrave 7717 Chicago Ave #108 Richfield, MN 55423 612-327-2842

Sarah Nelson

39178

Dear DNR, I'm writing to express how truly worried I am about the proposed PolyMet mine. I sincerely hope that you will reject this project outright. Minnesota is a beautiful place. And our abundant fresh water is a big part of what makes this place special. Not everyone is so lucky. But we shouldn't let our abundance make us stupid. We must take good care of our resources - and this mine project looks just disastrous for our fresh water. 500 years or more of pollutants leaching into the ground water and our waterways. This is a no-brainer. Reject PolyMet's permit application. Minnesota doesn't want their business. Perhaps we need to invest some resources into retraining underemployed residents of northern Minnesota. That would be far more cost effective than selling off our beautiful northland resources to a corporation that might not even exist in 20 years. Please, please say no to this mine. Sincerely, Sarah Nelson Roseville, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Nelson

39623

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please reject the proposed PolyMet mine project. By now you've heard all the environmental risks - both imminent and long term. Really, it's a no-brainer. A terrible trade off. A handful of jobs, for a host of certain damages to our fresh water. In 10 or 20 years, the company will have made their profits and be gone. Minnesota will be left with all the costs. It would be craziness to do anything but reject this project in every way. I am not unsympathetic to those who are in need of good jobs in Northern MN, but let's invest in retraining folks who need jobs, rather than sell-out the environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Sarah Nelson 2835 Pascal St Apt 24g Roseville, MN 55113-7103

39632

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Nelson

48823

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please reject the proposed PolyMet mine project. By now you've heard all the environmental risks - both imminent and long term. Really, it's a no-brainer. A terrible trade off. A handful of jobs, for a host of certain damages to our fresh water. In 10 or 20 years, the company will have made their profits and be gone. Minnesota will be left with all the costs. It would be craziness to do anything but reject this project in every way. I am not unsympathetic to those who are in need of good jobs in Northern MN, but let's invest in retraining folks who need jobs, rather than sell-out the environment. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Sarah Nelson 2835 Pascal St Apt 24g Roseville, MN 55113-7103

sarah nevins

43474

Dear Ms Fay, I respectfully ask that you deny Polymet/NorthMet a permit to mine in the state of Minnesota. I also ask that you deny the Section 404 permit allowing for destruction of wetlands. This activity would (if allowed) destroy the vital and vibrant tourism economy in northern Minnesota. It would jeopardize the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness - not only environmentally, but it would impact every activity tourists partake in; from sightseeing and wildlife viewing to hunting, trapping and fishing. Part of the plan is to "monitor and treat polluted water for 500 years" . This is simply not feasible. A project that openly plans to pollute fresh water for that long should never be allowed. Fresh water is the necessary for life as we know it and is becoming more and more scarce. We must protect our resources for future generations, not sell them to the company who spends the most. I am a resident of the town of Bayfield on the Bayfield Peninsula in northern Wisconsin. I look out my window as I type and there is Lake Superior, all frozen. There is the ice road out to Madeline Island, and The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, all around me. This proposed project would affect all of the Lake Superior Basin, sulfuric acid in the lake will not stay in one place as you certainly know. In Wisconsin we know firsthand the destruction sulfide mining causes. We share Lake Superior, not only with each other, but with all future generations as well. I want my grandchildren to be able to swim at the beaches of this beautiful National Lakeshore. I want the tourists to be able to come and visit the ice caves and the sea caves. And I want to be able to travel to the BWCA, as I will be doing this summer to spend 10 days canoeing and portaging through the most beautiful wilderness I have ever experienced. Please keep our economies and our environment healthy. Please deny PolyMet/NorthMet a permit to mine in the state of Minnesota, reject the exchange of Superior National Forest land that would allow the project to move forward, and deny the Section 404 permit. Respectfully, Sarah Nevins 231 North 1st Street Bayfield Wisconsin 54814

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Nurnberger

16270

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

41965

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sarah Nurnberger 5516 Lyndale Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-1720

Sarah Oppelt

36615

Sarah Oppelt 14760 Easter Avenue Apple Valley, MN 55124 I do not support the approval of the PolyMet mine in Northern Minnesota because of concerns over the environmental impacts over the short and long term. The mine will provide relatively few jobs for a relatively short amount of time with very likely significant environmental impacts. If the mine is approved, please do ensure that there are significant financial assurances in the permitting process. It is important to me as a Minnesotan that there is enough money to deal with contamination problems when they do arise to minimize the impacts on our precious waterways and land. Thank you, Sarah Oppelt - "Be tough, yet gentle. Humble, yet bold. Swayed always by beauty and truth." -Bob Pieh

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Petzel

41785

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Pradt

46086

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Let's learn from the mistakes of the past, not repeat them. My family has been in Minnesota for generations, and I feel so lucky to be connected to a place of such beauty, with great societal values that include caring for both the environment and for people. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate. Please reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal because it poses unacceptable risks to human health. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, at least require a re-do of the SDEIS to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: How much mercury would be released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. Please re-do the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. Please re-do the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. Please re-do the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury in fish. 5-Assessment of cumulative cancer and non-cancer risks from existing and additional sources of toxic chemicals, such as manganese, arsenic, lead and nickel, applying the most protective health risk analysis. 6-Assessment of all risks using a 70-year "lifetime" for exposures. 7-Assessment of cumulative risks of multiple chemicals and exposure routes (drinking water, fish, wild rice) on infants, children and the elderly. 8-Assessment of cumulative risk of toxic chemicals (mercury, arsenic) in fish, game, and wild rice on persons who rely on fishing, hunting and gathering for subsistence. 9-Assessment of cumulative risk of methylmercury contamination of fish in the St Louis River and estuary for Lake Superior. •Complete the mercury TMDL study of the St Louis River before finalizing the PolyMet SDEIS or issuing any permits for the PolyMet sulfide mine project. The PolyMet SDEIS is an inadequate assessment of human health impacts and the PolyMet sulfide mine and mine wastes proposal poses an unacceptable risk to the health of fetuses, infants, children and adults in Minnesota. Please reject both the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet mine. Very truly yours, Sarah Pradt Sarah Pradt 1282 Stanford Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Sarah Schaefer

54560

Polymet's proposal will leave cleanup for 500 years at its lowest proposed timeframe. This is likely a bill that will be paid by Minnesotan tax-payers. Despite claims that this project will create jobs and revenue, only 100 jobs in 20 years of its existence will be for in-state workers and only approximately 1% of revenue will stay in-state. Say NO to the Polymet proposal to mine NE Minnesota.

Sarah Sederstrom

39551

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Sarah Sederstrom 8700 Jeffrey Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082-9251 (651) 407-6220

Sarah Shankle

43065

Hello, I am a resident of Minneapolis and I am very concerned about the proposed PolyMet copper nickel mine in Northern Minnesota. I have been following the news about this issue and I feel that it will have serious impacts to the health of the land and people of Minnesota. The negative impacts of this projects will be felt for generations. I urge you to stop the proposed mine. Sincerely, Sarah Shankle

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sarah Sigford 54648

See attachment

Sarah Stevens 14842

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

sarah stonich 45929

There's .5 ounce of copper in your cell phone - if every time we bought a cell phone we included 5 pennies for the manufacturer in our payment - that would cover it. A computer, perhaps 30 pennies, A tablet, maybe 20- Batteries, I'm not sure. So, how about we eliminate the penny as currency and collect the pre 1983 all-copper pennies for manufacturers needing copper. Too simple. Not really. Sarah Stonich 1831 Benjamin Street NE Minneapolis, MN 55418 - For more visit [HYPERLINK "http://sarahstonich-com"](http://sarahstonich-com) Of the writing in Vacationland, The Minneapolis Star Tribune says, "Storytelling gifts reminiscent of our most holy mother of the frozen north, Alice Munro. Like Munro, Stonich delivers beautiful storytelling without ever resorting to sentimentality."

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sarah wilson 41398

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency gave the PolyMet sulfide mine environmental study a failing grade, saying that the study itself was “inadequate” and the sulfide mine project would be “environmentally unsatisfactory.” The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. It makes claims without facts behind them. It doesn’t analyze the effect of pollution on workers’ health or on nearby drinking water wells. It doesn’t explore alternatives that could reduce PolyMet’s destruction of wetlands. It doesn’t examine the effect that PolyMet’s sulfide mine, combined with other mines, would have on toxic pollution, like mercury contamination of fish. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would destroy up to 8,263 acres of wetlands in the Lake Superior Basin. Its waste rock piles, mine pits, and tailings waste would leak and seep pollution into surface water and groundwater, increasing sulfates and toxic metals that harm fish, destroy wild rice, and impair health of adults and children. PolyMet makes a lot of rosy predictions, but the SDEIS shows that pollution from the mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters “would continue in perpetuity.” Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota’s fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely sarah wilson 3442 10th avenue south Minneapolis, MN 55407 6128252160

Sarah Wolbert 42491

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sarah Wolbert 3237 Chicago Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-2104

sbarkema 7201

We are sending this email to inform you of our strong opposition to the Polymet project being allowed to proceed. To even think about letting this project continue is hard for us to understand. The people behind this6 push have only one thing on their mind. \$\$\$\$\$\$ They will do anything and promise anything to get this started. The damage it WILL cause and the pollution it will create now and for hundreds of years are what we and our next generations will have to live with long after the \$\$\$\$ has disappeared. The HUGE potential for additional damage and problems that can happen once this project gets the go ahead is in no way feasible for the few temporary jobs they SAY will be made. Minnesota should NOT be made a testing ground for this form of mining when they have such a BAD track record and our environment laws are not being enforced. This is just setting us up for a MAJOR MISTAKE We could go on listing many other objections but the bottom line is if we had to vote on this, they would NOT get the go ahead. They cannot be trusted to do what they promise and people with vision and common sense will not allow this to continue. We need leaders to vote for what is the right decision for Minnesotans and protect us and our country from plunder NOW. After our environment is trashed, it will be too late to do the right thing. This is just the tip of the iceberg that will come if we don't stop it. Byron and Sherry Barkema 2742 Hwy 3 Two Harbors, MN 55616

Scarlet Freese 54789

See attachment

Scarlett Antcliff 42576

See attachment

Schmidt Michael 17371

Hello, The more I read about the proposed copper sulfate mine in NE MN the more I am against this. This time of mining appears to be a boom-bust proposition with so much potential for immediate and ongoing pollution and industrial damage to the environment of this beautiful natural and tourist area. Even with a very large bond posting by the company or industry I do think support this type of a destructive industry in Minnesota. Sincerely, Michael Schmidt 428 Bruns Court St Paul, MN 55127

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scot Dauner

57256

Please don't allow the Polymet mine upon in northern MN. I've tried to get as I can on this topic and nothing adds up. There is no track record of a pollution free solution for the type of mine and it is right next door to the BWCA. I don't believe one but that anyone is going to sign up to clean water for 200 to 500 years. Especially when they pull up stakes after 20-40 years. Polymet wants all the reward, but who do you think is taking on all the risk? Scot Dauner 10000 Nord Rd Bloomington, MN 55437

scott anderson

9473

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I do not understand why 300 jobs for 20 years is more important than clean water. This mine will play out in 30 years. while the water has another 480 years before it might be non-toxic. this 480 years who will pay for the containment of the toxic water. Tax payers. The containment plan of this toxic water, does it take into account large rains, like in june of 2013, the 100 year rain. What if polymet goes bankrupt to get out of their commitments. then the tax payers will be held accountable. Remember the United States is only 238 years old. 500 years is along time to contain toxic water. This is the largest fresh water basin in the world. Water flows north, and south. How much of a tourist area is Butte Montana. Waste Land, with way less water to be messed up. how is their containment doing, how much is that costing. Have you ever read the LORAX. I think you should. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, scott anderson 125 4th ave two harbors, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

scott anderson

18424

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I do not understand why 300 jobs for 20 years is more important than clean water. This mine will play out in 30 years. while the water has another 480 years before it might be non-toxic. this 480 years who will pay for the containment of the toxic water. Tax payers. The containment plan of this toxic water, does it take into account large rains, like in june of 2013, the 100 year rain. What if polymet goes bankrupt to get out of their commitments. then the tax payers will be held accountable. Remember the United States is only 238 years old. 500 years is along time to contain toxic water. This is the largest fresh water basin in the world. Water flows north, and south. How much of a tourist area is Butte Montana. Waste Land, with way less water to be messed up. how is their containment doing, how much is that costing. Have you ever read the LORAX. I think you should. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, scott anderson 125 4th ave two harbors, MN 55616

38753

Count me as strongly opposed to a copper-nickel mine in northeast Minnesota. Scott Anderson 9990 Julep Trail N. Scandia, MN 55073

Alphabetical by sender's first name

scott anderson

50544

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: I do not understand why 300 jobs for 20 years is more important than clean water. This mine will play out in 30 years. while the water has another 480 years before it might be non-toxic. this 480 years who will pay for the containment of the toxic water. Tax payers. The containment plan of this toxic water, does it take into account large rains, like in june of 2013, the 100 year rain. What if polymet goes bankrupt to get out of their commitments. then the tax payers will be held accountable. Remember the United States is only 238 years old. 500 years is along time to contain toxic water. This is the largest fresh water basin in the world. Water flows north, and south. How much of a tourist area is Butte Montana. Waste Land, with way less water to be messed up. how is their containment doing, how much is that costing. Have you ever read the LORAX. I think you should. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, scott anderson 125 4th ave two harbors, MN 55616

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Bennett

44180

Scott Bennett 2065 Oak Glen Trail Stillwater, MN 55082 March 13, 2014 TO: HYPERLINK
"mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us .

As an avid outdoorsman and a financial contributor to the Minnesota DNR and who spends a lot of time fishing, hunting and camping along the north shore region of Lake Superior I am very concerned about the possible impact on the BWCA posed by acid mine drainage from PolyMet's NorthMet project.

PolyMet's web site claims that water that will be discharged from its project site would never enter the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness lakes or stream. In reality, however, hydraulic conductivity testing is needed to determine the actual effect of acid mine drainage into the waterways on the edge of the Boundary Waters. The proposed PolyMet mine site borders and is uphill from One Hundred Mile Swamp, which drains (in part to Langley Creek, which is a tributary to Rainy Lake in the BWCA watershed. Without hydraulic conductivity testing and measurements, PolyMet has no way to show that water entering One Hundred Mile Swamp will not then flow into Rainy Lake in the BWCA watershed.

It is also a concern that the authors of the SDEIS have used incorrect maps which contradict the US National Atlas watershed map, with the goal of suggesting that mine waste water will not seep into the BWCA watershed. Significantly, the SDEIS claims that there is no delineated boundary for One Hundred Mile Swamp—while in reality, the boundaries of One Hundred Mile Swamp have been delineated, and are accessible at HYPERLINK "<http://www.nationalatlas.gov/streamer>"www.nationalatlas.gov/streamer. Having first misrepresented the mere existence of One Hundred Mile Swamp's boundaries, the SDEIS maps then omit the section of One Hundred Mile Swamp that drains into the BWCA watershed: whereas the National Atlas shows a 10-mile-long wetland that drains to both the St Louis River and BWCA watersheds, the most recent SDEIS maps depict the One Hundred Mile Swamp as only six miles long, and as existing only on the St Louis River side of the divide. PolyMet's re-drawn and inaccurate maps would mislead a reader to believe that its proposed project would have no impact on the Boundary Waters.

Finally, there has been no baseline water testing in the Dunka River, Langley Creek, or anywhere else in the Rainy Lake watershed. Without such testing in the Rainy Lake watershed, there is no way to gauge the possible harm to the BWCA and Quetico from PolyMet mine drainage.

For all these reasons, PolyMet must be required to correct its SDEIS to include accurate watershed mapping, with hydraulic conductivity testing in One Hundred Mile Swamp, with water quality testing for the BWCA watershed, and with a data-based statement of the impact of the proposed mine on BWCA water quality.

I know that the Boundary Waters are a unique and fragile ecosystem which needs our protection. It should concern everyone who is responsible for protecting our resources—which PolyMet has affirmatively misrepresented and omitted crucial facts in relation to its project proposal. I urge you to view the SDEIS critically, and to require PolyMet to provide correct and appropriate data so that the impacts of its proposed project can be accurately assessed.

Sincerely,

Scott Bennett-Minnesotan

Scott Bol

18134

So I'm Scott's Bol, and I guess I want to wish peace on earth, good will to all here. I was going to bring that as one of my signs but I forgot it so I guess I'll just pass it on verbally. I want to speak today about concern about jobs and environment. I very much realize that a lot of folks are desperate for work. I'm very disappointed that we didn't create jobs when our market fell back in 2007/2008. And so many people are hurting for jobs. I know I volunteer as a citizen patroller and I'm very concerned and in our neighborhoods that people are desperate. They're going to be doing desperate things if we don't have jobs, and I think the risks, now, for this sulfide mining is just too great; that -- that the tremendous storms that we have these days, with what happened in the Philippines with world-record typhoons, and the tremendous flooding that we've had in Duluth, it's actually true that with global warming we're having tremendous weather changes and the storms are coming. So we have 500-year storms, we have 100-year storms every few years. So when we have seepage from the holding pits, they could flood and that could be a tremendous problem. Now, I think about the economic concerns in West Virginia and what happened in West Virginia that Freedom Industries went bankrupt. They found that these unanticipated costs of all that spillage was tremendous. That would be unfortunate. I would want us to make sure we have all of our stockholders and all of our investors in PolyMet to make sure that they are going to be accountable and not for five years, but for decades, and we start looking at a tremendous amount of years. So it's a huge insurance cost. We know tragedies happen. They happened at Chernobyl in the Soviet union, they happened at Fukushima in Japan. So tragedies happen, you know. We -- people came here saying they trust the agencies. Things go wrong. They trusted the agencies in West Virginia, and the Freedom Industries found the freedom to declare bankruptcy. So let's be careful here. We value our environment. I value jobs. I want us to stand together, strong. I had a union brother come up and thank me just recently for joining him in standing up at Black Friday. We were giving out pizzas in Duluth to the Walmart workers. So, I'm very concerned about labor. I want jobs. We need to stand together for jobs, but not this one.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Coryell

10788

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Scott Coryell 3168 SW Rockbridge Dr Lees Summit, MO 64081-3868

10799

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Scott Coryell 3168 SW Rockbridge Dr Lees Summit, MO 64081-3868

11427

Feb 7, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Scott Coryell 3168 SW Rockbridge Dr Lees Summit, MO 64081-3868

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Cramer

19869

Scott Cramer 3148 29th Avenus South MPLS, MN 55406 I have listened to the voices of my fellow Minnesotans about copper mining, and am struck by what I have heard. Everyone says they are concerned about preserving our beautiful land, our precious water and our children's future. And yet, a troubling fact remains. Mining is a highly disruptive activity that will cause hundreds of years of monitoring and clean up after all the ore is gone. Otherwise, we face wide scale water pollution. This time frame should give us pause. When we think of our ancestors, we rarely remember little beyond our own grandparents. From their time to now, human population on the planet has more than doubled. We utilize every conceivable material, and manipulate every possible resource into what we want. And whether we most value our cell phones, I pads, wind turbines and solar panels or our snowmobiles, aluminum boats, pickup trucks and rifles, what we have in common is our need for more metal. But if we are true stewards of the earth, we should be most concerned about our legacy. What will we leave for the future generations. Will America fall apart if we leave this copper in the ground. Might it be possible that 100 years from now a safer, cleaner, cost efficient method of mineral extraction will have been found. Don't we believe that leaving waste dumps and mine pits leaking toxic chemicals is no gift but rather a poison pen letter to our future offspring. The irony that our success as a species may contain the very seeds of our own destruction is not lost on me. If we truly love our children, our land and our planet, we must find a better way to care for them, and we must start now. We are the caregivers and caretakers for what will come after us. Lets start acting like it, and not permit this mining. .

Scott Daby

38886

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. The potential long-term negative environmental impacts far outweigh the potential short-term economic gains. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Scott Daby 3509 Roosevelt St NE St Anthony, MN 55418-1556

scott duffy

4175

Dec 22, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Five hundred years is the amount of time Polymet corp. says will be needed to treat the groundwater pollution at the metallurgical site. Think about that number for a moment. 471 years ago, Copernicus published his heliocentric theory of the solar system which proposed that the sun is the actual center of the universe. 496 Years ago, Leonardo da vinci had just completed what would prove to be one of the most famous pieces of artwork in history; The Mona Lisa. 511 years ago, Christopher Columbus had just finished the last of his exploratory voyages to the Americas. 500 years ago, the United states would not exist for another 263 years. The DNR/EPA is asking the public to read, digest, and comment on a 2300 page Environmental Impact Statement in 90 days. What is the rush. Give the public the time it needs to fully look over the report. This is a decision that will not only affect us, it will affect future generations for hundreds of years to come. I urge you to extend the comment period. Sincerely, Scott Duffy The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Scott Duffy 2336 Golfview Dr White Bear Lake, MN 55110-5505

Alphabetical by sender's first name

scott duffy

44396

To whom it may concern, I have done my best in the time allotted to read over the EIS report for the northmet project, and I have some serious concerns regarding the proposal. I have highlighted a few of the glaring issues below: -On page ES-53 the EIS states: " Air quality of the BWCA will not be adversely affected". The EIS makes no mention of the air quality of the immediate area surrounding the project site. How will this project affect the air quality of the surrounding area. -The Moose, was recently added to the states "species of special concern" list, and if population trends continue, will be placed on the state's endangered list in the near future. The EIS makes no mention of the effects on Moose and moose habitat that this project will have. How much moose habitat will be destroyed with this project. What is the Moose population in the area. -In 2002, Duluth Minnesota, a mere 100 miles from the proposed mine site, had a "500 year" flood which devastated the surrounding landscape. The Babbit area also received over 10 inches of rain during this same storm. The EIS makes no mention of what contingencies are in place to protect the mine site if this type of event should happen. How can you even begin to make these types of calculations with any level of confidence. -What happens in the event of a "worst case scenario". The EIS paints a very sanitized vision for the mining process. In reality, there will be pollution. How much pollution is the question. What happens if it is discovered that the mine site is leeching sulphur and other pollutants into the groundwater. Who is going to pay for the cleanup costs. What will happen to the surrounding wildlife. What will happen to the largest (and cleanest) freshwater lake in the world. What happens if these events occur after the mine is closed. How can a company possibly give financial assurances for 200-500+ years in the future. Do we really want a superfund in this state. What will happen to the DNR's reputation with the public if this project is allowed to move forward and then there is some type ecological disaster. How could the public ever trust the DNR again. We are at an important crossroad. This is probably the most important issue that the DNR has faced in many decades, if not ever. Whatever decisions are made with this project will set a precedent for years to come. The floodgates will be opened for all of the other mining projects who are sitting on the sidelines waiting to see how the Polymet proposal plays out. There will be no turning back. Sincerely, Scott Duffy 961 County Road D Vadnais Heights, MN 55109

51611

Dec 22, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Five hundred years is the amount of time Polymet corp. says will be needed to treat the groundwater pollution at the metallurgical site. Think about that number for a moment. 471 years ago, Copernicus published his heliocentric theory of the solar system which proposed that the sun is the actual center of the universe. 496 Years ago, Leonardo da vinci had just completed what would prove to be one of the most famous pieces of artwork in history; The Mona Lisa. 511 years ago, Christopher Columbus had just finished the last of his exploratory voyages to the Americas. 500 years ago, the United states would not exist for another 263 years. The DNR/EPA is asking the public to read, digest, and comment on a 2300 page Environmental Impact Statement in 90 days. What is the rush. Give the public the time it needs to fully look over the report. This is a decision that will not only affect us, it will affect future generations for hundreds of years to come. I urge you to extend the comment period. Sincerely, Scott Duffy The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Scott Duffy 2336 Golfview Dr White Bear Lake, MN 55110-5505

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Dulas

9659

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Scott Dulas 5311 Greenwood Rd Duluth, MN 55804

18528

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Scott Dulas 5311 Greenwood Rd Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Dulas

50604

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Scott Dulas 5311 Greenwood Rd Duluth, MN 55804

Scott Francis

44585

As a young person living in the state of Minnesota it is obvious that job creation should be forefront on our minds. The PolyMet Copper Nickel mine, is not the way to create these jobs and boost our economy. The amount of short term benefits are vastly outweighed by the massive implications that the mine could have in the future. The clean up of the mine is in the neighborhood of 500 years. That is completely unacceptable. Even though the PolyMet corporation claims responsibility for the clean up, how can we as minnesotans make sure that a brand new mining corporation will last 500 years into the future to continue the clean up process. The mine also is poised too close to the spectacularly preserved boundary waters area. Ruining that area through exploitation of the natural resources shows a lack of forethought and planning for the future. As the future of the state of minnesota, I do not want the burden of cleaning up the mistakes of the paSt Sincerely, Carter Francis Senior at Prior Lake High School

Alphabetical by sender's first name

scott haskins

47004

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Glencore should be a responsible party for financial assurance in PolyMet's mine plan To [Decision Maker], The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1) Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2) Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3) Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Sincerely, Mr scott haskins 23530 Yellowstone Trl Excelsior, MN 55331-2961

Scott Helgeson

18159

My name is Scott Helgeson, H-E-L-G-E-S-O-N, from Bloomington, Minnesota. I have an MBA and I've worked for a number of companies, including some large industrial companies. I understand what "present value" is. I understand what "future value" is. I understand financial modeling. I understand that what we have here is a 500-year commitment, which is absolutely insane. I just came back from Salt Lake City. You cannot breath the air there. The air is so polluted in Salt Lake City that I want to tell you, you can't walk around outside and jog or do anything. And people are concerned about their health. Now that's air quality. Just up the road in Salt Lake City is a big mine, copper mine. The people who live next to that copper mine are relying on reverse osmosis for their town water. They cannot drink it. The EPA says it's just fine. I am damn glad I don't live in West Virginia. What is going to prevent this company from going belly up in 30 years from now, declaring bankruptcy, and saying, "Gee we can't pay the bills anymore." What is going to prevent that? What assurances are we going to have that this is going to be a long-term financial commitment to take care of our water and our natural resources for 500 years. Are we insane? I mean what investment does anybody do for 500 years these days? Nobody does. And yet we're being sold this bill of goods that somehow for 500 years they're going to watch over this polluted water and make sure it doesn't seep into our natural environment up there and pollute what we have, which a lot of people their job depends on it. I own some land and a cabin up by Lutsen on the North Shore. I have three daughters. And I'm concerned about this narrow, short-term view of ours that can possibly rationalize this insanity. Thank you very much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Hochhalter

40911

Hello, I have been reading about the proposed copper sulfide mining project up by the Boundary Waters, a beautiful natural resource so unique to my beloved Minnesota. I have been on many transformative experiences on my journeys in the BWCA. It truly rivals my trips to Machu Picchu in Peru, the Taj Mahal in India and Cappadocia in Turkey. I hate to think that something could even remotely threaten the natural beauty we possess locally. This mining operation has serious environmental consequences. And in my opinion, not enough jobs created to validate the destruction of the land, water, and habitat. PolyMet itself has said it could take up to 500 years to clean up the toxic mess this kind of mining creates. I am absolutely sick of the environment losing out to big corporations. I am doubly concerned that this issue hits so close to home. Please protect the Boundary Waters. Scott Hochhalter Minneapolis, MN - "The world needs more people who specialize in the impossible." -Theodore Roethke

Scott Kylander-Johnson

43830

Dear Ms Fay, To Whom It May Concern, Who do we look to to keep our air and water clean. Is anyone looking out for the human species or any other species on planet Earth. How can the DNR possibly think the PolyMet project is a good deal. Corporations have long ago figured out how to influence every government official/representative/agency with copious amounts of money and this influence leads to made up "facts" about whatever "project" they're working on. The PolyMet project is no different. There has never been a mine that hasn't polluted the Earth. Science cannot clean up the mess once it is made - and it certainly will be a gigantic mess. As a life-long Duluthian I am already loaded up with heavy metals according to results from my blood work. How will PolyMet make the Duluth area any better. I don't care about a few jobs and a majority of money that will head to other countries thanks to a few minerals extracted from this area. It is time for the government to begin looking out for the people and all life on the planet. A great first step would be to reject the Polymet land exchange. Respectfully, Scott Kylander-Johnson Scott Kylander-Johnson 4110 99th Ave West Duluth, MN 55810

43831

To Whom It May Concern, Who do we look to to keep our air and water clean. Is anyone looking out for the human species or any other species on planet Earth. How can the DNR possibly think the PolyMet project is a good deal. Corporations have long ago figured out how to influence every government official/representative/agency with copious amounts of money and this influence leads to made up "facts" about whatever "project" they're working on. The PolyMet project is no different. There has never been a mine that hasn't polluted the Earth. Science cannot clean up the mess once it is made - and it certainly will be a gigantic mess. As a life-long Duluthian I am already loaded up with heavy metals according to results from my blood work. How will PolyMet make the Duluth area any better. I don't care about a few jobs and a majority of money that will head to other countries thanks to a few minerals extracted from this area. It is time for the government to begin looking out for the people and all life on the planet. A great first step would be to reject the Polymet land exchange. Respectfully, Scott Kylander-Johnson Scott Kylander-Johnson 4110 99th Ave West Duluth, MN 55810

Scott Lombardo

35764

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Why should any sane person think that NorthMet can be any different. What bond and in what reasonable amount can be required to compensate this and future generations of Citizens for the problems that NorthMet is likely to create for our planet. What justifies this project anywhere on the planet. What say will Citizens be given, one-man-one-vote basis, so that the decision is not left to potentially money-corrupted politicians and the corporations that corrupt them and our governance. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Scott Lombardo 4022 N Hamlin Ave Chicago, IL 60618-2106 (773) 908-0251

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Long

45548

We had a cabin mid Gunflint Trail until last summer and we have visited this area and gone canoeing and camping in the BWCA for many years. We are very concerned about this Polymet Project and the danger it poses to the environment because of its proximity to this pristine wild area. We understand that this would bring many jobs to northern MN to people who really do need those jobs but we feel it cannot be at the expense of possibly long term harm to the waters of the BWCA and its environment plus to nearby areas as well as pollution travelling the rivers to other areas. Polymet really does not have a track record we can look at to see how well they do on environmental protection and a major investor is a European company with a less than stellar record for environmental protection among other things. We are not convinced they can be trusted to know what they are doing and do as they promise. The time needed for Polymet to treat this water is just too long to really count on anything. We just cannot believe with enough certainty that Polymet will not find a way out of this expense as soon as it is done mining the area. It is a business and the bottom line and keeping investors happy is the most important thing to them. Also who knows what the world will be like in 500 years or what other unforeseen factors will enter the picture in hundreds of years. It seems that testing and long term projections concerning the toxic byproducts of this mining are not adequate and do not take into consideration every possible reach and scope of this pollution. From what we have read, it seems the studies may be unrealistically optimistic. In addition to or as a result of the ground and water pollution, the mine would destroy many acres of ecosystems for many wildlife species that are very special to Minnesota as well as destruction of wetlands and important vegetation. These are the things we and the many tourists who come here come to see. We love this area and do not want to see anything implemented that could pollute the clean water that is so special to the area or make it harder for our special animals like the Lynx, Moose and Wolves to survive. We also do not want to see the Superior National Forest cut up by a mine. Getting isolated pieces of land in exchange is nearly worthless to the experience of the visitor who goes to the Superior National Forest to camp and hike and fish and see wildlife and just experience peace and quiet. If these things that are so appealing to so many are impacted negatively the gain in employment from mining may be offset by the decline of tourism to the area and all of the money and jobs that brings. Another point is, if Polymet ceases to exist or just gets out of cleanup once it is done mining, then it is up to the state and the taxpayers of the state to continue with the cleanup and that would have a negative impact on all of us who live in Minnesota. We urge you to reject Polymet's current plan for mining in Minnesota. Thank you, Scott and Sue Long 1240 79 ½ Street Victoria, MN 55386 [HYPERLINK "mailto:suelong@entplace-com"suelong@entplace-com](mailto:suelong@entplace-com)

Scott Mead

42650

See attachment

43047

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Rd St. Paul, MN 55155 Douglas Bruner Regulatory Branch, St. Paul District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 180 Fifth St. E., Suite 700 St. Paul, MN 55101 Tim Dabney, Deputy Forest Supervisor Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Ave. Place Duluth, MN 55808 Susan Hedman, Regional Administrator EPA Region 5 Ralph Metcalfe Federal Building 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago IL 60604-3590 March 10, 2014 Re: PolyMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS I have concerns with the PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 1.) I am concerned that we, in the US, are bending over backwards to accommodate a foreign mining company that has a very good chance of polluting NE MN for many centuries. 2.) The amount of water used/consumed was grossly under stated in the SDEIS. The actual water used will change the figures used for water treatment. Even using Poly Met's figures, the water used will deplete some aquifers and there is a threat of contamination in other aquifers. 3.) The MN DNR is aware that the modeling used regarding water quality was flawed. 4.) The reverse osmosis is not a proven process and has only been "tested". 5.) PolyMet isn't even sure how to handle the residue. 6.) The dams, dikes, pumps, and pipes will last 500 years? Of course not. A no to each item. Long term maintenance wasn't address or was inadequately addressed. 7.) Wetlands that will be destroyed are very unique and cannot be replaced or renewed. How can you replace a peat bog that is tens of thousands of years old? 8.) If this project will create a few jobs, why are other established industries/business going to be negatively affected? Logging. Recreation. Tourism. Local business. Local residents. We are putting our environment in jeopardy. Water is our most valuable resource. Not copper. Not nickel. No mineral is more valuable. And we are willing to sacrifice that for profits that won't even stay in our country. Please take a good hard look at what will be an unfortunate sequence of events. Thank you for the opportunity express my position. Scott Mead 9130 W. Branch Rd. "Duluth MN 55803 (218) 848-2051

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Mead 54812

See attachment

Scott Moen 43127

I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. 1 The proposed mine plan will not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean because: PolyMet would need to actively treat polluted water for at least 500 years; Each year, 11 million gallons of untreated polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater; and Each year, over 5 million gallons of untreated polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater. 2 The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. When accidents occur, will we be left to hope for the best. 3 The proposed mine plan would not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. After closure, the following will be left: 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock on the surface; a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer; A synthetic and soil cover over the waste rock pile requiring annual maintenance, erosion repair, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material; A pit "lake" whose water level must be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River; A tailings basin pond whose water levels must be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River; and A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water must be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. 4 The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance the company will provide are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know the cost of 500 years of water treatment, how the company will be held responsible for centuries of costly water treatment, or how the public will be protected from liability. Given the need to monitor the consequences of the mine for hundreds of years, why is the mine being given serious consideration. A commitment for hundreds of years is simply not meaningful. And, if polluted seepage ruins fragile and pristine wilderness, how will money solve the problem. If the mine is approved, it will be just one more example of privatizing profits and socializing risk. SCOTT MOEN 491 MONTROSE LN SAINT PAUL MN 55116-1134 (651) 428-1547 HYPERLINK "mailto:smoen@ecobizlaw-com"smoen@ecobizlaw-com P Please consider the environment before printing.

Scott Polyner 10711

My name is Scott Polyner I Live At 2435 Grant McMahan Blvd. in Ely MN and I am in favor of the Polymet project going forwaRd I have worked at Minorca mine in Virginia MN since 2007 so I am familiar with the regulations mining operations must follow to maintain required permits. I have been assigned dozens of projects to install new emission monitors, improve access to existing dust collection systems, and controlling process water for conservation reasons. Some of these improvements were made due to technology changes from 1976 to current day, and some were made because monitoring was not required before but all were made to comply with an evolving regulation process that strives for a clean as possible process for all mining operations. Having read the SDEIS, I am confident that the involved agencies will hold this project to those same standards that allow us to have the largest taconite mines in the USA and still have the cleanest water in Minnesota. I understand that there are differences between the copper process and the iron process, but I believe the MPCA, the DNR, and the Army Core of Engineers will adapt and over come any issues that arise. I am a fifth generation Elyite, I live 20 minutes away from this proposed mine and if I thought there was any danger to the water in my well, or the outdoors I hunt and fish in, I would not support this project as strongly as I do. In conclusion, I see no reason for any of the involved agencies to deny Polymet the permits they need to start this mine 10 plus years in the making. Thank you for your time Scott Polyner

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Robertson

7332

Forgot to include: Scott Robertson 5125 Bryant Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419 On Wed, Jan 22, 2014 at 7:07 PM, Scott Robertson <[HYPERLINK "mailto:scotterob@gmail-com"scotterob@gmail-com](mailto:scotterob@gmail-com)> wrote: I do not support the proposal for NorthMet Project mining, nor for the land exchange proposed with the Superior National ForeSt The detailed descriptions of wastewater control design in the SDEIS are encouraging, but that report's conclusions about mercury concentrations in the St Louis River watershed assume 100% performance of the WWTP, bentonite clay containment barriers, etc Based on experience with industrial water protection systems, I would ask the authors what level of wastewater containment failure they would find acceptable. Were various levels of failure modeled for the EIS. I find no evidence that they were, which does not seem reality-based. Systems do fail, and it's rational to predict a realistic rate of failure. I grew up along the St Louis River in the 1970s, and it was a very impaired waterway. I'm proud of the steps Minnesota has taken to address water quality within the St Louis River watershed, and the steps that various federal, state and interstate agencies have taken to address threats to Lake Superior. They are healthier than they were. I do not believe the rosy description that NorthMet WWTP discharge will actually help clean up the St Louis River. I think it's great that was taken as a design goal, but I do not believe it will happen. As far as what rate of failure EIS authors might find acceptable: my answer is none, because I do not believe this mine is "what's next" for the Iron Range. I do not oppose mining per se; however I do oppose any expansion of mining in Northern Minnesota, incl taconite mining. I simply believe that this part of our land has done it's share. Aerial photos show that much of the Range is wasteland. I was last there 3 weeks ago and was reminded of how many smokestacks, how much scarred earth, and how depressed the towns are. It's time for the citizens of the Range to find other things to do than cut trees and pull rocks from the ground. And it's time for them to stop shipping wealth away to faraway owners, and to keep it for themselves.

Scott Rodbro

41750

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Scott-Kovalovic 42560

See attachment

Scott Slocum 3639

12/20/2013 To: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources From: Scott Slocum, 1416 Birchcrest Drive, White Bear Lake, MN 55110- Re: Insufficient PolyMet sulfide-ore treatment SDEIS. I have read about the dangers of sulfide-ore mining in Minnesota, and about the plans proposed by PolyMet Mining, Inc. to avoid those dangers. It is clear to me that the Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement (SDEIS) prepared by PolyMet Mining, Inc. is not sufficient to avoid the dangers of sulfide-ore mining in Minnesota. Therefore, I recommend that the proposed PolyMet mining project (and any project without sufficient safeguards) should not be allowed to proceed. -Scott Slocum

Scott Smith 38757

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Scott Smith 10421 Shelter Grv Eden Prairie, MN 55347-4858

Scott Watkins 42050

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Scott Watkins Willmar, Minnesota

Scott Weappa 42788

See attachment

Scott Wolff 46992

I doubt anything I say will make a difference, but here are my two cents: I remain inherently distrustful of a large corporation that floods the media with their message (eg their sponsorship of the Mn HS hockey championship) and brings busloads of workers wearing hardhats to public hearings. They have strong commercial interest, while the rest of us have nothing to gain, just a lot to lose. Can Polymet show us a similar project that has gone well without environmental damage. I don't think so. I would like to know who is responsible if something goes poorly. Specifically I would feel much better if individuals at the upper level of the Polymet hierarchy have something personally at risk, "skin in the game" if you will. If there is a massive environmental problem, I would like to see their personal assets at stake-they can still get a nice salary, but the 2nd and 3rd homes get liquidated to pay for it. They can be very friendly and polite, but who really pays. since corporations now have the rights of individuals, who goes to jail for a jail-able offense. You have heard all the other objections so I won't trouble you with redundancy. Sincerely, Scott Wolff 4136 Minnesota Ave Duluth, MN 55802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Scott Wolla 21814

The Polymet project is important to the economy of northern Minnesota, and the US economy. The natural resources found here are important to our economic vitality. And, the technologies utilized are the cleanest available. Please allow this project to proceed. Scott Wolla

Scott/Mary Eckhoff 48171

We have not inherited this land from our parents. We are borrowing it from our children. We cannot jeopardize this beautiful area of our state. Lake Vermillion State Park will increase tourism into this beautiful area. Our children will wonder what were we thinking if we open this area to mining. Scott Eckhoff Glencoe, MN

Sean Engel 42837

See attachment

sean goossens 41808

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, sean goossens Saint Paul, Minnesota

Sean Heckman 6717

My name is Sean E. Heckman, 33375 Ski Hill rd Bayfield, WI. 54814- Email slheckman99@yahoo-com. Phone 715-209-2557- First I would like to state that I am a investor in PloyMet. I also believe that PloyMet has invested heavily in the control of pollutants. I am a layman and would never claim to fully understand the full process of the water treatment. I believe they will be a leader in the forefront of responsible mining. Just a little back ground of myself. I live in a very healthy town of Bayfield, WI. and have lived here for 35 years. I am the Chief Engineer for the Madeline Island Ferry line so I am very dependent on the tourist industry on lake Superior. That being said when we first moved here when I was in the Coast Guard in 1979- At that time there was a thriving fishing industry, logging industry and a manufacturing plant in town although small. Local families could survive and make a descent living and the children of these families could stay in the area. When my children went to school they would walk with about 15-20 other children from the city of Bayfield. Now Bayfield has become a second home community or homes of wealthy retirement people. Now there may be 4 children from the city going to the school. The bulk of the student population is from Red Cliff which is a town just north of Bayfield and a Indian reservation. No new families can afford to move into Bayfield because of reality prices and no jobs of a high enough pay to live here. Depending on tourism does not work. Only the Bed and Breakfast and restaurant owners make money. The jobs that are here are low paying, seasonal and without any kind of benefits. There are a few like myself that have year round jobs and were lucking enough to have bought land before the reality prices went through the roof. They only other main employer is the government Fed,State and local. My children who are all educated, one is a RN, one a musician and the other is a lieutenant in the US Air Forcse will never be able to return to this area because of lack of good high paying jobs. We are a material society and until we start to reduce the population the demand for raw materials will be present, why not take the forefront to responsible mining, help bring good year round high paying jobs to northern Minnesota and get them off unemployment. It seems that all the environmentalist are on their computers, their cell phones and their cars protesting this and forgetting that all of the above has copper, or iron or other metals in them. There's a saying around here. You want your cars, your cell phones, your computers but you want to (poop) in the neighbors yard and not in your own. Why not do it cleanly and controlled in your own. Thank You for your time.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sean Piette 39592

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is a very dangerous mining and Minnesota does not care for mining. There is, never has been, and probably never will be a clean, environmentally damage free mining. Please don't destroy our lands and our water. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Sean Piette 3214 Greysolon Pl Duluth, MN 55812-2304 (218) 728-6392

48806

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining is a very dangerous mining and Minnesota does not care for mining. There is, never has been, and probably never will be a clean, environmentally damage free mining. Please don't destroy our lands and our water. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Sean Piette 3214 Greysolon Pl Duluth, MN 55812-2304 (218) 728-6392

Sen. John Marty 42961

Hello, Here are Senator John Marty's Comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS. Thank you, Emmy Waldhart Intern, Office of Senator John Marty

Sen. Bev Scalze 9508

I haven't sent any comments yet. Connected by DROID on Verizon Wireless --Original message-- From: "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" To: "Sen. Bev Scalze" Sent: Wed, Jan 29, 2014 20:19:04 GMT+00:00 Subject: RE: PolyMet Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

9578

Tony, Thanks for sending your comments. I agree with them. I attended the hearing at the River Center last night and joined the groups of people with "clean water" stickers on their clothes. You are right that the underground water movement has not been addressed, nor has its affect on the streams and rivers flowing into the BWCA. This was brought up at the hearing last night. You should send your comments to the DNR at [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) NorthMetDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us before March 13, 2014- Also, you could mail the comments to Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Environmental Review unit, 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25, St Pul, MN 55155-4025- It is very important that they hear from you. Thanks again for sending the e-mail message. >>> Tony Jordan 1/28/2014 1:06 PM >>> My Name is Tony Jordan, and I live at 3754 Rustic Place, Shoreview, MN 55126- Although it has been 8 years since I've been to the BWCA, I know it to be a true "water world". The flow of the visible water through passages connecting lakes for 100 miles or more is a sensitive provider of all forms of life in the area. The flow of the water that we can't see underground is even more intricate and sensitive. The minerals are not going anywhere and their value will only increase. We should wait for technology to be developed to offer the possibility of mining them without the accompanying destruction that future generations will pay for. I am against the mining proposal because of the irreversible damage that will be done to the area. I am in favor of an additional user fee for the BWCA that would be shared with the residents of the area to compensate for their not getting the 300 some jobs that come with the destruction of the area. Thank you, Tony Jordan (651) 482-9608

Senator Al Franken 47597

Dear Ms Fay: Attached, please find a letter from Senator Franken regarding the NorthMet copper-nickel mining project. Best, Sam - Samuel Bockenbauer, PhD
Office of Senator Al Franken (202) 224-1032

Alphabetical by sender's first name

September Steinolfson

39074

---Original Message--- From: october@usfamily-net [mailto:october@usfamily-net] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 4:56 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, September Steinolfson 6711 Canterbury Ln Eden Prairie, MN 55346-2844

Serina Gebrehiwet

54181

I am against the mine. The water is going to become polluted. The boundary waters are important to the area that you are going to destroy. It is very popular in Minnesota so it should be kept with us. You can mine somewhere else less important. This mine has been done in other lakes and rivers and the negative affects they have on the environment. It hurts the ecosystem. The acid will throw off the PH balance and kill life in the water. The affects are too negative and copper and nickel can be found elsewhere.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Seth Levin

15995

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Shandra Thao

54231

To whom it may concern:It has come to my attention and many others that the SDEIS map have mislead the public. The map of the swamp has cut off half of the one hundred swamp diverting everyone from the fact that the BWCA will be completely unprotected from the acidic drainage of the mine. The public is not aware of this, they are not aware of something that will affect the rest of their lives and their children's lives. They are not aware of what may endanger them because they have only been told of the benefits. It will provide jobs; an economic boost but how many people know that less than 2% of the water on earth is pure water? Before we know it, there will not be any pure water left! Are they willing to take this risk knowingly? This needs to be fixed because they are misleading the public.Sincerely,Shandra ThaoProud Student of Humboldt High School1238 Jessie StreetSaint Paul, MN 55130

Shane Johnson

44620

3/13/14 I have reviewed the SDEIS for the Polymet Project, and fully approve of the proposed processes and mitigation systems as well as the science used in designing them, and ultimately constructing them. I also believe from an economic standpoint, that expediting the current processes so Polymet could begin construction immediately would bring a desperately needed, immediate economic boost to the Iron Range, not to mention the added benefit of more public lands, through the land exchange. I fully support the SDEIS in its entirety. Shane Johnson 7955 Waris Road Embarrass, Minnesota 55732

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shannon Darsow

39746

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Shannon Darsow 13376 Carrach Way Rosemount, MN 55068-4807

Shannon Martin

18277

My name is Shannon Martin. I would like to publicly oppose the PolyMet mine. I think 500 years of water pumping and treatment is not a good trade-off for 20 years of jobs. I think one of our top priorities in the state should be the state protecting our natural resources in the long run. That's it. Thank you very much.

Shannon Palma

21586

Mar 5, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, To Whom It May Concern: Please put our wildlife first. Irreversibly hurting our habitat would be a sad legacy. I want my little boy to have the same relationship with the outdoors that I had. Please don't do something you can't take back. West Virginia should stand as an example of what happens when we let business come before people and animals. Please protect our water. Sincerely, Mrs Shannon Palma 382 Haskell St E West St Paul, MN 55118-1646 (320) 491-2792

Shannon Peterson

41973

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Shannon Peterson Princeton, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shari Mleczewski

16010

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

shari smith

48065

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. shari smith 5100 Peabody St Duluth, Minnesota 55804 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sharjeel khan

41929

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, sharjeel khan Saint Paul, Minnesota

Sharlyn Dahl

57502

To Whom It May Concern: I, as a citizen of Minnesota and resident of the Iron Range for 58 years, have total confidence that Polymet has done everything possible to make their operation safe for our environment now and for my grandchildren. I can not believe that with all the time and studies that have been made and proven, that there should be any question of this. Polymet will be an extremely great benefit to our area, and to the state as well. Sincerely, Sharlyn Dahl 5490 Carnation Ave Virginia, MN 55792 218-741-7882

57503

To Whom It May Concern: With all of the time and money that has been and is being spent on environmental issues, I have full confidence that all it will be an environmentally acceptable mining operation. The permitting process takes a ridiculously long time. Hopefully, from here to start up, will go much faster. Sincerely, Chuck Dahl 5490 Carnation Ave Virginia, MN 55792 218-741-7882

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Angell Magliulo

21228

From: sharon angell magliulo [mailto:smagliulo55731@yahoo-com] Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 12:17 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Official Comments for PolyMet's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) COMMENTS FOR NORTHMET MINING PROJECT AND LAND EXCHANGE Lisa Fay or to whom it may concern: We are asking for the "No Action Alternative" because the following are inadequate, flawed, or missing from PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS):

- Inadequate cumulative impacts and effects. "Past, present, and reasonably future actions" are not included. Public needs to be informed that this is the beginning of a sulfide-mining district in the lake country of the Arrowhead. The NorthMet Mine and other proposed sulfide mining projects would be in the Duluth Complex, not on the IronRange; this is not being addressed.
- There is no cost benefit analysis.
- The LTV tailings basin is unstable and leaking. The SDEIS underestimates the amount of leakage. There are faults and streams running under the basin that the SDEIS does not address.
- The hydrology is flawed. Poor comparison to the Canisteo Pit. Not the same geological formation; not the same depth; inadequate test borings.
- National Forest Land must not be exchanged. The Weeks Act protects the land. Also, the exchange does not adequately compensate the American Public for loss of this land. The exchange will have a significant effect on wildlife habit and corridors, loss of wetlands and wetland functions (inadequately addressed), as well as overall ecological quality.
- There is no "500 year event" at the core of the SDEIS. An SDEIS based on a hundred year event is insufficient.
- The SDEIS is flawed in the areas of water exceedances and rates of water flow. Conclusions are incorrect. One year of documentation is insufficient for water flow.
- The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of the amount of seepage collected and treated, as well as its levels of toxicity. It is seriously flawed in its assessment of seepage that escapes untreated.
- The impacts from the tremendous amount of coal-fired electricity used to operate a sulfide-mining district (or one sulfide mine on top of taconite mining releases) are not adequately addressed.
- Climate change is not addressed. Carbon based energy used to do this type of mining is irresponsible. PolyMet alone would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year.
- Sulfates: the effects on wild rice, on newborns in the Lake Superior basin due to mercury levels in fish, and other related ecological impacts need to be better understood and addressed before any sulfide mine is permitted.
- Ecological affects of extensive limestone treatment on an entire ecosystem need to be addressed.
- Chlorides are insufficiently addressed, essentially ignored.
- The reverse osmosis plan is insufficient and unproven on the scale involved. Sulfate removal is overestimated. None of Minnesota's taconite mines have found reverse osmosis to be feasible. The Eagle Mine in Michigan is already having problems
- There are no elucidated plans for unforeseen events; repeatedly saying that the company and agencies will deal with incidents as they arise is not only unacceptable, it is negligent. Not having back-up plans spelled out and included as part of the SDEIS makes this document incomplete.
- The Regional Copper Nickel Study is forty years old. Still valid. However, additional studies need to be done in this decade before any sulfide mine permit is issued.
- Perpetual treatment or any long-term treatment after closure is unacceptable; a mine is to be maintenance free under Minnesota Rules.
- In the best interest of the people of Minnesota financial assurance needs to be part of the public comment period, with transparent and complete information provided.
- This type of mining has never been done successfully in this type of water environment.
- Water must b

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Angell Magliulo

21231

COMMENTS FOR NORTHMET MINING PROJECT AND LAND EXCHANGE Douglas Bruner or to whom it may concern: We are asking for the “No Action Alternative” because the following are inadequate, flawed, or missing from PolyMet’s Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS): • Inadequate cumulative impacts and effects. “Past, present, and reasonably future actions” are not included. Public needs to be informed that this is the beginning of a sulfide-mining district in the lake country of the Arrowhead. The NorthMet Mine and other proposed sulfide mining projects would be in the Duluth Complex, not on the IronRange; this is not being addressed. • There is no cost benefit analysis. • The LTV tailings basin is unstable and leaking. The SDEIS underestimates the amount of leakage. There are faults and streams running under the basin that the SDEIS does not address. • The hydrology is flawed. Poor comparison to the Canisteo Pit. Not the same geological formation; not the same depth; inadequate test borings. • National Forest Land must not be exchanged. The Weeks Act protects the land. Also, the exchange does not adequately compensate the American Public for loss of this land. The exchange will have a significant effect on wildlife habit and corridors, loss of wetlands and wetland functions (inadequately addressed), as well as overall ecological quality. • There is no “500 year event” at the core of the SDEIS. An SDEIS based on a hundred year event is insufficient. • The SDEIS is flawed in the areas of water exceedances and rates of water flow. Conclusions are incorrect. One year of documentation is insufficient for water flow. • The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of faults and fractures. • The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of the amount of seepage collected and treated, as well as its levels of toxicity. It is seriously flawed in its assessment of seepage that escapes untreated. • The impacts from the tremendous amount of coal-fired electricity used to operate a sulfide-mining district (or one sulfide mine on top of taconite mining releases) are not adequately addressed. • Climate change is not addressed. Carbon based energy used to do this type of mining is irresponsible. PolyMet alone would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year. • Sulfates: the effects on wild rice, on newborns in the Lake Superior basin due to mercury levels in fish, and other related ecological impacts need to be better understood and addressed before any sulfide mine is permitted. • Ecological affects of extensive limestone treatment on an entire ecosystem need to be addressed. • Chlorides are insufficiently addressed, essentially ignored. • The reverse osmosis plan is insufficient and unproven on the scale involved. Sulfate removal is overestimated. None of Minnesota’s taconite mines have found reverse osmosis to be feasible. The Eagle Mine in Michigan is already having problems • There are no elucidated plans for unforeseen events; repeatedly saying that the company and agencies will deal with incidents as they arise is not only unacceptable, it is negligent. Not having back-up plans spelled out and included as part of the SDEIS makes this document incomplete. • The Regional Copper Nickel Study is forty years old. Still valid. However, additional studies need to be done in this decade before any sulfide mine permit is issued. • Perpetual treatment or any long-term treatment after closure is unacceptable; a mine is to be maintenance free under Minnesota Rules. • In the best interest of the people of Minnesota financial assurance needs to be part of the public comment period, with transparent and complete information provided. • This type of mining has never been done successfully in this type of water environment. • Water must be, and is, protected by Federal law. NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE Respectfully, Sharon A. Magliulo and William A. Hauser email- smagliulo55731@yahoo-com 821 E. Pattison St Ely, MN 55731 218-365-2272

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Angell Magliulo

50981

COMMENTS FOR NORTHMET MINING PROJECT AND LAND EXCHANGE Tim Dabney: We are asking for the “No Action Alternative” because the following are inadequate, flawed, or missing from PolyMet’s Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS):

- Inadequate cumulative impacts and effects. “Past, present, and reasonably future actions” are not included. Public needs to be informed that this is the beginning of a sulfide-mining district in the lake country of the Arrowhead. The NorthMet Mine and other proposed sulfide mining projects would be in the Duluth Complex, not on the IronRange; this is not being addressed.
- There is no cost benefit analysis.
- The LTV tailings basin is unstable and leaking. The SDEIS underestimates the amount of leakage. There are faults and streams running under the basin that the SDEIS does not address.
- The hydrology is flawed. Poor comparison to the Canisteo Pit. Not the same geological formation; not the same depth; inadequate test borings.
- National Forest Land must not be exchanged. The Weeks Act protects the land. Also, the exchange does not adequately compensate the American Public for loss of this land. The exchange will have a significant effect on wildlife habit and corridors, loss of wetlands and wetland functions (inadequately addressed), as well as overall ecological quality.
- There is no “500 year event” at the core of the SDEIS. An SDEIS based on a hundred year event is insufficient.
- The SDEIS is flawed in the areas of water exceedances and rates of water flow. Conclusions are incorrect. One year of documentation is insufficient for water flow.
- The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS is flawed in its determination of the amount of seepage collected and treated, as well as its levels of toxicity. It is seriously flawed in its assessment of seepage that escapes untreated.
- The impacts from the tremendous amount of coal-fired electricity used to operate a sulfide-mining district (or one sulfide mine on top of taconite mining releases) are not adequately addressed.
- Climate change is not addressed. Carbon based energy used to do this type of mining is irresponsible. PolyMet alone would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide each year.
- Sulfates: the effects on wild rice, on newborns in the Lake Superior basin due to mercury levels in fish, and other related ecological impacts need to be better understood and addressed before any sulfide mine is permitted.
- Ecological affects of extensive limestone treatment on an entire ecosystem need to be addressed.
- Chlorides are insufficiently addressed, essentially ignored.
- The reverse osmosis plan is insufficient and unproven on the scale involved. Sulfate removal is overestimated. None of Minnesota’s taconite mines have found reverse osmosis to be feasible. The Eagle Mine in Michigan is already having problems
- There are no elucidated plans for unforeseen events; repeatedly saying that the company and agencies will deal with incidents as they arise is not only unacceptable, it is negligent. Not having back-up plans spelled out and included as part of the SDEIS makes this document incomplete.
- The Regional Copper Nickel Study is forty years old. Still valid. However, additional studies need to be done in this decade before any sulfide mine permit is issued.
- Perpetual treatment or any long-term treatment after closure is unacceptable; a mine is to be maintenance free under Minnesota Rules.
- In the best interest of the people of Minnesota financial assurance needs to be part of the public comment period, with transparent and complete information provided.
- This type of mining has never been done successfully in this type of water environment.
- Water must be, and is, protected by Federal law.

NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE Respectfully, Sharon A. Magliulo and William A. Hauser email- smagliulo55731@yahoo-com 821 E. Pattison St Ely, MN 55731 218-365-2272

Sharon Bachman

10203

To All whom it concerns, Due to an unproven track record in the copper mining industry and the sensitive nature of the BWCA area and all those who’s livelihood depend on it we do not in any way approve of the land exchange or the Polymet mine proposal. Not that it’s a vote but Please add 2 no votes for us. Richard and Sharon Bachman Bachman's Photography shari@bachmansphotography-com 13000 Sylvan Ave Lindstrom, MN 55045 651-257-9380 www.bachmansphotography-com <https://www.facebook-com/pages/Bachmans-Photography/200802479948160-ref=ts>

Sharon Barnett

57936

I am a mother of a 3 year old boy and I want to protect Minnesota's waters and wildlife for the next generation. I support the No Action Alternative. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Sharon DeCelle

32919

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Open pit sulfide mining is destructive and polluting. It is not in the public intereSt Please do not approve the destruction of our environment. Sincerely, Sharon DeCelle 309 E Holmes St Urbana, IL 61801-6731 (217) 365-0330

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Lane-Getaz

42904

March 12, 2014 Lisa Fay, Environmental Impact Study (EIS) Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Lisa Fay, We should not be copper-nickel mining in Minnesota, not here, at the headwaters of the mighty Mississippi. Northern Minnesota is the site of 3 major watersheds. We and many states downstream from us need fresh, clean water. I am concerned about the pollution that is left behind for hundreds of years after mining ceases, especially water pollution. The PolyMet project, which is reportedly the tip of the iceberg in companies who are exploring options in Minnesota, proposes 20 years of mining near Hoyt Lakes (20 miles south of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness). Per Renee Richardson of the Brainerd Dispatch (January 30th, 2014), "once mining operations are done, mechanical water treatment at the site is proposed for 200 years at the mine site and 500 years at the plant site. The state reported it's unknown how long water treatment would be required other than to say long term." Northern Minnesota should not extend mining rights to an outside corporation that cannot realistically provide stewardship for our water nor our environment. Kathryn Hoffman, staff attorney with the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, said "the process to treat the water is complex, requiring multiple systems to work successfully and a mine in Michigan using a state-of-the-art reverse osmosis plant to do just that has already had more than 40 permit violations for not meeting water quality standards." While jobs are important, we may be talking about as few as local 90 jobs in the balance compared to 500 years of ongoing water treatment. I support jobs in northern Minnesota that are sustainable to all life in the area, and I encourage the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to take a leadership role in promoting sustainable industry. However, Hoffman estimated that while "PolyMet project is expected to create 360 jobs after experts in the mining field are imported the site will create about 90 local hires." In summary, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources should block copper-nickel mining in northern Minnesota. Thank you for taking comments under consideration. Sincerely, Sharon Lane-Getaz. PhD 32293 Alta Avenue Northfield, MN 55057 Sharon J. Lane-Getaz, Phd ----- AsSt Professor Statistics and Education St Olaf College 507-786-3411 URL: <http://sharonlanegetaz.efoliomn-com/Home>

Sharon Legg

43727

To Whom it may Concern: I have been trying to learn as much as I can about the proposed Polymet copper mine in northern Minnesota. Based on what I have figured out, the potential negative impacts far outweigh the positives. The environment that this type of mining is being proposed in makes no sense given the impact it will have on water. However, I do understand that the DNR is in the position of making that determination according to information in hand. What I have not been able to figure out, is how will a mining company be able to control the sulfides reacting to air and water as they are exposed, as they are uncovered in the pits. I realize that the waste will be encapsulated in the waste piles, but what happens before the waste is transferred to that site. Obviously, exposing acres and acres of rock which contain these sulfides, will impact air and water quality. There will be dust and there will be seepage not all of the water can possibly be captured and the air will travel with dust in it. Additionally, I understand that there should be some financial assurance from the company to avoid taxpayers having to fund clean-up efforts in the future. I am concerned as to how anyone can come up with the amount necessary. How can we know. And, what discount rates will be used. We are unsure of how many years we are even trying to project the needs for these funds to become available. How can we possibly know what costs will be at some unknown date. In my mind, it has to come down to cash in the bank right now that will compound at some future rate to allow enough money to deal with issues. Finance is my occupation. I understand how much discount factors impact results. And, I also understand that we are dealing with a huge company (Glencore) that will be sure factors are used to their advantage. I don't think they have the reputation of caring about environmental impacts and will work to make as much profit as possible. Therefore, they will persuade us that what is being put up as funds will be sufficient, but it will not be. If the State of Minnesota was dealing with a known commodity, a company (Polymet) that actually had experience in this type of operation and that was not being funded by a company (Glencore) that clearly has a bad reputation, there could be hope that past practice would indicate a positive future outcome. In this case, neither applies. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment. The future of the state is in your hands. Please take care of us. Sharon Legg 10110 Olive St NW Coon Rapids, MN 55433 [HYPERLINK "tel:763-755-6567"763-755-6567](tel:763-755-6567)

Sharon Lindberg

54126

The mining process & its clean-up has never successfully prevented environmental problems before. Contaminated water still must be dealt with!! Unless PolyMet is willing to put one billion dollars up front for the eventual clean up, this copper mineral mine should not be dug. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Marquis

40265

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sharon Marquis 25 Ridgewood Rd Willington, CT 06279 US

Sharon Meister

45787

I would like you to consider not approving this project. I think the real resource that we need to covet is clean fresh water. In the future, it will truly be the most valuable and, unfortunately scarce resource. I don't see how anyone can assure us that the water used in the processing of this mine will not leach into the surrounding surface or ground water. Thank you. Jeff Meister 8540 Cain road Corcoran, MN 55340

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Root

9602

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sharon Root 504 Fairgrounds Rd Marshall, MS 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Root

16155

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Root

18507

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sharon Root 504 Fairgrounds Rd Marshall, MS 56258

50589

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sharon Root 504 Fairgrounds Rd Marshall, MS 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Wehner

16142

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Sharon Koll

47342

To whom this concerns :: PLEASE VOTE NO .. It is not worth the jobs promised - - - -to destroy any part of our heritage. This proposal is just a precedent. There are more of the same pending. I've read parts of the proposal. I can give you specifics when needed. This proposal will: * destroy our heritage * destroy Minnesota tourism * set a precedent Please do not allow any company / organization to take advantage - - - - -to rape and pillage the State of Minnesota - - - - and to leave us taxpayers to clean up their accidental mess. I beg of you - - - - -PLEASE VOTE NO - - - - on this proposal. It'l take "guts". DO NOT allow Polymet or any other mining to happen We only have one chance to protect God's creation. Sincerely, Sharon Koll 2508 Claremont Drive Mendota Heights, MN 55120 [HYPERLINK "mailto:skoll@paulbunyan-net"skoll@paulbunyan-net](mailto:skoll@paulbunyan-net)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sharon Koll 47344

I just lost my email to you . This is a brief summary. PLEASE VOTE NO It is not worth the jobs promised to destroy any part of our heritage. I have read parts of the proposal. I can be specific when needed. This proposal will: * destroy our heritage * destroy Minnesota tourism * set a precedent Please do not allow any company / organization to take advantage - - - - -to rape and pillage the State of Minnesota - - - - - and to leave us taxpayers clean up their accidental mess. It'll take "guts". Please do NOT allow Polymet nor any other mining to happen. You only have one chance to protect God's gift to Minnesota. Thank you. Sincerely, Sharon Koll 2508 Claremont Drive Mendota Heights, MN 55120 [HYPERLINK "mailto:skoll@paulbunyan-net"skoll@paulbunyan-net](mailto:skoll@paulbunyan-net)

Shary Hess 42533

See attachment

Shary Zoff 43045

March 7, 2014 Greetings United State Forest Service, This letter is asking you to reject the proposed PolyMet Land Exchange. PolyMet is proposing that the Superior National Forest swap 6,650 acres of high quality land in the Partridge River headwaters for lower quality land scattered throughout NE MN. The deal may be good for PolyMet but breaking up large pieces of acreage into scattered pieces does not serve the ecosystem well. This also violates the 1854 Treaty with the Ojibwe tribes. Have we not violated too many treaties already for far too long? Thank you, Shary Zoff 1651 Two Harbors Road Two Harbors, MN 55616

Shawn Beattie 6604

Dear Sir or Madam, I'm writing to comment on the proposed NorthMet mine. I live in the metro Twin Cities area, but like to vacation up north and recreate/hunt in the area as well. As citizens of this state we are extremely fortunate to have such a beautiful, natural landscape to call our own. Having lived about half my life out on the East Coast of the US I can appreciate this luxury even more because we lacked large, public natural areas that hadn't already been tainted. I realize from an economic standpoint there would be new jobs created if the mine was approved, and that would obviously be a boon to the local people in the area. But I cannot support the mine based on the risks and long-term possible complications it may cause to such a pristine area. Once it's gone or ruined, it's so difficult to get back, if at all. The company has stated they will be good stewards, but unfortunately history is not on their side. And accidents happen; just look at the rail car explosions that have happened recently, or the water poisoning in West Virginia last week. Please do not allow this mine to be approved. Thank you, Shawn T. Beattie 4742 102nd Trail North Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

Shawn Bryant 15439

Hello, I want to express my strong opposition to approval of the proposed Polymet copper-nickel mine. The potential damage to the environment would be impossible to overstate. More to the point, name a company that has been in business for 500 years. This is the proposed time period for which environmental mitigation would be required if the project is approved. Most insightful was the action of the West Virginia company who declared bankruptcy within days of spilling chemicals into the water supply for the city of Charleston. Similarly, the Wyoming pit mines which have recently been abandoned by the mining companies leaving open mines and environmental waste behind. The local benefit of a few hundred jobs lasting 20 years (at most half of the working lifetime of an American worker) does not come close to mitigating the environmental degradation and danger which would come with the proposed mine. Sincerely, Dr Michael Grouws, MD 2311 Willow Lane S. St Louis Park, MN 55416

Alphabetical by sender's first name

SHAWN CLARK

16347

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Shawn Conrad

45458

Numerous reasons have been registered regarding the SDEIS being inadequate and I concur with those conclusions, feeling no need to restate them once again here. I am opposed to the PolyMet project moving forward as it is shocking that the state would consider permitting a project with detrimental environmental impacts that will require mitigation longer than the probable lifespan of the corporation pursuing the permit. It is beyond ironic that the same agency that would fine a taxpaying, license-buying Minnesota citizen for a minor fish or game infraction would actively encourage a foreign corporation to do permanent damage to our forests and waters to plunder Minnesota's ores simply so the agency can appease a vocal anti-environment contingent who repeatedly overstate the positives and understate the considerable negatives of this mining proposal. Shawn L Conrad 534 Elizabeth Avenue Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shawn Resch

42063

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Shawn Resch Woodbury, Minnesota

Shawn Roed

3565

The environmental sensitivity and public value of areas within and surrounding the proposed mining sites, as well as the disturbing environmental record of copper-nickel mining, leave no room for error in the regulatory process. A report released by Conservation Minnesota, Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness and the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy highlights sulfide ore mining occurring in other states and countries. In many cases, despite guarantees that water quality standards would be met and efforts from mining companies to do so, unacceptable contamination of water supplies and soil resources happens over 75% of the time in and around mining sites. When contamination occurs it can be difficult to cover the costs for cleanup and remediation. Mining companies go bankrupt or fail to set aside enough financial assurances ahead of time, and taxpayers can end up holding the bill to cleanup their own community. These concerns should be taken seriously given the proximity of these mining proposals to the BWCAW, and their location within the Superior National Forest and Lake Superior watershed. This is not something that we should risk based on uncertain potential results - we have to be caretakers of our lands for future generations. DO NOT MOVE AHEAD WITH THIS PLAN. Shawn Roed 4855 Idlewild Street Duluth MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shawna MullenEardley

46984

I believe that PolyMet's Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. Wild Rice needs exceptionally clean water, and as such, is threatened by the certain water pollution that will result from the sulfide mining process. Additionally, this mine poses a threat to wildlife, including the federally listed Endangered Canada Lynx. By fragmenting its habitat, the mining is certain to negatively impact Lynx. The mining would also affect the long-eared bat, a species proposed to be listed as endangered. Eleven state-listed endangered, threatened, or special concern plant species and six state-listed animals are known to occur in the proposed PolyMet mining area. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest-the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream long after the mining operation is done. However, the assessment does not look at the extent of the affects to these many species of plants and wildlife. This is simply unacceptable. Concerning human health, the World Health Organization lists 10 chemicals of major public health concern. Of those, sulfide mining involves five of them: mercury, arsenic, lead, asbestos, and air pollution, which (again) the SDEIS does not sufficiently address the extent and impact of these chemicals. Additionally, the SDEIS does not look at the possible health impact of dust containing asbestos-like amphibole fibers because such dust is not regulated. This is clearly a health concern, as we learned in the 1970's when a north shore iron ore pit was court-ordered to stop dumping its waste containing similar fibers into Lake Superior for fear of the hazards to human health that the fibers pose. Perhaps one of the most prevalent arguments for PolyMet is the number of jobs it will create. However, these jobs are attached to severe toxic pollution, health concerns, destruction of habitat, and threats to wildlife. Instead, we should be bringing clean jobs to the Northland. The Green industry is growing tremendously and has a sustainable future (sustainable in terms of job security as well as environmental sustainability). For current and future generations of Minnesotans, all of this is unjustifiable. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Shawna MullenEardley B.A. Biology Duluth resident

shawna stennes

41976

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, shawna stennes stillwater, Minnesota

Sheila Dillon

38782

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sheila Dillon 1701 5th St SW Willmar, MN 56201-4179

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sheila Mandell

40400

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Sheila Mandell 401 E. Las Olas Blvd Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 US

Sheila Packa

11336

I am strongly opposed to the proposed mining operation. I grew up on the Iron Range south of Biwabik near five lakes Wynne, Merritt, Esquagama (these are a chain of lakes flowing toward Lake Superior) and near the smaller Silver and Bass Lakes. The St Louis River also winds through this area on its way into the St Louis Bay and Lake Superior. The Iron Range is a valuable water resource and sulfide mining jeopardizes the safety of water, wildlife, and people. I have also used Crane Lake, Lake Vermilion, and other smaller waterways for recreation. The state of Minnesota has long touted its "Land of 10,000 Lakes." I can't imagine the horror of sulfide mining within this kind of watershed. In this time of increasing need for water resources across the country, it is foolhardy to ruin the ample fresh water supplies here. Economic development concerns need to be secondary to the health and welfare of the landscape. PolyMet has presented information suggesting that they could contain the effluence. They are not able to predict extreme weather events, human error, and failures of technology-all of which are likely to occur. They always occur. Corporate interests must be set aside and not drive government policy in the interest of health and safety. Thank you for your vigilance in protecting the quality of life in Minnesota. Sheila Packa 2 Chester Parkway Duluth, MN 55805 HYPERLINK "<http://www.sheilapacka-com>"www.sheilapacka-com 218-393-4218

Sheila Sullivan

10237

I would like to have my voice heard: I DO NOT support mining of copper and other metals in and around Superior National Forest. I understand that jobs are important but we need to consider long term economies not a 20 year stint that may damage other business in the end. After the news of water contamination in West Virginia I am hoping more people see our wealth in terms of vital natural resources such as the water we drink and the air we breathe. These can be replenished and are seen as renewable. The amount of water we have on our Earth is finite and by poisoning it we are limiting our quality of existence. I realize Polymet has a plan to treat the water - for hundreds of years. Why would Polymet commit to such a long term agreement. And how long is long. Please explain who will continue to treat the water when Polymet is not longer in existence. Has any company lasted over 200 years. If we could replace the ecosystem and guarantee no water contamination then I would be happy to add jobs to the economy. There has been no evidence of mining where the land returns to its natural state. It is too invasive to our Earth. Please provide jobs that search for improved technologies for mining and perhaps focus on recycling and reusing of old metals. Many up and coming companies are looking for money making opportunities that also consider our Earth's resources as finite. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my views. Sheila Sullivan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sheila Wilcox

45268

To Whom it May Concern: I am writing to list the concerns I have about Polymet's proposed mining project. I am a public school music teacher with 25 years of teaching at Virginia High School in Virginia, MN. I have a master's degree in instrumental music education and have made the Iron Range my home since 1988- I also serve on the board of directors of two 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations in the region-The Mesabi Symphony Orchestra and the Minnesota State Old Time Fiddle Championships. I am married to a native of the Iron Range, and together we are raising two school-aged boys. The boys love their communities, their schools and their environment. Our hope is that when they return to the Iron Range after their schooling that we have preserved the legacy of clean air, clean water and clean land for them and their families to enjoy forever. I am not in support of the Polymet mining project for the reasons below. 1- First and foremost is my concern about pollution of our environment. We love the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and we recently purchased land on Elbow Lake and built a log cabin. We value being able to hunt and fish on the lakes around our region. We have taught our boys to only eat the small fish or the plant eating fish like sunfish due to the high levels of mercury already in the larger fish. Since there has never been a sulfide mine able to pull metal out of the ground without leeching toxins into the ground water and surface water, I am convinced that no matter what Polymet says they will not be able to mine in our region safely. 2- I am concerned about current mining operations that are not meeting minimum wastewater discharge standards. What kinds of variances will be allowed for Polymet. If we can't or won't police the taconite industry, how much more difficult will it be to police Polymet. 3- I am concerned about the costly effects of cleaning up the poisoned water and soil when Polymet either goes bankrupt or gets sold to some other company. In the past, the state (that means me, the hard working tax-payer) gets stuck with the bill for the cleanup. That is not fair to burden our children with these cleanup costs. 4- I am concerned about the astronomical cost of health care for all the individuals who will develop illnesses decades later due to unsafe exposure to manganese, arsenic and mercury brought about by pollution from Polymet. This could be a huge health care crisis that, again, the tax-payers will foot the bill for. We need a company who is committed to the health of the community. I do not believe that Polymet is that company. 5- I am concerned that in exchange for polluting 6,000-8,000 acres of pristine water rich land, we are returning much less important and quite scattered lands to wetland. In my mind that is not exchanging an apple for an apple. 6- Finally, I am concerned about the Polymet's lack of support for the community in the form of giving to non-profits, especially the arts. The non-profit arts organizations that I am affiliated with have repeatedly asked for funding from Polymet for projects that bring quality live music to the underserved audiences of the Iron Range. We have repeatedly been denied this funding. The iron mining companies of the past invested in the communities, schools, libraries, etc in the cities in which the mines operated. That is why the aging Iron Range schools all have beautiful auditoriums rivaling Carnegie Hall, and why the schools have one or even two swimming pools. We don't need companies whose large corporate headquarters are states and even countries away. We need a company willing to invest in its community. I do not believe Polymet is that company. I am overall very much opposed to the Polymet mining project for all the reasons listed above. Thank you for allowing me to comment on the SDEIS. Feel free to contact me by letter, phone or email if you need any further information.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shelby Flint

16344

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Even if PolyMet offers to mitigate wetland loss by constructing wetlands or purchasing and conserving other acreage, such measures are inadequate. Newly constructed wetlands would not contain the biodiversity or carbon-storage capacity provided by intact bogs - the science and practice of wetland restoration is simply not advanced enough. Purchase and conservation of wetlands outside the 100 Mile Swamp watershed won't mitigate the impacts to ground- and surface-water flow that will occur if the wetland destruction proposed by PolyMet is permitted. Further, the drawdown and drying of peatlands that will occur if the plans proceed as proposed, will result in rapid decomposition of existing peat and a substantial release of CO₂- Lastly, the SDEIS needs to take into account not just the anticipated impacts under the current climate, but the likely impacts in future under probable future-climate scenarios. The expected changes in precipitation and temperature will impact bog hydrologic regimes (and therefore plant and animal assemblages and water chemistry. Even peatlands not directly destroyed by the proposed activities will be less resilient to climate-change impacts because of the disturbances caused by mining. Permitting the proposed PolyMet activities would be short-sighted and cause much more environmental harm than economic benefit. Sincerely, Shelby Flint 1145 Raymond Ave Apt 2 Saint Paul, MN 55108-1937 (603) 988-6237

Shelley Colvin

38762

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Shelley Colvin 2267 Walnut Ct S New Brighton, MN 55112-5014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shelley Hines

14882

From: Shelley Hines [mailto:pshines@msn-com] Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 8:37 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Please ensure Polymet's SDEIS addresses details of financial assurances I'm being told that the financial assurance section of the Polymet SDEIS does not reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for the conceivable potential period of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors) and how they will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation of what would constitute adequate treatment Thanks for your attention to these issues. As a taxpayer, an accountant, and a father, it is important to me that the people of Minnesota be protected from the risks of this mining process if it becomes a reality. Too often, corporate America is not held responsible for the long term risks of their pursuit of short term profits. I do not want to prohibit mining activity if it is determined to be a reasonable risk, but I do want to make sure that the companies profiting from it are required to assume the cost of the risks, not the taxpayers. It is the responsibility of agencies such as yours to ensure that the long-term view is taken in addressing issues such as this. Thank you for protecting current taxpayers and our children and their descendants. Shelley Hines 5540 Candy Cove Trl SE Prior Lake, MN 55372 Ph. 952-447-7298

19474

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Div. of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney, US Forest Service Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please increase the length of the comment period from 90 days to 180 days for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). Please also reschedule the proposed January public meetings so that they happen later in the comment period. If you can't do that, please add another public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period, such as in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Sorry, but we in the public just can't possibly read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks which include the winter holidays. I don't think this is fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is REALLY long, like 2,169 pages long. This is like four or five Harry Potter books, and not nearly as easy to read or understand. * My understanding is that the SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can readily understand it. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * I'm being told the SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues, and that the SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. I'm hearing that no data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed, and as an accountant I'm big on data. * I'm hearing the SDEIS seems to be one-sided, so plenty of time is needed for both sides to address the contents * For the public to be able to tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense, the list of references will need to also be made available to the public, and time will be needed to review the source information. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, so it is critical to give adequate time for all parties to review, understand, and comment. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Shelley Hines 5540 Candy Cove Trl SE Prior Lake, MN 55372 Shelley Hines 5540 Candy Cove Trl SE Prior Lake, MN 55372 952-447-7298

Shelley L Robinson

54554

Why do we have to keep learning the same lesson over and over again? We're promised "Pie in the sky" benefits when what it really means is a few people benefit and the rest of us pay. 500 years to clean up the results of a few years of "productive" mining? It only makes sense to those who will ultimately profit—and those who pay will suffer the consequences for generations.

Shelley O'Neill

54771

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shelley Rask 10042

I believe that the PolyMet project should receive their necessary permits to continue their goal to mine non-ferrous metals up on the iron range. I have lived here for 30 years and believe that today's processes for such a project can be done in a most protective way to not harm the water, air or land. I believe that PolyMet has meet all the necessary steps to ensure that the process is sound. I have property (a cabin) very close to the area that is intended to be mined and feel that my way of life and use of my property would not be adversely damaged. Please allow the permitting process to continue for PolyMet. Thank you. Shelley Rask | Administrative Assistant TOWN AND COUNTRY ELECTRIC (218) 741-4618 Phone (218) 741-5802 Fax

Shelley Robshaw 20120

PolyMet Mining's proposed copper nickel mine near the boundary waters is dangerous to a precious natural resource. Wild rice has already been hurt by the sulfide released into the water from previous mining. Waste water and contamination holding tanks have been proven to be unreliable. We cannot risk destroying the environment for this short term gain. The negative impacts will live on for generations. PolyMet cannot guarantee the safe performance of its process, nor can it provide the financial resources to handle cleanup activities long into the future. As supporters of the Superior Hiking Trail and the boundary waters, we ask that you do not approve this venture. Shelley and Michael Robshaw 1410 Lafond Ave St Paul, MN 55104

Shelley Strohmaier 15430

My name is Shelley Strohmaier. My address is 3800 Upton Ave S./Minneapolis/MN/55410- My husband and I also have a home in northern Minnesota, about 7 miles south of Biwabik. This issue is of great concern to us. By way of background, my father was an engineer with US Steel and played an integral role in designing and operating the Minntac mine in Mountain Iron. I share that personal information to provide context that I do not come from a general position of opposing mining. However, my reading and researching on copper sulfide mining has convinced me that the polymet mine poses an unacceptably high level of risk to our pristine northern Minnesota waters. It seems absurd and short sighted in the extreme that the state would allow a mine project to go forward that will produce only a few hundred jobs for just 20 years. In return for those relatively small and short lived gains for the Northern Minnesota economy, we risk hundreds and hundreds of years of spoiled waters. Time and again throughout the world (including sites in Colorado, West Virginia, and Montana), sulfide mining companies have destroyed the environment and failed to provide the funding required to prevent or repair the environmental damage they have caused. Please do not let this project move forward, for the sake of those of us who value protecting the environment for us and for countless future generations.

Shelley Valentini 5937

Thank you~ Shelley* Shelley Valentini Executive Director Cell # 218-966-1998 cid:image004-jpg@01CE1E5B.F0322B40 United Way of Northeastern MN 229 West Lake Street, Chisholm, MN 55719 HYPERLINK "http://www.unitedwaynemn-org/"www.unitedwaynemn-org BE THE CHANGE YOU WANT TO SEE IN THE WORLD GIVE. ADVOCATE. VOLUNTEER.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sheri Plesha

39192

I'm writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. First, I want to express my confidence in your agency to thoroughly evaluate the project and its ability to mitigate potential environmental impacts. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, I'd like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out – all the more reason to support it. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws – some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country. Minnesota is home to a world-class deposit of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium and gold. This is an economic opportunity right below our feet that will benefit the state's economy for future generations. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. This project would mean 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state needs. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts has been completed. Thank you Sheri Plesha Gilbert, MN 55741

Sherie Bosak

43311

Dear Reader: 1- The public deserves more time to educate themselves and weigh the costs and benefits. Please extend the public comment period. 2- Polymet's proposal to implement water osmosis treatment has been unproven on such a large scale. 3- Polymet's proposal to contain contaminated waters erroneously pro-ports that the geological underground is not fractured and therefore, a "holding" tank of some type is to contain contaminants. The geology of northern Minnesota is widely known to be fractured. 4- Sulfide mining has never been done in such a lush waterway. The mining industry has no proven track record for keeping waterways clean. 5- Polymet's promise of more jobs brought to northern Minnesota does not take into consideration the jobs lost due to lack of tourism with polluted waters. 6- Please require a health cost impact. I understand children born in northern MN already have higher levels of mercury which may have resulted because of taconite mining. 7- The proposed site is in a verdant marsh area. This land is not replaceable by a equal land exchange. 8- There is no "damage deposit" required of Polymet should contamination occur. (I do not believe that sulfuric acid can even be removed from water.) Please insist on a damage deposit. 9- By Polymet's own projections, copper contamination to fish, at its best, will be 100 X's greater than DNR's safety levels of contamination. 10- I have already chosen to go camping away from lands where preliminary drilling is said to be going on. I understand the sound of drills can be heard throughout the night. Let us preserve our jewel of northern Minnesota. It is not worth the risk of a short sighted economic boon. Thank you for reading this. I am, Sherie Bosak, St Paul, MN

Sherita Townsend

54208

I don't think it's a good idea to mine on the boundary waters. People go there to relax and enjoy the wilderness. These waters are very important to Minnesota. Mining on the boundary waters could cause pollution. It would never be the same. Our boundary waters is more important than mining copper and nickel.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sherrie Christian

41885

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Sherrie Christian Prior Lake, Minnesota

Sherrie Lindskog

42841

See attachment

Sherry Folsom-Meek

16289

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sheryl Huffman 9645

I am sending this email to notify you that I am not in favor of the proposed mining operation. Sheryl Huffman

Sheryl Wilson 45942

I am unable to attend a local meeting since I live in out state Minnesota, but I need to express my very negative reaction to this proposal. The environmental damage caused by this enterprise will be significantly greater than any positives this mine will bring to the area or Minnesota. 300 jobs is really just a drop in the bucket. I am so tired of rhetoric that encourages people in depressed economic areas to poison their surroundings in order to make a living. Think about what has happened in the poor coal mining areas of Kentucky and West Virginia. This is just big business preying on the economically disadvantaged for the sake of huge profits. In addition, this type of mining is environmentally unsound and has proven to be very likely to cause damage in the future. Let's not be so short sighted. We have a beautiful state here and the Boundary Waters are a national treasure. Please don't put all of that in jeopardy for only a few hundred jobs. Sheryl Wilson Sent from my iPad

Shira Brech 57184

Don't mine near the boundary waters – work towards job creation through renewable energy – we need to be moving forwards – the boundary waters is beautiful and preserves humanity and hope – protect the people, workers, and planet. Thank you. Shira Brech 3825 Aldrich Ave So Minneapolis, MN 55409

Shirley Ann Steinhagen 57180

Minnesota, the "Land of Sky Blue Water." In my opinion, we should respect and this "Land of Sky Blue Water." Contaminated streams, rivers and lakes are at serious risk to the health of all animals and our forests. Let's not forget the people who consume contaminated wild life from creatures in the water and on land. It is necessary to have a decent population of people living and raising families and having jobs to earn a living and enjoy our state. Where does this lead us if the ground and air so contaminated? It puts a risk of our resources a life for everyone well into the future. Let us not forget Lake Superior and the dangers of contamination. There needs to be a more safe way and not to rip the ground asunder. Shirley Ann Steinhagen 8738 Vinland St Duluth, MN 55810

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shirley Huskins

12782

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

54797

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shirley Reider

15984

Feb 21, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Shirley Zumberge

58084

I feel strongly we must protect our Arrowhead Region from such toxic mining. At this time I see no guarantee of safety to our water, air or wildlife. The risk is much too great. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shonie Buenvenida

9772

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Shonie Buenvenida 56461 180th Ave West Concord, MN 55985

18587

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Shonie Buenvenida 56461 180th Ave West Concord, MN 55985

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Shonie Buenvenida

50663

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Shonie Buenvenida 56461 180th Ave West Concord, MN 55985

sid foster

38233

I grew up in Babbitt in the 70s and 80s. The Iron Range is a great place because of mining. I am a shareholder and full supporter of Polymet Mining. Sincerely, Sid Foster 4347 Hamilton Dr Eagan MN 55123 Sent from my iPad

Sierra Club

3922

Dec 24, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have witnessed sulfide mining firsthand in South America. The waste-water from sulfide mining damages the ecosystem around the mine, as well as everything downstream from the runoff. Studies show there is not a possibility long term pollution, but a certainty. It doesn't belong in Minnesota. The companies that own the mines will reap the profits and then leave, forcing the citizens of Minnesota to deal with the damage to the health of humans as well as wildlife. There is no guarantee that any company will be around long enough to sufficiently correct all of the damage done, no matter what these companies promise in the beginning. However, there is a guarantee that damage will be done to the natural environment, especially the irreplaceable Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Destroying the beauty and health of the state of Minnesota is not worth creating a few hundred temporary jobs. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Benjamin Cook 6805 Athena Way Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-2413 (651) 492-1640

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sierra Club 4048

Dec 23, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The known - and unknown - hazards of sulfide mining demand that any permit granted for mining in Minnesota be conditioned on a posted bond sufficient to cover the costs of mitigating any and all of those hazards. Beyond that, the state must first be assured by all competent authorities that this project will not damage Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations. The state must recognize that the mining of precious metals beneath our surface may first require the development of new mining technologies. In this regard, would-be miners should be encouraged to contribute funding for research by the University of Minnesota and work with the University to develop those safe mining practices. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Jerry Kahlert 900 Robert St S Apt 110 Saint Paul, MN 55118-1484 (612) 839-0725

4092

Dec 23, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thanks for considering my comments. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Tom Canning 511 17th St N Moorhead, MN 56560-2356

Sierra Club Northstar Chapter 19507

From: Gardner, Annah J. [mailto:AJGARDNER@stthomas-edu] Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:02 AM To: DLL-CEMVP OP-R Inquiry Subject: [EXTERNAL] request for extended comment period for the Northmet Mining Project I am emailing to request a 180 day comment period for the Northmet Mining project. The PolyMet SDEIS is extremely long and I need extra time to be able to read it. thank you Annah Gardner Classification: UNCLASSIFIED Caveats: NONE

42946

[See attachments for Submission ID 42950]

42947

[See attachments for Submission ID 42950]

42948

[See attachments for Submission ID 42950]

42949

[See attachments for Submission ID 42950]

42950

Attached are comments submitted on behalf of the Sierra Club North Star Chapter, there will also be a couple more subsequent emails including attachments to our comments thank you

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Signe Martell 43071

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders, I am asking you to please say no to allowing the PolyMet sulfide mining to take place. Our water, air, and entire environment will be spewed with toxins which will affect all living beings. Please stop this now. Sincerely, Signe Martell Signe Martell 2149 Goodrich Av St Paul, MN 55105 651-231-1058

Silvia Bertano 40851

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Silvia Bertano Corso Rosselli 123/8 Torino, NY 10129

Silvia Comparini 17534

Thank YOU. On Sun, Feb 16, 2014 at 7:55 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: HYPERLINK "https://www.boxbe-com/overview"Boxbe http://www.boxbe-com/stfopen.tc_serial=16383744487andtc_rand=271597396andutm_source=stfandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=ANNO_MWTPandutm_content=001*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) (HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) is not on HYPERLINK "https://www.boxbe-com/approved-list.tc_serial=16383744487andtc_rand=271597396andutm_source=stfandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=ANNO_MWTPandutm_content=001andtoken=puIwZr11L CFGdQ5xB%2BqZF2z0JZfD%2BiqvhMqSRWXli9L3vZBG3ZZBFE12ACWZZYR9andkey=%2FbKLS%2FOccX%2FvrFxmTgUF4WiAmg%2Fi9UNI8%2FvuSOlht98%3D"your Guest List | HYPERLINK "https://www.boxbe-com/anno.tc_serial=16383744487andtc_rand=271597396andutm_source=stfandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=ANNO_MWTPandutm_content=001andtoken=puIwZr11L CFGdQ5xB%2BqZF2z0JZfD%2BiqvhMqSRWXli9L3vZBG3ZZBFE12ACWZZYR9andkey=%2FbKLS%2FOccX%2FvrFxmTgUF4WiAmg%2Fi9UNI8%2FvuSOlht98%3D"Approve sender | HYPERLINK "https://www.boxbe-com/anno.tc_serial=16383744487andtc_rand=271597396andutm_source=stfandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=ANNO_MWTPandutm_content=001anddomandtoken=puIwZr11L CFGdQ5xB%2BqZF2z0JZfD%2BiqvhMqSRWXli9L3vZBG3ZZBFE12ACWZZYR9andkey=%2FbKLS%2FOccX%2FvrFxmTgUF4WiAmg%2Fi9UNI8%2FvuSOlht98%3D"Approve domain Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Simon Gretton

40176

Dear Mr Bruner, Having read the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have great concern about the proposed PolyMet Sulfide Mine. I do not think this project should be allowed to go ahead because of it's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet spokes people talk of job creation, but as a resident of North East Minnesota who lives only a little above the poverty level, I feel strongly that a few dozen or even several hundred jobs are not worth long term damage to our environment. Though the economic benefits of this project are questionable, I don't think any economic benefit is worth this potential threat to our environment. Also, it's worth noting the economic benefits of metal mining tend to be very volatile leading to long term downturns and the decline of local communities. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. An additional fear is that if this project is given the go ahead, it will open the door to even bigger sulfide mining projects by Twin Metals and others. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As far as I can tell there has not been a sulfide mining site that had not resulted in significant long term pollution. Given that runoff water from the site will need treatment for some 500 years, the chance of significant pollution at some point seems highly likely. Thank you for considering my comments. Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169, Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 (218) 491-3713 [HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"](mailto:simongretton@gmail-com)simongretton@gmail-com

40194

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Dear Ms Fay, Haing read the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have great concern about the proposed PolyMet Sulfide Mine. I do not think this project should be allowed to go ahead because of it's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet spokes people talk of job creation, but as a resident of North East Minnesota who lives only a little above the poverty level, I feel strongly that a few dozen or even several hundred jobs are not worth long term damage to our environment. Though the economic benefits of this project are questionable, I don't think any economic benefit is worth this potential threat to our environment. Also, it's worth noting the economic benefits of metal mining tend to be very volatile leading to long term downturns and the decline of local communities. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. An additional fear is that if this project is given the go ahead, it will open the door to even bigger sulfide mining projects by Twin Metals and others. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As far as I can tell there has not been a sulfide mining site that had not resulted in significant long term pollution. Given that runoff water from the site will need treatment for some 500 years, the chance of significant pollution at some point seems highly likely. Thanks you for considering my comments. Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169, Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 [\(218\) 491-3713">HYPERLINK "tel:%28218%29%20491-3713"](tel:%28218%29%20491-3713)(218) 491-3713 [HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"](mailto:simongretton@gmail-com)simongretton@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Simon Gretton

44184

Dear Ms Fay, Since I contacted you several days ago it has come to my attention that internal DNR documents show groundwater base flow is 200-300% higher than the rate used in PolyMet's analysis. It seems that neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. Given the extensive history of sulfide mining pollution and the potential long term threat to receiving waters, this confirms my opinion that this project should be rejected. Sincerely, Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169 Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 [\(218\) 491-3713](tel:%28218%29%20491-3713) On Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 3:46 PM, Simon Gretton <[HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"simongretton@gmail-com](mailto:simongretton@gmail-com)> wrote: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Dear Ms Fay, Haing read the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have great concern about the proposed PolyMet Sulfide Mine. I do not think this project should be allowed to go ahead because of it's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet spokes people talk of job creation, but as a resident of North East Minnesota who lives only a little above the poverty level, I feel strongly that a few dozen or even several hundred jobs are not worth long term damage to our environment. Though the economic benefits of this project are questionable, I don't think any economic benefit is worth this potential threat to our environment. Also, it's worth noting the economic benefits of metal mining tend to be very volatile leading to long term downturns and the decline of local communities. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. An additional fear is that if this project is given the go ahead, it will open the door to even bigger sulfide mining projects by Twin Metals and others. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As far as I can tell there has not been a sulfide mining site that had not resulted in significant long term pollution. Given that runoff water from the site will need treatment for some 500 years, the chance of significant pollution at some point seems highly likely. Thanks you for considering my comments. Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169, Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 [\(218\) 491-3713](tel:%28218%29%20491-3713) [HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"simongretton@gmail-com](mailto:simongretton@gmail-com)

47792

From: Simon Gretton [<mailto:simongretton@gmail-com>] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:17 PM To: Periman, Richard -FS Subject: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft EIS Dear Mr Periman, Having read the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have great concern about the proposed PolyMet Sulfide Mine. I do not think this project should be allowed to go ahead because of it's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet spokes people talk of job creation, but as a resident of North East Minnesota who lives only a little above the poverty level, I feel strongly that a few dozen or even several hundred jobs are not worth long term damage to our environment. Though the economic benefits of this project are questionable, I don't think any economic benefit is worth this potential threat to our environment. Also, it's worth noting the economic benefits of metal mining tend to be very volatile leading to long term downturns and the decline of local communities. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Minnesota Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. An additional fear is that if this project is given the go ahead, it will open the door to even bigger sulfide mining projects by Twin Metals and others. Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As far as I can tell there has not been a sulfide mining site that had not resulted in significant long term pollution. Given that runoff water from the site will need treatment for some 500 years, the chance of significant pollution at some point seems highly likely. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169, Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 [\(218\) 491-3713](tel:%28218%29%20491-3713) [HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"simongretton@gmail-com](mailto:simongretton@gmail-com)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Simon Gretton

49080

Dear Mr Dabney, Having read the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have great concern about the proposed PolyMet Sulfide Mine. I do not think this project should be allowed to go ahead because of it's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. PolyMet spokes people talk of job creation, but as a resident of North East Minnesota who lives only a little above the poverty level, I feel strongly that a few dozen or even several hundred jobs are not worth long term damage to our environment. Though the economic benefits of this project are questionable, I don't think any economic benefit is worth this potential threat to our environment. Also, it's worth noting the economic benefits of metal mining tend to be very volatile leading to long term downturns and the decline of local communities. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. An additional fear is that if this project is given the go ahead, it will open the door to even bigger sulfide mining projects by Twin Metals and others. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. As far as I can tell there has not been a sulfide mining site that had not resulted in significant long term pollution. Given that runoff water from the site will need treatment for some 500 years, the chance of significant pollution at some point seems highly likely. Thank you for considering my comments. <http://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/images/cleardot.gif> Simon Gretton 1300 E Hwy 169, Apt. 137 Grand Rapids, MN 55744 HYPERLINK "tel:%28218%29%20491-3713"(218) 491-3713 HYPERLINK "mailto:simongretton@gmail-com"simongretton@gmail-com

Simona F

41914

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Simona F Minneapolis, Minnesota

Sindy Mau

38877

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sindy Mau 1733 Lansford Ln Mendota Heights, MN 55118-3704

Siri Lindquist

54535

Please re-write the EIS until there is more information or more examples of successful mining without long term pollution. I am thankful that there is going to be an EIS on the effects of the Polymet Mine...I only ask that the EIS take several things into mind. Think about the after effects of mining. One, the tailings and impact on the land of the unused material from this mining. Think about the total picture of the future—the sulfuric iron will seriously affect the land and water of the area, and the ecological changes that cannot be undone. In addition to the ecological changes, past mining experience, have seriously shown that the long term safety or isolation of the waste cannot be guaranteed. To preserve the waste from running into the land should be important. Put the responsibility clearly on Polymet, and think about how it is impossible to ensure 500 years of securing the waste. 10 years of mining for 500 years of after effects or possible pollution if it fails.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sister Rosita Aranita 42809

See attachment

Siyanda Elizabeth 15659

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This project is all wrong. Why would we sacrifice the quality of our land and water to provide economic benefit for a few individuals in the mining industry. Stop PolyMet and Save Minnesota. Please reject the SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine in Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Siyanda Elizabeth Siyanda Elizabeth 3381 Newton Road Hibbing, MN 55746

50507

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This project is all wrong. Why would we sacrifice the quality of our land and water to provide economic benefit for a few individuals in the mining industry. Stop PolyMet and Save Minnesota. Please reject the SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine in Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Siyanda Elizabeth Siyanda Elizabeth 3381 Newton Road Hibbing, MN 55746

SJ Hanson 41818

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, SJ Hanson St Louis Park, Minnesota

Skip Fay 57975

We shouldn't mine in the current proposed area. Even if you can "mitigate" risk, the current natural state is too valuable, and our water is at risk without a mine. How precious is that water? Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

solfrid ladstein

14769

Feb 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

solfrid ladstein

17725

Feb 15, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby communities, and describe contingency plans to address the risk to public health and worker safety if asbestos-like fibers are detected during construction, operation, closure and post-closure 3) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate inaccurate characterizations of the University of Minnesota mesothelioma study. Specifically, eliminate statements that imply that commercial asbestos is the primary risk factor for mesothelioma risk Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms solfrid ladstein 1892 Wellesley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1615

41899

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms solfrid ladstein 1892 Wellesley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105-1615

Sommers

20111

Lisa Fay - Please do not allow Copper/Nickle mining in BWCA. No need to repeat arguments here - Thanks. Dave Sommers, 46 Cliff Cove Road, Schroeder, MN 55613 - Dave Sommers [HYPERLINK "mailto:sommers@boreal-org"](mailto:sommers@boreal-org)sommers@boreal-org

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonia Schmerl

40637

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans and other Americans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Ms Sonia Schmerl 539 S 1st St Ann Arbor, MI 48103-4947 (734) 668-1402

Sonja B

39276

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources, which is in direct violation of the Clean Water Act. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights:

- Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines.
- Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes.
- Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected:

- The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands.
- The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense.
- The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lynx,

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonja Johnson

17136

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sonja Johnson 3000 W. River Pkwy. #112 Minneapolis, MN 55406

20668

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please: • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance. • Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS. • Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect" wetlands losses. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin. • Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1-Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2-Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3-Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4-Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5-Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands. Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceable wetlands and fresh water resources in the Lake Superior Basin for generations to come. Very truly yours, Sonja Johnson 3000 W. River Pkwy. #112 Minneapolis, MN 55406

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonja Johnson

50405

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Sonja Johnson 3000 W. River Pkwy. #112 Minneapolis, MN 55406

Sonja Meintsma

47095

Mar 12, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. The Boundary Waters are a sacred place for many Minnesotans and Americans-I urge you to ensure the protection of these lands. We have a duty to future generations and the Earth to make educated decisions regarding proper environmental treatment of our lands. People often find solance in these waters, we must protect our connection to these lands. Please STOP the Ploymet.. Sincerely, Ms Sonja Meintsma 14541 Wellington Rd Wayzata, MN 55391-2414

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonja Misch

41798

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sonja Misch Dale St Paul, MN 55116

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonya Mirus

46931

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a resident of northern Minnesota, I value the clean water and unsullied natural areas. The proposed PolyMet mine would destroy what I love most about this area. It is not a sustainable source of jobs, and it would greatly deteriorate the quality of life for human residents and wildlife, not to mention decimating the local tourism industry. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Sonya Mirus Duluth, MN Sonya Mirus 428 E 10th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sonya Mirus

46932

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: As a resident of northern Minnesota, I value the clean water and unsullied natural areas. The proposed PolyMet mine would destroy what I love most about this area. It is not a sustainable source of jobs, and it would greatly deteriorate the quality of life for human residents and wildlife, not to mention decimating the local tourism industry. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of heavy rains and flooding at the mine site, particularly at the "west equalization basin," which will contain reject concentrate from plant site reverse osmosis. The SDEIS should also reveal the level of contamination that this highly toxic "basin" would contain, long after the mine shuts down.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Sonya Mirus Duluth, MN Sonya Mirus 428 E 10th Street Duluth, MN 55805

Sophie Justinak

38341

Mar 6, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Minnesota has already implemented the Legacy Amendment, which allocates a significant amount of its' revenues towards the Clean Water Fund. The pollution from the PolyMet proposal that would leak into ground water, and which would affect surface water will just add to the list of Minnesota's impaired waters. Additionally, the proposal includes the destruction of vital peat bog habitat, and carbon-sequestering forest. The projected 20-year use of the PolyMet mine seems cursory; considering the 100's of years that the waste water treatment facilities will operate after the mine closes, along with the time and money that will have to be spent on the restoration of the surrounding areas. In Minnesota we proudly pay extra taxes in order to protect our beautiful and bountiful ecosystems - please respect this fact and do not support the PolyMet mine, which would undermine the progress of Minnesotan's hard-earned tax dollars towards cleaner waters and lands. Sincerely, Ms Sophie Justinak 3967 114th Ln NE Blaine, MN 55449-7031 (763) 232-6128

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Soua Xiong

54236

Dear Ms. Fay, My name is Soua Xiong and I am writing to you from Humboldt High School. I have heard that there is going to be a mining in the Bounding Water Canning Area (BWCA). I have not been to the BWCA, but my family is making plan to have a camping trip there in the summer. From what I have seen in the website of the BCWA, it is naturally beautiful place. I want that place to stay like that for the next hundreds generations and even mine generation to explore in the wild. Please keep it safe from pollutions and mining, even anything from destroying it. About the mining that is going to take place around that area, please I want it to be change. Even though the SDEIS drew a map that the mining won't affect the BWCA, from what I have seen, that map is wrong. The SDEIS have a wrong calculation of the map. They left out the half of the one hundreds mile swamp. That means it also leaves the BCWA completely unprotected from the acid mine. There are lacks of evidence that the mining won't goes to BCWA, but the mining will only affect Lake Superior. But the map is wrong because Langley Creeks goes to BCWA not Lake Superior. There are many possible solutions to protect the BCWA: 1. Correct the SDEIS maps and measure in the right calculation of the mining 2. Testing the water of the Langley Creek into the BCWA 3. More evidence that the mining won't affect the BCWA Please consider these possible solutions to keep BCWA protected for many years ahead of us. Sincerely, Soua Xiong

Spencer Ludtke

21451

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Spencer Ludtke 1451 Juliet Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Spencer Ludtke

49889

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Spencer Ludtke 1451 Juliet Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Spencer Snyder

58070

Clean water means more than profits Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dmiinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Stacey Bishofsky

42065

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Stacey Bishofsky Elgin, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stacey Kemp

16220

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Stacey Larsen

38607

I support PolyMet and the work they are doing in the State of Minnesota. The fact the we have a local deposit of copper, nickel and PGMs of this magnitude speaks for itself. Why would we not mine these metals domestically. Since it can be done soundly and produce local jobs and revitalize a struggling economy in northern Minnesota, I do not know of any reason why our state would not want to mine these metals. As someone who works in a career in the environmental field, I have every faith that they will not harm our environment. I believe the laws in place in our state and country ensure that. As someone who's job is connected to the mining industry, mining plays a key role in keeping me, as well as hundreds of other Minnesotans, employed. Please keep the process moving forward and lets get this mine permitted. Stacey Larsen 240 Spring Street Unit 221 Saint Paul, MN 55102

Staci L Drouillard

54854

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Staci Revers

15763

The environmental impact statement which is supposed to protect the environment has a big problem. PolyMet did some revisionist geography to imply that acid drainage from waste rock piles can't flow to the BWCA because the site is on the south side of the Laurentian Divide. In fact, the mine is uphill from a wetland that exists as a divot in the divide and drains down both sides. A pretty big divot, it even has a name – The One Hundred Mile Swamp (it's actually a little over 10 miles long). This concerns me. I would like PolyMet to do more testing on the flow through the swamp to ensure BWCA is safe. Thank you. Staci Revers

Stacie Groll

42497

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Stacie Groll 200 W Sterne Pkwy Apt 109 Littleton, CO 80120-3852 (720) 583-6330

Stacie Whaley

39478

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Stacie Whaley 2323 Boland Drive Duluth, Minnesota 55804 The views and opinions expressed in this message are my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

stacy chladek-doyle

40291

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, stacy chladek-doyle 18n 2nd st pleasantville, NJ 08232 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stan Paczynski

18066

Again, my name is Stan Paczynski. I'm a business representative for the Brick Layers and Allied Craft Workers. I represent about 2,800 people, working people. I'm here in support of the PolyMet project. For one, I trust in the numerous agencies and facilities that have done their homework and their due diligence. And I have my full trust in what they do. Not only in the jobs and economic stability to the area I think we need to rely on our people doing their job, again, with the agencies and the government entities that are doing the permitting processing and have faith. I look forward to the process going forward as a safe process. It's a construction project if the work goes through and to bring some growth and economic stability to our Northeastern Minnesota.

stan sheggeby

40299

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, stan sheggeby 302 oriole lane madison, WI 53704 US

Stephanie Digby

18267

My name is Stephanie Digby. I live in St. Paul. This is just a very brief comment. I will be writing further. I have discovered that in the reclaimed water and in the whole reclamation process microorganisms have not been considered. I have a doctorate in botany. I have studied algae and microfungi that inhabit only the water. They are environmental indicators and they are also necessary for the health of the water and the water system. They are the start of the food chain. I have been told this has not been considered. I will be writing to you with suggestions about how to do an evaluation. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephanie Kessler

16244

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Stephanie kRawn

5984

Dear Sir: This morning I listened to the Public Radio program about the mining project you are proposing near Aurora, Minnesota. It appears that people who are concerned about the project oppose it because of water issues. Wouldn't it be prudent to try to resolve those issues by researching ways to not contaminate the water system. To me it comes down to big business vs the average Joe. At what point does big business take over the course of our lives and what can we do about it. I would prefer not to have this battle. Please find a way to help the water system in Northern Minnesota remain pure for those who use it AND be able to extract the various minerals you need. I apologize for the money you have already sunk into this project, but the well-being of Minnesota residents should also be considered. Thanks, Mrs Stevie Rawn St Paul, MN

Stephanie L Carlson

57148

The PolyMet's mine proposal would not be in the best interests of the people or land of Minnesota or the greater region, were it to go through. We cannot afford the environmental degradation and water pollution that would ensure. Our precious resources of water, particularly, along with forest and wildlife, are irreplaceable and are worth far more than any short-term profits to be gained by sulfide mining. The trade-off is not worth it, and the damage inflicted could, I believe, not be undone, resulting in great loss for all of us, for generations to come. Stephanie L. Carlson 4414 Robinson St Duluth, MN 55804

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephanie Onorat

18250

Stephanie S-T-E-P-H-A-N-I-E, Onorat, O-N-O-R-A-T. I moved to Minnesota in 1998, with all its pristine beauty and the fact that the residents appreciate and enjoy. In regards to the focus of the evening, the PolyMet proposed sulfide mine, I will preface my remarks with a quote from the union of concerned scientists because it is so apt. "Politicians and lobbyists have exaggerated scientific uncertainty to delay actions that would protect the public from tobacco, pesticides, the ozone hole and acid rain. When people believe the science is not settled, they are less likely to take or demand action. Who benefits from the uncertainty? Big business." In this case, big business is PolyMet. PolyMet's initial environmental impact statement was so vague that they were requested to provide another one, which is somewhat more substantive. Nonetheless, the risk of benefit analysis is essential here and the scarcity of facts at Minnesota's disposal, as well as the ones we do have, dictate the rejection of the proposed mine. Under the risk-benefit analysis, the risks, fact one would be sulfide mining is toxic. It will result in environmental destruction, loss of wildlife, habitat, economic loss, and water contamination for possibly 500 years. The flip side of the risk-benefit analysis, the benefit, as we know at this point, can only with certainty be said that PolyMet stands to benefit from this transaction. They will make their fortune and move on, leaving us with currently unquantifiable damage because the flaws in their environmental impact statement have not yet been alleviated. I would note that PolyMet has not committed to establishing a trust fund with millions of dollars in it so Minnesota can monitor its water for the next 200 to 500 years, which appears to be a certainty. And finally, there's simply a lot of lobbying going on here. Let me end with a quote from the union of concerned scientists in that regard. "A UCS-commissioned study by The Center for Responsive Politics found that prescription drug, biotechnology and medical device companies spent more \$700 million lobbying Congress and the White House between 2009 and 2011. In 2012, Congress gave these industries more say in how prescription drugs and medical devices are approved." Don't allow PolyMet's aggressive attempts to influence, override Minnesotan's common sense.

Stephanie Onorato

9627

I attended last evening's Public Comment Hearing at the St Paul River Centre and was disappointed that I was not chosen to speak (although I did put some remarks on the record with a stenographer). I'm sure it was a misperception on my part, but it did seem as if 2 out of every 3 speakers chosen by the lottery system represented some business enterprise that stood to gain from approval of the PolyMet sulfide mine. At any rate, I have some additional comments post-Hearing. The first is actually a question: What does the government stand to gain from this transaction. Is PolyMet going to pay us for this opportunity, if granted. Or do we simply give them carte blanche to come, destroy the environment and then leave us with a gaping hole in the ground and rampant toxicity, not to mention other deleterious environmental effects. Have they agreed to put millions into a trust fund for Minnesota's use so we can monitor and possibly clean-up pollution for hundreds of years after they are long gone. If that premise is correct, is the justification the few hundred jobs PolyMet will create for a finite period before the copper and nickel supplies are exhausted. Some speakers were proponents of job creation in the Iron Range / diversification but this proposal does not address the issue. The Iron Range economy was based on mining and this is a continuation of the same. If the government is serious about diversification / job creation there, monies need to be invested in technology and training for those jobs, because they have a future. Finally, there was discussion about the "land-swap" that PolyMet has so generously proposed. I believe the terms involve the government relinquishing control of prime land situated in National Forest (or close to it) for land somewhere - no mention of where. Is it in a swamp. Is the value even remotely comparable to what is being given up. What will be the effect of a full-on mining operation in the middle of pristine forest. At the very least, destruction of habitat, interruption of the life-cycle and feeding/migration habits of wildlife, pollution and NOISE from constant drilling and trucking in the midst of our quiet space. This proposal is a travesty. Only PolyMet stands to gain long-term and the self-serving businesses linked to PolyMet's fortunes. There is no track record for PolyMet - only talk; apparently, their second EIS is also flawed. Let PolyMet experiment elsewhere before destroying what is Minnesota is known for.

38882

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Stephanie Onorato 31520 White Rock Trail Welch, NJ 08033

Alphabetical by sender's first name

stephanie sharp

39012

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. . Sincerely, stephanie sharp 2763 128th Ave NW Coon Rapids, MN 55448-1162 (763) 757-4951

Stephanie Summers

40119

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Any plans that rely on keeping systems to protect the environment in place for hundreds of years seems unrealistic if not practically delusional. The mining companies almost never keep their promises and cut corners at the first opportunity. What happens when the company goes out of business or is bought. I sympathize with the need to improve the area's economic picture but this plan seems inherently flawed. This kind of natural environment is fragile and must be preserved for the enjoyment and use of all humans and for the welfare of our brother and sister beings now and in the future. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Stephanie Summers 743 Parkview Ave Saint Paul, MN 55117-4045 (651) 488-8528

Stephen Bailey

24938

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I AM GIVEN TO UNDERSTAND THAT CORPORATIONS ARE LEGALLY PEOPLE- THAT BEING THE CASE, THIS CORPORATION/PERSON IS, BY ITS TOXIC ACTIONS, CARRYING OUT A SLOW FORM OF SUICIDE-BY-POISONING-ITS-HOME.. SICK, SICK, SICK.. AND PROFOUNDLY, HEINOUSLY SICK IN THAT HE/SHE/IT IS NOT ONLY KILLING ITSELF SLOWLY, IT IS ALSO, IN THE PROCESS, KILLING ALL WITHIN RANGE OF ITS WEAPON OF CHOICE. STOP THE POISONING OF OUR HOME IT IS PATHOLOGICAL, SICK, TRULY INSANE. ALL OF OUR CHILDREN WILL BE SUBJECTED TO THIS POISON, SICKENED AS WELL, AND THEIR CHILDREN, AND THEIR CHILDREN, FOR GENERATIONS. STOP THIS MADNESS. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Stephen Bailey 4778 Edward Dr Deming, WA 98244-9415

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen Dahl

17250

Feb 17, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, As someone who values clean water, I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). It is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest, which we own and should not surrender. More than 900 acres of wetlands will be directly destroyed by the mine. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. Additional toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will damage aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns, and Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr Stephen Dahl 36 Diane Dr Kingston, RI 02881-1213

Stephen Greenfield

47494

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I realize that metals have to be mined somewhere, but sulfide mining inevitably leads to heavy metal contamination, and should never be done in a place like the boundary waters that is so connected to multiple major watersheds. The revenues look tempting, but the amount of time that we will have to manage the pollution and its costs clearly dwarf any benefits. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Stephen Greenfield 3429 Girard Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3818 (612) 825-6202

48592

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I realize that metals have to be mined somewhere, but sulfide mining inevitably leads to heavy metal contamination, and should never be done in a place like the boundary waters that is so connected to multiple major watersheds. The revenues look tempting, but the amount of time that we will have to manage the pollution and its costs clearly dwarf any benefits. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Stephen Greenfield 3429 Girard Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-3818 (612) 825-6202

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen Hamre

16770

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Stephen Hamre 22090 Ethan Ave Forest Lake, MN 55025

stephen hoglund

2

No hard rock Non Ferrous Sulfide Mining, including copper/nickel/gold/silver etc Keep the status quo. We have a amazing tourism industry that can only grow, unless this nightmare takes place in North Eastern Minnesota. Stephan Hoglund 3 businesses all dependent on Clean Air and Water and a healthy ecosystem Superior Design Jewelry/Stephan Hoglund Design Stephan Hoglund Photography Artists Loft Vacation rental Box 850 Grand Marais Minnesota 55604 218 387 1752 Jewelry Gallery 218 370 1314 Mobile HYPERLINK "mailto:sh@stephanhoglund-com"sh@stephanhoglund-com

Stephen J Jay

23471

Thanks. They got it. I attached for you. Sent to the kids few min ago. sj Stephen J. Jay M.D. Professor of Medicine and Public Health Indiana University School of Medicine Richard M. Fairbanks School of Public Health 714 N. Senate Avenue, EF 203B Indianapolis, IN 46202 Phone: 317 274 3126 Email: HYPERLINK "mailto:sjay@iupui-edu"sjay@iu-edu NOTE: my email address has changed to HYPERLINK "mailto:sjay@iu-edu"sjay@iu-edu. Please update your contact liSt Thanks From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 4:10 PM To: Jay, Stephen J Subject: RE: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement SDEIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

stephen mastey

38944

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr stephen mastey 856 Raymond Ave Saint Paul, MN 55114-1597 (651) 646-1020

Stephen P Jorgenson

54344

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I believe that the Polymet Mining Inc.'s plan to extract copper, nickel and platinum group elements will greatly affect Minnesota, both positively and negatively. The economy of Minnesota, I think, will benefit from the surge of job opportunities and the addition of a new mining branch. The disadvantages, however, seem to outweigh the advantages. First, six endangered or threatened species will be affected by the mining operations. Some species, such as the Canada lynx, will be directly affected by noise and possible habitat destruction. Others will be indirectly affected. Eleven plant species will be affected by the mining operations. If these species aren't protected then they will possibly go extinct. Secondly, air and water quality will be reduced. During mining sulfur dioxide and other gases will be released. The gases will be released throughout the entire processing of the material. Dust will reduce visibility, taking away natural beauty from the surrounding area. Mercury could also be found in small amounts in the tailings pit. If this were to contaminate the water, then there would be a significant loss of plant and wildlife. Copper, cobalt, and nickel could also be released, all of which could affect the water-based organisms, if they were allowed to enter the water. Thirdly, a great number of cultural resources will be affected. Although the Sugarbush camp area will not be affected, other nearby resources will be. Parts of the Laurentian Divide will suffer damage. The Divide has been sacred to the Ojibwe people for centuries. The Erie Mining Company Concentrator Building will be affected due its proposed refurbishment and use. The mining will also happen on land that was ceded to the United States by the Bands under the 1854 treaty. This reserved the right for people to hunt, fish, and gather on these lands. With mining operations affecting wildlife, the damage is unknown. Finally, reclamation of the lands may leave them permanently damaged. Deconstruction of buildings will be time consuming and cost lots of money. Hazardous materials will need to be correctly taken care of otherwise the surrounding area will greatly suffer. Storms have the potential of washing pollution off site. These are just some of the many disadvantages that may come as a result of Polymet Mining Inc.'s plans. I hope I have been able to shed some light on this matter. Sincerely, Stephen P. Jorgenson Jr.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen P. Safranski

43108

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Re: Comments on the NorthMet Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (December 2013) Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to submit my comments concerning the NorthMet Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I am opposed to the proposed project of Polymet Mining Inc. for all of the reasons outlined in the Comments submitted by the Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness yesterday. (See 3/12/14 Letter from B. Daub to L. Fay.) I write additionally to emphasize my personal concern over the project's grave threat to Minnesota's clean water. Preserving clean water and sources of clean water will be one of the greatest challenges of the 21st century, as global and North American demand for fresh water will completely eclipse the supply. Long undervalued as a supposedly inexhaustible resource, both the economic and societal value of clean water are predicted to skyrocket in the coming century. That is one of the reasons that the Polymet project is so concerning. Even with its current scarcity and concern over the environment, the prospect of a project that would impair our clean water resources for 200 to 500 years is significant. But with the coming global water crisis quickly approaching on the horizon, the potential costs of this project are incalculable. I hope that the Department of Natural Resources will give this project the type of scrutiny that is required, and that it require whatever protections are necessary to protect future generations. Sincerely, Steve Safranski 6552 Cherokee Trail W. Eden Prairie, MN 55344 952-303-6768

Information contained in this e-mail transmission may be privileged, confidential and covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC. Sections 2510-2521- If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, distribute, or reproduce this transmission. If you have received this e-mail transmission in error, please notify us immediately of the error by return email and please delete the message from your system. Pursuant to requirements related to practice before the U. S. Internal Revenue Service, any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for purposes of (i) avoiding penalties imposed under the U. S. Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another person any tax-related matter. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. Robins, Kaplan, Miller and Ciresi L.L.P. HYPERLINK "<http://www.rkmc-com/>"<http://www.rkmc-com/>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen Rossiter

44170

Stephen Cary Rossiter 74 West Golden Lake Road Circle Pines, MN 55014 Comment on PolyMet SDEIS – 2/28/2014 Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I ask you to reject the SDEIS for the proposed PolyMet mine on the basis of deeply concerning issues, from false modeling assumptions to inadequate financial assurance, that I will describe below. But first, I feel I am fairly well qualified to assess this issue. I've just received a master's degree in biology, which has impressed upon me the great potential influence that using false assumptions can have on modeling efforts. Also, I have had several seasons of ecological field experience as well as college courses in chemistry and geology. Furthermore, the proposed mine and its effects could affect me. I live in Minnesota and usually travel in the St Louis River watershed once or twice each year to relax, recharge, and hone my professional skills (botany, ornithology). Also, my, and my children's, future tax dollars could be much better spent than cleaning up this pollution if PolyMet goes bankrupt after they finish mining. I have no reason to trust PolyMet, and it seems that I am being asked to trust the word of PolyMet for several parts of the SDEIS. Given the great and long term potential consequences to wilderness and public health, trust is not something I'm willing to rely on. Certainly not when PolyMet's main motivation must be a return for their investors. And certainly not when PolyMet appears to be structured so that, besides this project, it has no other assets that could be recovered in the event that something goes wrong or cleanup costs become greater than planned for with the financial assurance package (compared to Glencorp owning the project directly). Issues: The public (ie the financial assurance program) should receive much more money up front. On page 3-66: "Long-term maintenance of the Category 1 Stockpile would include repairing erosion and removal of woody species and trees from the stockpile cover system." Is this maintenance included in the planning of the financial assurance package and how many years is "long-term". Any effects of pollution would be felt the most by underprivileged peoples. Both Native Americans and low income people rely on a clean natural world for food and water. It would be unjust to force them to accept the risks while others receive the financial benefits. Most economic benefits would go abroad while Minnesotans get a few low paying jobs over a few years but the permanent potential for pollution. Furthermore, due to carcinogenic nickel dust and other toxic metals that would be present at the sites, I ask that the Minnesota Department of Health do a Health Risk Assessment for the safety of mine workers, which so far this has not been included in the planning of this project. The SDEIS contains inadequate quantification of unintentional seepage from the mine site that could make its way beyond the mine perimeter thru the groundwater. Not only that, but in general, northern Minnesota is a very water rich area and attempting a project that requires containing and managing all that water to prevent unacceptable pollution seems foolhardy. I'm told that, of other projects in water rich areas with EISs that claimed there would be no water pollution, 89% of them ended up polluting. Relatedly, estimates of the rate of groundwater flow used in the SDEIS seem to be inaccurate and underestimated. A recent map of fault lines in the project area suggests there may be more routes for groundwater to move thru than acknowledged in the SDEIS and that there may be a greater threat to any aquifers below the site. The SDEIS says on page 4-47 that at the mine site "the hydraulic connection between surficial aquifer and underlying bedrock underlying is weak." But that assertion is not quantified in a meaningful way. Does "weak" mean effectively zero, or, overtime, will the polluted seepage add up to a significant level

Stephen Ryan

36511

To MDNR: I support the PolyMet project, it is good for Minnesota. This is our chance to have a first rate mine in a location that has the most qualified workers with the knowledge and experience to do nonferrous mining. The State Of Minnesota has laws and regulations that will require the owners to meet or exceed these regulations. We have an opportunity to do the mining in Northern Minnesota where we have done mining for many generations and would do it the right way. In reading the SEIS it looks like science says it will work so why would we not do it. This is a opportunity for Minnesota to show the rest of the Nation how to do this type of mining the right way. I ask for your approval so PolyMet Mining can go forwaRd Thank You Stephen Ryan 2829 Timberline Dr Grand Rapids Mn 55744

Stephen Smith

42494

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Stephen Smith 4741 Humboldt Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419-5218

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen Snyder

46084

Dear Sir/Madam: I have followed the public discussions and have reviewed a copy of the SDEIS for the proposed PolyMet mine project in the Lake Superior watershed. Please accept these comments about that Supplemental Draft. 1- The SDEIS does not adequately address a scenario wherein the party that proposes a major mining project has never before operated a mine. PolyMet is a company that has never generated any revenue or income let alone operated any mine. It is just a front organization for the foreign money that is behind this project. That scenario requires particular scrutiny. The assurances made by a front organization should be given no weight. No business would ever be satisfied with assurances received only from a straw purchaser. The environmental review should demand commitments from officers of the actual companies that will be operating this controversial mine. 2- The SDEIS does not adequately address the material risks that are presented by the proposed mining of base minerals from sulfide-bearing ores in the wet environment of northeastern Minnesota. Models based on copper-nickel mining in dry environments have no application here. This issue is particularly important because the SDEIS is based on inaccurate projections of surface water flow. Exposure to water is the number one risk here, yet the SDEIS itself in its current form only addresses this issue within its margins of error. There also has been no attempt to study the actual ground water flows below the proposed tailings pond. 3- The SDEIS does not adequately address the impact on the nearby Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness if the ground waters in part will leach in that direction. There is no impenetrable barrier at the continental divide. Since the route of the ground water flowage is only approximated from the surface flows, the SDEIS fails to adequately address other potential consequences. The wilderness character of the BWCAW is a fundamental asset to Minnesota and any potential impact on its watershed must be thoroughly addressed. An after-the-fact "sorry, we didn't know," is no substitute for a detailed map of the actual ground water flows below this site. 4- The long-term maintenance required during and almost forever after for this proposed mine presents an impossible modeling challenge. The SDEIS offers no adequate method to accurately project political upheavals, economic collapses, population changes, epidemics, climate change, wars, and the inevitable but unknowable other changes that will occur over the next 200 – 500 years. Can we model such an extended future any better now than Christopher Columbus' staff could have done when they set foot on Hispaniola to set up mines about 500 years ago. The agencies may be able to model the next 50 or maybe even 100 years with some confidence, but it is ludicrous to think that anyone could prepare an adequate model to predict how the massive byproducts of this proposed mining project will be maintained for the next 500 years. If we cannot model the future for this type of mining project, then how can we evaluate the future environmental degradation that will result from this project if it is approved. 5- The agencies bear a particular burden here to objectively evaluate the potential environmental issues from this proposal to extract minute quantities of minerals from sulfide-bearing ores. Proponents for this mine have loaded the record with their arguments based on reminiscences about growing up in ferrous mining communities. Politicians have also jumped on the "jobs" bandwagon with rhetorical flourishes. My own grandfather emigrated from Europe at the turn of the last century to work in the iron ore mines in Ely while my mother's inheritance from her grandfather's holdings in Pennsylvania coal country paid for her education and that of her siblings, but none of that has anything to do with a proper environmenta

Stephen Talty

17507

Ms Fay, I wanted to convey my concern over the plans for a sulfide mine in Superior National Forest area. We have enjoyed this area of the country for years, coming to hike, ski and fish. The potential for the long term destruction of the area is a huge concern for us. As you are fully aware of the hazards associated with this type of mining-hundreds of years of pollution and destroying of ecosystems and water supplies, please know that we hope this project will not move forward Minnesota is one of the most beautiful of our states and the vibrant natural resources should not be ruined all for the almighty dollar. It is not only the topical effect that concerns us but the water supplies that trickle down toward the Great Lakes where our water source comes from that is of concern. To risk contamination of water supplies that will affect so many people in so many ways-from abundance of wildlife to fishing to drinking water is irresponsible. Please prevent this. Respectfully, Kiv Talty 2403 Saranac Lane Glenview, IL 60026

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stephen Wlosinski

41933

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I'm wondering how these issues are being addressed. Sincerely, Stephen Wlosinski 1121 W Morgan St Duluth, MN 55811-4446 (218) 726-1911

Steve Adams

41841

Dear Environmental Review Unit MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources: We cannot believe that the DNR is even considering a project that will contribute toxic metals and sulfate pollution to the St Louis River watershed - for 500 years. The threat that this project poses to the environment, wild rice, and non-mining-related uses of the land should be enough to nip it in the bud. The mining industry's record of evading its fiscal and environmental responsibilities is shameful. The recent chemical disaster in West Virginia indicates what is bound to happen when public protection of water systems fails and private industry leaves us all with a toxic mess. Stephen and Barbara Adams 3351 Red Oak Lane Barnum, MN 55707

Steve Braker

15747

See attachment

Steve Clemens

7020

As a resident of MN, and a registered voter, I am strongly opposed to the proposed Poly-Met mine because of the severe threats to clean drinking water as well as potential pollution to our rivers and Lake Superior. Short-term (20 years) profits and jobs are a poor risk in face of potential (and probable) long-term environmental damage. - Steve Clemens 2912 E. 24th St Minneapolis, MN 55406-1322 (612) 724-3255 HYPERLINK "mailto:steveclemens@gmail-com"steveclemens@gmail-com HYPERLINK "http://www.mennonista.blogspot-com"www.mennonista.blogspot-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve De Bock

18201

Hello, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. I came here tonight not with the intention of speaking, actually. I wanted to listen and hear what things are to be said. By the way, my name is Steve DeBock from Duluth, Minnesota. Currently, the director of manufacturing at a company called GPM, Inc. We are a heavy-duty submersible pump manufacturing company and provide pumps throughout the country, Canada, and we've even got some internationally outside the US. Along with our pump, we also manufacture a motor to go with it, and we all know Motor State Copper, so it's -- this is very important to us, and PolyMet is very important to us. I'm listening to a lot of people talk here tonight, and they're giving people a hard time about ceding their time. I'm not as eloquent of a speaker as most. I've never done this before, so please be respectful of when people do cede their time to somebody that has something that they want to say, be prepared -- be polite to them. Anyhow, I'm here to state that GPM currently is a vendor of PolyMet, and we fully support the study they've done, EIS, and we support everything that has been said about it to this point. We think that it's been done in a thoughtful, careful manner. It has taken a very long time to get to this point. We've been at this now for nine years, plus, and we wholly endorse this process and we believe in the science that's behind it, but we appreciate the time and effort that was put in by the DNR, the EPA, and fully trust in them to make the right decision. Only here can we sit in this state and make this process that we have and give people on both sides who sit next to each other and voice our opinions, so it's very much appreciated that that's allowed. And again, I apologize. I wasn't prepared to speak tonight. Maybe, if I would have been thinking ahead and known instruments were allowed, I could have brought my trombone with and broke out in a little song for everybody. Anyhow, I'd just like to sum up by saying that we fully support the process. We believe it can be done. That's one thing, I guess to touch on that, I hear a lot people saying it can't be done. Copper-nickel mining can't be done safely. We didn't get to where we're at in this country by saying we can't do something. There's a way to do everything. You just have to put the proper time into doing it properly and make sure it's done properly and safely. I believe that they've done that to this point, and we're ready to move forward. Enough is enough with this. We need -- we need to move on and to get this thing done. It's going to be great for jobs our economy in Minnesota, Northeastern Minnesota, Minnesota in general, and the whole nation, quite frankly. Let's put this thing behind us. I urge everybody to get behind this and finally let this thing go through, here. And again, I apologize for myself, I was not prepared to speak. Thank you for your time.

Steve Debock

18359

My name is Steve DeBock. Thank you all for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. And I appreciate the ones that have strong enough buttocks to still be here listening. D-E-B-O-C-K. I am currently the director of manufacturing at GPM. We reside here in Duluth. We are a heavy-duty commercial pump manufacturing company. We currently employ 60 people. In addition to the pumps that we make we also manufacture our own motor to go on them. And obviously anybody that knows motors knows they take copper and lots of copper. I'm here tonight to state we totally support and endorse the mining processes that are planned by PolyMet, and believe they will build and operate a mine that will comply with all the regulations and protect the environment at the same time. We embrace this project because of the hundreds and hundreds of new jobs that PolyMet will create either through direct employee instruction or new jobs with their vendors like us. This project is good for our region. I believe it's good for Minnesota. And quite frankly, I also believe it's good for our national economy. A lot of questions and challenges have been placed in front of PolyMet since they first announced their plans for precious metals mining in Northern Minnesota. They have answered and completed every one of them. In fact, they have done far more than what was asked of them to ensure the processes were safe not only in the short term but the long term as well. Anyone that says we cannot do this is wrong in my opinion. This country was not built on people saying "it can't be done." It can and it can be done safely. Management and directors at GPM believe that the EPA, MEPA, and Army Corps of Engineers that they have taken a diligent approach in examining the sciences and the processes that will be used by PolyMet. And we believe these processes will not only be safe but also carried out in a responsible manner. It would be irresponsible to disregard the time and effort put forth by PolyMet to ensure we can mine safely right here in Minnesota. For that reason GPM and it's employees fully support the EIS and its conclusions. We ask that you join us in supporting the issuing of the required permits and allow PolyMet to finally begin operations. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve El

19992

For the sake of brevity I would like to raise two objections to the SDEIS in its current form. 1) The Canada Lynx is federally listed under the Endangered Species Act. The SDEIS acknowledges that the project will reduce lynx habitat and kill individual lynx through accidents etc (see Chap. 5). However, it claims that since the whole population in the mine area (perhaps 200 or fewer animals) wouldn't be lost but rather just a few, there is no problem. However, decades of conservation work around the world indisputably show that loss of habitat causes species to go extinct. A stray animal hit by a truck here and there is not so much the problem as the removal of habitat. I would also add that the area in question is home to an already at-risk population of moose. Moose, of course, depend on wetlands, some 8,000 acres of which will be destroyed. Promises of restoration, even should they be reliably fulfilled, will not come nearly in time to mitigate the destructive effects on the moose population. 2) The SDEIS is explicit (Chap 5-122) about pollution of the Partridge River continuing to be problem "in perpetuity." That is, forever. How can we possibly believe that Polymet will be able to take responsibility for treatment of this pollution in that timescale. In view of these two concerns alone I ask that the SDEIS be redone to include an analysis of alternatives to species loss through habitat destruction, and a credible plan for mitigating ongoing pollution over deep time. Respectfully, Steve Lechuk 3943 Bryant Ave S #9 Minneapolis, MN 55409

Steve Gildersleeve

6060

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Steve Gildersleeve 3789 PARKWOOD LN Vadnais Heights, MN 55127 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve J. Nelson

46967

I own and operate a canoe outfitting and retail outdoor store in Ely, MN. We service wilderness travelers going into the BWCA and Quetico Park. We have a number of concerns about the copper nickel mining proposals; 1- Protecting Minnesota citizens from future adverse effects of mining on environment with financial assurances, ie insurance policy, is critical. Requiring assurances to safeguard against company filing bankruptcy after damaging the environment is critical. Copper/nickel prices will rise and decline over the lifetime of this mining project. Mining companies have used bankruptcy as a business strategy to walk away from their failure to mine responsibly. As a tax payer, I do not want to pay for their mistakes. 2- What contingencies are or will be in place for major catastrophic failures in the mining process. If water processing fails, water holding ponds leak, electrical supply is offline for an extended period what is the action plan to protect the environment. Looking back 40 years to how Judge Miles Lord handled the Reserve Mining Case showed the company had legal contingencies in place well before any legal decisions were made. If the court implemented an action, the company already had figured out what it would do. Case in point was Judge Lord ruled the company to close. Within 24 hours Reserve was open and doing business. It appeared the Federal legal team had not planned out their response or next steps. The company had. 3- Is Minnesota mining policy and regulations sufficient to handle adverse mining effects 20-30 years from now. To think that policy and regulations of 2014 are all that is needed is short sighted. Processes change, markets change, unforeseen issues develop. How will our regulatory agencies handle these changes or future developing issues. 4- The BWCAW is a state and national treasure. Maintaining water quality is critical. Is the current technology, ie reverse osmosis, sufficient to handle any sulfide runoff. 5- No information has been included in the SDEIS concerning the epigenetics of increase consumption of sulfides, copper and nickel on local populations due to emissions and releases into local water system. I am not against mining near the BWCA as Minnesota and the local economy needs the jobs and increase to the tax base. However, mining responsibly is crucial. I want my granddaughters and their children to experience the BWCA similar to how it is today. Having financial assurances, contingencies in place to act if environmental damages start, and regulatory agencies ready to act in a timely fashion is needed. Best regards, Steve J. Nelson Owner <http://www.elycanoetrips-com/spirit-logo-1-png> Spirit Of The Wilderness Creating Lifetime Memories 2030 E. Sheridan ST Ely MN 55731 Ph: 218-365-3149 or 800-950-2709 HYPERLINK "<http://www.elycanoetrips-com>"www.elycanoetrips-com Online store: HYPERLINK "<http://www.BWCAshop-com>"www.BWCAshop-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Johnson

16093

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Steve Jorgenson

4140

Dear Public Servants and Caretakers of our Environment, Thanks for the good job you do in serving the public, and in protecting the environment for generations to come. Briefly, here are my comments regarding the proposed mining up north by Polymet. It is absolutely immoral to even consider allowing companies to place a mine near a wilderness area, solely for short term profits, and pollute our earth and water in the process, a long term consequence. Creating jobs is not a good justification; jobs can be created by wind farms, solar power, and many other sustainable industries that benefit the environment instead of destroying it. Of all of the many horrible things happening in the world, this ranks near the top of the liSt. Thanks, Steve Jorgenson 36901 Xenon St NW Princeton, MN 55371

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve K 6059

PolyMet will "install and operate a system to capture at least 90 percent of the groundwater seepage at the proposed tailings basin and the permanent waste rock stockpile." Figures of untreated groundwater release have been estimated as such: 10 gallons per minute of untreated water at the mine site and 21 gallons per minute of untreated water at the tailings site during closure. How will this seepage of untreated water (up to 10% of total discharge) into the groundwater effect the potability of groundwater for surrounding residents, flora and fauna, including those in the connected watersheds. What type of groundwater contaminates would be introduced into the environment. Have there been longitudinal epidemiological studies of how they effect human and wildlife populations. I believe that the environmental impact statement that has been drafted is shortsighted. In the terms of potentially doing permanent damage to our environment, I believe that any amount of discharge of waste into the environment is unacceptable, both from the standpoint of a resident of Northern Minnesota and a person who survives off of natural resources from the region. Thank you for hearing my comments. Steven Karels 602 E 5th St #602 Duluth MN 55805

Steve Kath 57703

To whom it may concern, I support the PolyMet Mining project. Thank You <http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/images/trcsiglogo.jpg> Steve Kath President, CLMC, THE RETROFIT COMPANIES® 507-414-5116 (p) | 507-456-1654 (c) | 651-717-4768 (f) | HYPERLINK "mailto:skath@retrofitcompanies-com"skath@retrofitcompanies-com 1010 Hoffman Drive, Suite A Owatonna, MN 55060 Connect with TRC HYPERLINK "http://www.linkedin-com/company/2340383"http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/images/linkedin.pngHYPERLINK "http://twitter-com/#./TheRetrofitCo"http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/images/twitter.pngHYPERLINK "http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/news.php"http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/images/lighterside.pngHYPERLINK "http://www.facebook-com/pages/The-Retrofit-Companies/272995075215"http://www.retrofitcompanies-com/images/facebook.png HYPERLINK "http://nalmco-org/"untitled

Steve Kinney 54803

See attachment

Steve Kippen 42109

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Steve Kippen 11178 330th St Onamia, MN 56359-2172

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Koschak

45414

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Steve Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731

45415

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Steve Koschak PO Box 397 Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Koschak

57335

My name is Steve Koschak, K-O-S-C-H-A-K, from Ely, Minnesota. I am a business owner in the town of Ely, a tourism-based business. I've been in business for 38 years. My business depends on clean water, clean air, a clean environment, and I am worried about what is going to happen with the advent of this sulfide mining in northern Minnesota in the lakes region. The SDEIS, in my opinion, fails to address a number of issues. First of all, permanent water pollution, not only will it be 500 years, but basically to the end of perpetuity, but water pollution from sulfuric acid and heavy metals is indicated. But in addition, not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. This is what PolyMet calls minimizing the water pollution in their marketing rhetoric. How is the SDEIS going to address using an antiquated tailings basin which is a leaker? Ten percent of the volume of water that there will be, the waste will not be going into any type of discharge pond. It will not be reclaimed. It will be let go out into the environment. Basically, if there were ten people standing in line to use the bathroom, the tenth person, his waste would go out on the ground. In essence that's what it is. Ten percent of the water is going to be wasted; not treated. A very discerning fact. Why does the SDEIS not provide a solution to this situation? Secondly, there is no plan for events or failures of PolyMet's water treatment system. It provides no details for what happens in the event of catastrophic accidents or failure for the system to operate for 500 years, during which polluted water is discharged. Daily operations are planned to treat some 6.2 million gallons of water daily. What is going to happen with broken pipes or tailings basin and human errors? What about an employee falling asleep on the job or not being attentive, and all of a sudden we have a major catastrophe. This mining plant is designed for a 100-year storm, and given the climate change, this design is lacking at best. Scientific studies suggested this facility should be designed for a 500-year storm. A 500-year storm is now occurring almost as often as a 100-year storm. The SDEIS provides no assurance or details on the impact of water quality, on wildlife or on human health if the treatment system fails or there is a breakdown, which is inevitable. I have another concern about the water quality analysis and how the samples and the studies were done. One of the water quality testings that they did was done in a dry season. There was very low water flow and they based their figures on low water flow, one of the lowest in decades, and this is what they based their study on. So, we'll have outflow from the water flow and waste not being adequately adjusted to reflect normal water conditions. Also, there is a lack of information regarding mercury contamination of fish and ultimately methylmercury in humans. There is an area of homes near to six operating taconite mines and there's already an alarming concentration of mercury and other pollutants. Every one of our taconite plants is presently operating under variances; basically a permit to pollute. I am afraid that with this copper mine we are going to have more of the same; a license to pollute. There is a lack of alternatives to the probable permanent destruction of some 8,263 (phonetic) acres of land, with some 918 acres being very high-quality irreplaceable wetlands in the St. Louis River watershed. There is no plan to compensate for thousands of acres of wetlands that would be indirectly harmed. The trade that is to take place with the Land Exchange will be a violation of the Weeks Act (phonetic). The Weeks Act (phonetic) was established to prevent open pit mining on federal land, and this land being the Superior National Forest. This trade and this exchange is going to be setting a precedent to other mining industries across the country, not only in the northern part of Minnesota, but anywhere in the United States where

Steve L'Abbe

3149

We hope and pray Polymet moves forward with permitting. What a great economic infusion for the Iron Range and all of Minnesota. Polymet has been patient, responsible and transparent. Hopefully all will get on board to ensure a bright outlook for all of Minnesota Steve L'Abbe Duluth, MN

3150

We hope and pray Polymet moves forward with permitting. What a great economic infusion for the Iron Range and all of Minnesota. Polymet has been patient, responsible and transparent. Hopefully all will get on board to ensure a bright outlook for all of Minnesota Steve L'Abbe Duluth, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

steve markus

40439

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, steve markus 3976 gateway dr Greenbelt, PA 19104 US

Steve Morse

18173

Hello. I am Thomas Leaf from Center City, Minnesota. And I am giving my time to Steve Morse. Good evening. My name is Steve Morse, M-O-R-S-E. I am the executive director of the Minnesota Environmental Partnership, a non-profit coalition of 70 environmental conservation groups in the state of Minnesota. First, I would like to thank the DNR and the other agencies for running a great open and respectful process with these meetings. However, let me say I'm very concerned about the other parts of the process for the SDEIS. The 90-day comment period is simply inadequate for the public to really understand this project. Many people have already given up trying to figure out all the ins and outs of it, and instead are falling back and saying, "We trust the agency. It's too complex. We can't figure it out. We trust the agencies." That is not real public participation and a public process. Without 180 days this process is flawed. Secondly, there are a number of serious outstanding issues. I just want to touch on a couple of them with the SDEIS itself. First, the planning for accidents and emergencies. There is a complete lack of backup plans from if something goes wrong with the tailings piles and basins, the pumps, the pipelines, the filters of the water system that needs to operate for hundreds of years. Surely we have learned something from the oil wells erupting in the Gulf of Mexico, chemical tanks contaminating drinking water in West Virginia, and oiler-tanker trains exploding on the North Dakota prairies. None of this was supposed to happen. None of it was planned. Yet it did occur. Second, the SDEIS relies on unreliable water modeling, including the flow of water that will be treated and the time frame for continued cleanup of the water from the mining. The truth is there is no end plan for when the mine will not require cleanup. Again, there is no end plan. PolyMet indicates it will continue to clean up the water for as long as it takes, forever if necessary. They acknowledge that they really won't know the duration of the pollution until they are already mining. This is not an adequate response, and as a result the SDEIS does not present adequate information to fully assess the environmental impacts that should be (inaudible) in order protect the environment. I spent four years as a deputy commissioner of the Minnesota DNR overseeing the environmental review process. This environmental review process was one of my responsibilities. It is clear that the science that these studies are based on is very important, and tremendous effort has been put into this project. Sometimes an EIS presents a very clear picture. Other times not so clear. Major issues might be left outstanding and unclear and unanswered. In the end it is the leaders of these agencies before us that will be faced with the judgment call to determine if this SDEIS is adequate. And, yes, there may be loud political voices urging you to forge ahead and move this project to the next stage. But most Minnesotans aren't ready to go there. Given the many shortcomings, uncertainties, and unreliable data (inaudible).

54907

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Olinger 43514

Steve Olinger 25 Deer Hills Drive North Oaks, MN 55127 While I understand and would hope for job creation in Northern Minnesota, I am concerned about how much we would be sacrificing to supply them. Looking at the mining proposal from PolyMet there are serious concerns: 1) There are no copper-nickel mining operations that don't have serious water pollution problems The Flambeau mine used as an example is really not a good example. It was a much smaller operation that did not stay in business and did have problems Other copper-nickel mines have serious problems 2) While there is an attempt to provide financial assurance, it does not seem realistic. Even the large amount of money designated does not seem sufficient to insure that water cleanup (even if the water treatment plant continues to work) would continue for the decades required. The public would be stuck with the bill. I do not see that we should grant the proposed permits.

steve palmberg 36721

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I agree that the Poly Met SDEIS is more than adequate and support Poly Met. Sincerely, steve palmberg 8156 james ave no brooklyn park, MN 55444

40475

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please Approve the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS. Very truly yours, Steve Palmberg steve palmberg 8156 james ave no brooklyn park, MN 55444

Steve Petersen 47236

I would like to make the point that if this company who is saying they will guaranty monitoring for years after they are finished mining goes bankrupt at any time after they are do or during their mining operation the state taxpayers are on the hook for the clean up. That is a price too high to pay for some short term gain. Sincerely Steve Petersen 4160 Shirlee Lane South Shoreview, MN [HYPERLINK "mailto:55126spetersen175@comcaStnet651-484-9277"](mailto:55126spetersen175@comcaStnet651-484-9277) 55126spetersen175@comcaStnet [HYPERLINK "mailto:55126spetersen175@comcaStnet651-484-9277"](mailto:55126spetersen175@comcaStnet651-484-9277) 651-484-9277

Steve Rush 40227

Attached is a letter from Steve Rush regarding the above matter. Thanks. Shelly Schilling Legal Secretary Holiday Companies 4567 American Blvd. W. Minneapolis, MN 55437 DD: 952-832-8646 Fax: 952-830-1681 shelly.schilling@holidaycompanies-com

Steve Schreader 58052

Sulfide mining should not occur in Minnesota!! The risks are too high & far outweigh any & all possible benefits. With the main benefit being jobs, what happens when the mine closes & what economic impacts will the disruption of the BWCA have on the economy. There are too many questions, not enough answers. The track record of this Mining speaks for itself. It should not happen here!! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dminage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Smith

47070

The Polymet mine project should be stopped. Destroying pristine forest lands and risking the future of our water resources, including native trout streams and Lake Superior is just not worth the supposed 'economic prosperity' a new mine would bring the region. Preserving Minnesota's natural beauty and resources for our future generations is worth much more than any short term prosperity a mining operation would bring. Polymet is spending a lot of money in advertising in Minnesota in order to sway public opinion but they aren't being completely upfront and truthful with the public about the environmental risks of their planned mining process. They also appear to be having trouble producing an acceptable EIS in their rush to start mining our resources. These should be major red flags indicating serious issues with the Polymet project. The fact is, the metals they're after are not going anywhere. The mining of the so-called Duluth Complex or any other area in Minnesota should not be allowed until technology is developed that would guarantee no damage to our water and environment. Thank you, Steven Smith 512 Rose St Duluth, MN 55803 Member of Trout Unlimited Gitche Gummee Chapter Member of Surfrider Foundation MN/Superior Chapter

Steve Snyder

18181

My name is Steve Snyder. It appears from the names on the list that having "Snyder" as a last name is good for this lottery. This is the first time in my life that that's ever been an advantage. But it is tonight. I want to make a few comment initially about this Supplemental Draft EIS. Just a few pointed comments about it. One, there is no model in this statement as long as it is that would apply for a 500-year period. When Christopher Columbus got off his boat 500 years ago, he had no concept whatsoever as to what would be happening in the Americas over this period of time. In fact, he didn't even know he was in the Americas. But we're actually putting this forth without a model as to the changes that will happen in the Americas over that period of time that these pollutants have to be constantly maintained and treated. Also within this EIS statement there is very little that addresses the huge concern of operating a mine in a plant such as this in this very water-rich environment. This is not a dry and arid environment that we are looking at here. This is a very wet environment. Of course, it is the combination of the water and the exposure to the atmosphere to create the sulfuric acid that creates the leaching out of these very toxic metals. In my view it's not adequately addressed in this statement. And in fact, we have just recently found out that even the basic data with respect to the groundwater flows into the Partridge River are not accurate in this document. That's why the EPA gave the original draft an "F" for its failure to address these type of matters. And yet after that work we come back and have the same type of issue here that needs to be addressed. I would also note that the document does not address the fractures in the bedrock that will be below these mining sites, and what this is going to do with the leaching that occurs and where that is going to go and where that is going to end up. I have a couple questions I want to ask of PolyMet. Nobody from PolyMet has spoken here today. I have a couple question. And maybe if somebody does speak they can address these. We have the assurances supposedly from PolyMet about what they are doing in this plant. But if it turns out those assurances untrue, would PolyMet agree that this mine should be closed down or would it instead lead to hearing that somehow they have to be grandfathered in and be able to continue to operate because they've already done the damage? Second, we hear a lot of people from the trades that are supporting this. And I support the trades. I very much do that. But I would like to know whether PolyMet is willing to commit that it will use union labor on these projects or instead it will be seeking to reduce workers' pay and try to defend against any claims for illnesses that arise on this job site (inaudible).

Steve Stratman

39441

--Original Message-- From: steve@urbanartbox-com [mailto:steve@urbanartbox-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:34 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: I think the arrowhead area and the Iron Range needs jobs. But this is way too risky. It's something that I believe will eventually be on the wrong side of history and future residents will think we were unwise to create such a black hole of ecological and economic problems If we're going to get stuck with a huge clean up bill, lets just take the money we would have spent on cleaning the mine pollution and invest it right now into business development and jobs. Or put the Taconite Tax Fund to work. I read that there's millions of dollars just sitting collecting interest when it could be used to create jobs, ie construction, public works, parks, subsidizing small business growth, etc I've been to Ecuador and Bolivia, Brazil and other countries that have already been down this road. The results are always the same. The corporation that owns the mine will promise everything, then they'll leave and not fulfill their obligations. It happens every time, regardless what they say to the contrary. We will end up with a hole filled with acid, and we'll have no one to blame but ourselves. Sincerely, steve stratman 4816 clinton ave Minneapolis, MN 55419-5659

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Sullivan 54163

I do NOT support mining. The forrest is eternal, jobs do not last just say no to mines. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

steve vennemann 40663

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Dr steve vennemann 1974 Castle Ct E Saint Paul, MN 55109-2881

Steve Wentworth 39986

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Steve Wentworth 3934 Denmark Ave Eagan, MN 55123-1451 (651) 249-1657

Steve Weston 43826

I believe it is unwise to approve any plan that requires ongoing active management of hazardous mine waste, such as treatment of toxic runoff, after a mine has been closed. The waste from such mines remains toxic not just for hundreds of years, but virtually forever. If the waste cannot be passively contained, but requires ongoing intervention for an indefinite period, there is too much danger that a change in legal, corporate, political, economic, or social structures could result in the treatment infrastructure being abandoned. We today are not capable of promising any action more years in the future than our republic has yet existed. Sincerely, Steven R.P. Weston 307 E. 42nd St Hibbing, MN 55746

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steve Eggimann

45943

To: Agency Decisionmakers The Boundary Waters is one of the crown jewels of our national park system. Like Yosemite, Glacier, and Yellowstone there are no other places like it on earth. Minnesota has recognized that fact for years. The many persuasive reasons to reject the Polymet proposal and all mining activities near the BWCA are well known to you. Any single one is enough to convince you to reject the incursion into the area. But, I urge you to reject the attempts and restate the principle that these wild places were set aside for all Minnesotans, all Americans, and all the world so there would be some places unspoiled for all peoples for all time. No economic argument to the contrary is worth consideration. There are no “hard choices” no “difficult balancing acts” when it comes to America’s Best Idea. Please restate the principle that it is your obligation, the obligation of all of us to preserve these very few wild places for all mankind.

Eggimann

Steve

45944

To: Agency Decisionmakers The Boundary Waters is one of the crown jewels of our national park system. Like Yosemite, Glacier, and Yellowstone there are no other places like it on earth. Minnesota has recognized that fact for years. The many persuasive reasons to reject the Polymet proposal and all mining activities near the BWCA are well known to you. Any single one is enough to convince you to reject the incursion into the area. But, I urge you to reject the attempts and restate the principle that these wild places were set aside for all Minnesotans, all Americans, and all the world so there would be some places unspoiled for all peoples for all time. No economic argument to the contrary is worth consideration. There are no “hard choices” no “difficult balancing acts” when it comes to America’s Best Idea. Please restate the principle that it is your obligation, the obligation of all of us to preserve these very few wild places for all mankind.

Eggimann

Steve

Steven & Cynthia Broste

39636

I have followed the discussions about the pros and cons of the Polymet proposal to mine metals from sulfide bearing rock in northern Minnesota, near the BWCAW. I also attended the excellent public information session in St Paul, and learned a good deal more. I fear that the way organized labor and local Chambers of Commerce from the area rigged the public testimony is a good example for how they will try to use their influence to push the DNR in a direction that would be very unwise for the future of the wilderness, wildlife and water in that area. My brother worked on Superfund cases for the EPA in the west, where mining companies created a toxic mess, then quietly disappeared leaving scars on the land and taxpayers to pick up the tab. From his stories and my reading, it doesn't appear that sulfide mining has ever been done without significant, long lasting damage and toxic waste. Much of this kind of mining has been done in the west, where the vegetation and sensitive wildlife and aquatic systems are more sparse. In this case, even Lake Superior would be in danger. The reason for the environmental damage is simple: these companies have a fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders, not the area residents, or those who value the northern waters and wilderness. Every decision will be questioned by management as to whether there isn't a cheaper shortcut, and accidental releases will be inevitable. The mindset will be that it is easier to ask for forgiveness than to ask for permission. All of this risk (current estimate 100%) for a few hundred jobs for 10 years or so. And after 10 years, the area will have lost the new jobs, and potentially the pristine wilderness that currently draws thousands of people to northern Minnesota. Like many others, I have personally spent well over a thousand dollars in Ely every one of the last 10 years because of the BWCAW, and this source of revenue to the area should not be underestimated. The especially dangerous part of this proposal is that everyone in positions to approve or stop this proposal will be long gone when the issues inevitably surface. The easy thing to do, but the wrong thing, would be to bow to the pressures from the mining and construction interests. I urge the DNR and the state of Minnesota to stand tall and not allow this mining to go forward I understand that these metals are needed for numerous things we all depend on, but we will need those things in a hundred years as well. Where will the metals needed far into the future come from if we exploit everything we can find now. Maybe at a time far in the future we will have developed better ways to extract these metals and better ways to protect the crown jewels of our state from the clear and present danger that the Polymet project represents. I urge the DNR to not permit Polymet to put our wilderness and water at risk. Thank you for your consideration, Steven Broste 11027 Timberline Drive North Champlin, MN 55316

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Amundson

18293

I am Steven Amundson, Amundson is spelled A-M-U-N-D-S-O-N, from Northfield, Minnesota. And my comment is that everything I've read about this sort of mining is that it has not been successful. It is that there have been very many environmental impacts; and therefore, I believe that this is a risk that is too great to take. Especially when you consider the pristine Boundary Water Canoe Area and all of our lakes in that area. I believe that this is a chance Minnesota should not take. The only thing that I would consider to be a viable risk would be one that ensures that PolyMet can actually guaranty that there is not only a system that would work to take care of the environment, but also that there would be enough money somewhere set aside to be able to clean up any issues well into the future. One of the problems I believe is that many companies like this, which are international companies, are sold or go bankrupt, and then the big question is, and then what? What do we do after that? So, if we were to move forward with this project, the only way that I would, as a Minnesotan, agree that it would be feasible, if there was enough money set aside for hundreds of years of cleanup, because I believe that's what will end up being necessary. That's everything. Thank you.

Steven Broin

48164

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Steven Broin 43 Diane Terrace Whitman, MA 02382

Steven Chesney

41830

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Steven Chesney 8172 Zenith Ct N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-2749 (561) 561-2512

steven dahlke

46991

I am a concerned taxpayer. Does Minnesota want a mining disaster. Or Lake Superior poisoned. Delay approval until Polymet Mining has financial assurances of \$500 Trillion or proves -it-First will be sAve Pass a Minnesota "Prove-it-First" law. Steven Kenneth Dahlke 550 View Street Saint Paul, MN 55102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven DeBoth

43804

As an investment advisor, I help clients assess the potential reward to be gained from incurring an assumed amount of risk. What makes this risk/reward analysis possible is that the potential risks and rewards are both of the same nature, in this case financial, and both accrue to the same entity, in this case the investor. He or she will not profit while someone else bears the risk of loss. If what I have read is even close to accurate, in my professional opinion as an analyzer of financial risk, I assure you that the probability of any of today's existing raw material extracting enterprises to still be around 500 years from now is nearly 0%. What this represents, then, is an extreme divergence of risk and reward factors, where those who will reap the rewards of this type of mining will be dwarfed by those bearing the risks, financial and otherwise. If what else I have read is also even close to accurate, the environmental impact analyses have been shown to be inadequate multiple times. In my opinion, that is also because those to receive the primary rewards are not those who will bear the primary risks from these proposals. It's akin to talking to a mortgage broker in 2006 who assures you that "don't worry, you can afford this house; I'm sure your income will go up by the time the mortgage rate adjusts upward, and by my estimates it can't really go up that much anyway. Besides, houses only go up in value." By the time the true damage from these projects begin, those who have reaped the primary rewards will be just fine. I see it every day. As someone who has spent time in those very same woods, this is as tangible of a selling your soul for a few shiny coins moments as I have ever seen. Those woods are the soul of the state. No amount of money is worth the nature of the risks, especially when the risk estimates are in control of those who will get your soul.

Sincerely, Steven J. DeBoth

Steven Eli Kokotovich

57213

Before you approve a Polymet mine, you need to be extremely confident that it will not damage the environment. A mistake on your part could be devastating for generations. Also, enough money (from Polymet) needs to be set aside (securely) for cleanup and all future monitoring. This cost should not be paid by the taxpayer. If you cannot ensure these requirements, then I am against the mine. We should then wait until the technology has been proven elsewhere. The minerals will still be there 10 years from now. Steven Eli Kokotovich 2119 Allegheny St Duluth, MN 55811

Steven gammon

10736

My first response relates to the current generation of people, and the health of our future generations. My response is to not allow any type of mining that could directly or indirectly allow any type of chemicals into the vital, precious water sources. This pollution could last for either a split second, or for hundreds of thousands of years in the area of Northeastern Minnesota. My second response is that the people of past and current generations have not stopped or prevented themselves from the massive consumption of nonrenewable resources. This consumption includes items that can be made from the materials and minerals that the mining in Northeastern Minnesota is believed to be able to produce. My question is: Why should we stop, or pretend that we have the desire, will power, or ability to stop any type of mining that may or may not actually pollute or damage our vital and precious water sources and harm the natural beauty of this area of our state. I thirdly would like to congratulate and applaud the cooperation, communication, and participation of all of the people that helped complete the environmental impact statements. These statements, other documents and comments concerning the vital and precious water sources of Northeastern Minnesota were well prepared and show genuine appreciation, concern and foresight into the effects of the proposed mining project. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven George

37819

Dear Ms Fay, Steven George 5970 Blesner lake Rd PO Box 535 Finland, MN 55603 Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: My name is Steven George and I live with my wife Amelia and two young children outside of Finland, MN. We harvest wild rice from lakes in our area and I am deeply concerned about the environmental impacts that are likely to be caused by Polymet's proposed mine. Polymet's tailings pile will have toxic metals and sulfates and the SDEIS proposes the tailings basin will have no liner to contain these toxins. The waste will need treatment for a minimum of 500 years. The proposed tailing dump site is on top of old LTV tailings. This tailings dump was designed in the 1950's for taconite tailings and it was built on top of streams to allow drainage through the tailings. How will this pit that was designed to leak possibly manage to contain the toxins safely for 500 years. When the Polymet plan was first proposed, the "Scoping Report" said that the EIS had to evaluate "if all tailings will need to be managed in a completely lined basin." The SDEIS must be redone to analyze the alternative of a completely lined tailings basin. The lined tailings basin alternative should avoid wetlands and streamS The Polymet SDEIS claims that the tailings piles won't cause pollution (page 5-159). Polymet says the project will increase seepage at the LTV tailings dump from 2,202 to 3,380 gallons per minute. The SDEIS claims that with the use of pumps, all except 21 gallons per minute will be contained, which would be a 99-37% collection rate. As far as I can find, this collection rate would be unprecedented. The SDEIS doesn't name a single unlined tailings pile that meets these almost perfect results with the use of pumps. The SDEIS must be redone to analyze water quality outcomes if the tailings pile collection rate is not what Polymet claims Looking back at the Draft Polymet EIS in Figure 4-1-9, you can see there are at least three streams that ran under the LTV tailings site. One of those streams runs right under Cells 1E and 2E, where they plan to dump the Polymet tailings, and then into Spring Mine Creek. Water is likely to drain through filled over streams as these are the historic drainage routes. Spring mine Creek is already impaired for aquatic life as a result of past mining and has excessive levels of sulfate, aluminum and mercury. (SDEIS, p. 4-122, 4-238). The SDEIS assumes all tailings wastewater will seep to the north side where the pumps will be. The SDEIS must specifically analyze impacts on water quality of seepage that would escape following historic stream drainage beneath the tailings basin. It's well know that fractures beneath tailings basins can transport pollutants, however the Polymet SDEIS doesn't have a single word addressing the possibility that fractures beneath the tailings site would transport pollutants. One example of seepage through fractures is in the Chevron Molycorp Superfund remediation, the EPA concluded "The pathway for contaminant migration is the leaching of tailing seepage downward from the tailing facility to groundwater that migrates through fractures to surface water." Existing tailings seepage already exceeds groundwater standards and on the LTV site, adjacent to the tailings, the SDEIS has documented that Area of Concern #8 has a plume of pollution propagating through fractures. (SDEIS, p. 4-12). The SDEIS must anticipate that tailings contaminants will propagate through fractures and clearly disclose the impacts this leaching through fractures will have on surface and groundwater quality. A few decades of mining for 500+ years of contaminants seeping into our water sounds like a pretty bad deal to me. This sounds like an especially bad deal for my children and their children and their children's children and so on. Do we really expect Polymet to still exist and be paying for the cleanup and monitoring of the wastes in 500 years, or even 100 years fo

Steven Graupman

21784

Mar 5, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I am very concerned with protecting our clean water, but I believe Polymet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota as described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement will. I believe that the SDEIS is sufficient and SHOULD be approved, because it details how new mining and processing techniques will be more than sufficient. PolyMet would provide many needed jobs and would finally end an economic depression for that area . Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food might be affected, but their numbers will rebound after mine reclamation. I urge decision-makers to APPROVE this well planned proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you, Steven Graupman 7595 Hyde Ave So. Cottage Grove, MN 55016 Sincerely, Mr Steven Graupman 7595 Hyde Ave S Cottage Grove, MN 55016-1976

Steven Hanke

14895

Is the Minnesota DNR able to require PolyMet to establish and/or negotiate terms and conditions of employment for the proposed workers prior to the project being approved. Steven B. Hanke 411 West 1st Street Duluth, MN 55802-1198 Phone (218) 730-5490 From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2014 10:50 AM To: Steven Hanke Subject: RE: NorthMet / PolyMet Mining Inc Project Comments Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Hanke 14896

I am concerned with the socioeconomic analysis portion of the project. What assurances does the Minnesota DNR have regarding the number of jobs this proposed project will create. Is any job considered in that calculation, or does it have to be full-time (40+ hours weekly) permanent employment. There are significant differences between part-time temporary positions and full-time benefit eligible positions. How does the DNR calculate the proposed economic impact of the jobs based on the limited information and description provided by PolyMet. Steven B. Hanke 411 West 1st Street Duluth, MN 55802-1198 Phone (218) 730-5490 From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us] Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2014 10:50 AM To: Steven Hanke Subject: RE: NorthMet / PolyMet Mining Inc Project Comments Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

14898

I am concerned by the lack of details regarding the economic impact analysis. The claims regarding the number of jobs to be provided by the project are vague and lack any effort at substantiation. The study needs to be extended to include number, type, duration, and pay ranges for those jobs, as well as an analysis of the economic impact to the area surrounding the proposed sites.

Steven Johnson 19905

Just do it.. We need the jobs and economic benefits. This mining can be done in an environmentally neutral way with minimal affect on the Eco-system. Steven Johnson 8256 Pennsylvania Rd Bloomington, MN 55438

Steven Jorgens 4220

Lisa Fay, I am writing in to express my support of Polymet project. My Grandparents lived in Biwabik and my mom and uncle were born there. So I have a very large interest in seeing mining and jobs to return to that area. I have read the draft EIS and I am very impressed with the detail that was done and the extent that Polymet has gone to to ensure that our environment is taken care of. Polymet partnering with GE to have a reverse osmosis system is also very impressive. Please approve this project and return this great part of Minnesota to some of its past glory. Thanks, Steve Jorgens 1995 Juneau Lane Plymouth, MN 55447 HYPERLINK "mailto:Sjorgens@msn-com"Sjorgens@msn-com

Steven Kraemer 2971

Dec 19, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. It threatens rivers, lakes, streams and wetlands across the Arrowhead Region. I've canoed the BWCA many times. It is a state and national treasure that should be protected for the enjoyment of current and future generations. Anything that could contaminate such a treasure should go through tremendous scrutiny and exhaustive review. I have read that acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Why won't it do the same in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota. I have major concerns about the impact of mining on our fragile environment. I also favor increasing employment whenever possible. But, why incur major risks and costs from sulfide mining which ultimately might far outweigh the short-term job creation benefits of the mine. Shouldn't ALL Minnesotans want to protect our natural resources and our public health. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Steven Kraemer 3924 Ottawa Ave S St Louis Park, MN 55416-3029

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Kraemer

52119

Dec 19, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota. It threatens rivers, lakes, streams and wetlands across the Arrowhead Region. I've canoed the BWCA many times. It is a state and national treasure that should be protected for the enjoyment of current and future generations. Anything that could contaminate such a treasure should go through tremendous scrutiny and exhaustive review. I have read that acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. Why won't it do the same in the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota. I have major concerns about the impact of mining on our fragile environment. I also favor increasing employment whenever possible. But, why incur major risks and costs from sulfide mining which ultimately might far outweigh the short-term job creation benefits of the mine. Shouldn't ALL Minnesotans want to protect our natural resources and our public health. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Steven Kraemer 3924 Ottawa Ave S St Louis Park, MN 55416-3029

Steven L Losh

46031

Date: March 12, 2014 Re: Addendum to Comment (dated March 11, 2014) on NorthMet SDEIS To whom it may concern: In connection with the gathering of data on which to base their Proposed Action regarding water quality, Polymet and the DNR also conducted long-term tests on the oxidation behavior of ore and waste rock containing various amounts and types of sulfide minerals, specifically to evaluate the potential for generation of acid mine drainage and release of heavy metals during oxidation at the surface. Based on these tests, they designed a strategy for storage of various kinds of sulfide-bearing rock that, in conjunction with runoff and groundwater collection and treatment, can be expected to adequately forestall acid mine runoff and leaching of heavy metals into groundwater or surface waters. This is a key concern regarding environmental impact of the proposed action, and Polymet is using a responsible, science-based approach in addressing it. Sincerely, Steven Losh Professor of Geology Dept. of Chemistry and Geology, FH 241 Minnesota State University Mankato MN 56001 Ph. 507-389-6323 Fax 507-389-5625

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven L Losh

46879

Date: March 11, 2014 Re: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange (dated November 2013) To whom it may concern: I support acceptance of the Proposed Action – the construction, operation, closure, and reclamation of the Northmet Mine and associated processing activities - as described in the SDEIS. Of particular concern to many including myself is the impact of mining and processing operations on water quality. The SDEIS shows that Polymet has done a thorough job of addressing these concerns. They have characterized in detail both geology and waters (both surface waters and groundwater) throughout the affected area: they have extensively sampled streams as well as a sizeable number of wells in the area of both the planned mine and the tailings basin. In addition, they performed multiple tests on wells to determine aquifer flow characteristics. They then utilized state-of-the art computer modeling in conjunction with geologic and chemical data to predict the quality of water leaving the site and to design a water collection and treatment plan that can safeguard the quality of both surface water and groundwater. Although there can always be more information gathered and added to the models (eg, bedrock permeability, which is likely very low, beneath the tailings basin), I am satisfied that the proposed action will remedy environmental impacts to an acceptable level. A double liner at the hydrometallurgical plant site will protect groundwater and surface waters from leakage from that source. During mining, Polymet will capture runoff from critical areas such as the waste piles and tailings basin, and route that water through state-of-the-art treatment facilities. Much of the water will be recycled on site, but the water that is discharged will for the most part be of better quality in terms of substances of concern (such as mercury and sulfate, as well as acidity) than the natural waters at the site. The proposed strategy for capturing groundwater that would otherwise exit from the tailings area – a cutoff wall to bedrock augmented with ditch and collection wells – appears adequate for ensuring water quality. The results of groundwater flow modeling show that, for reasonable conditions, discharge of waters of elevated concentration of various evaluated substances will be minimal to negligible. In the case of aluminum (one of the two substances potentially released at excess concentrations), the source of the excess substance is an already-existing reservoir that will be used in reclamation; in the case of lead (the other substance at potentially excess concentrations), the infrequent exceedances will be due to variations in water hardness rather than to actual elevated discharge of lead. Overall, as long as the proposed actions in the SDEIS are followed and monitored, water quality should not be adversely impacted. From the SDEIS, it appears that adequate steps will be taken to ensure water quality well into the future. Monitoring wells will be placed outside the perimeter of the tailings basin to further safeguard water quality, and can guide further remediation should it be necessary during and after mining. After mining is finished, Polymet’s reclamation plan appears adequate – among other things, the company will backfill pits with otherwise reactive waste rock to submerge it in water, which will isolate it from oxygen and prevent breakdown of sulfide minerals, cap the tailings area with bentonite to minimize oxidation and leaching of tailings, and continue to be responsible for meeting applicable water quality regulations for any water that does flow off site. The report is thoroughly researched and vetted by State and Federal regulatory agencies, which appear confident that the Northmet mine will meet if not surpass water quality regulations, and that environmental impacts of all the other aspects of the mining operations will be ade

Steven M Kramer

54894

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Mayberry

47964

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Steven Mayberry 4948 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419

48416

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Steven Mayberry 4948 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Mayberry

52443

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Steven Mayberry 4948 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55419

Steven R Lanthier

54564

I do not want sulfide mining anywhere in Minnesota. No one can replace our lakes & streams once they are destroyed. These are our recreation areas. Leave them alone.

Steven Schoenherr

37930

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Steven Schoenherr 4783 Lindahl Rd Duluth, Minnesota 55811 The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Schultz

16128

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Steele

40306

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Steven Ulmen

3145

First let me say I am a long time shareholder of Polymet stock so to that extent I am on the side of non-ferrous mining in Minnesota. I am also an environmentalist and see the damage done to the Mesabi Range by iron ore and taconite mining in the paSt That is not acceptable. Minnesota is poised to create a win-win situation for both the mining industry and the environment in northern Minnesota. It is called Polymet Mining Corp. Polymet comes to us possessing the technology to conduct non-ferrous mining at Northmet as well as the technology to protect the environment during the mining process. Reverse osmosis will treat the waste water to remove sulfides that meet the strict wild rice standard and not cause damage to water runoff at the mine site or in rivers and lakes, all within the standards set by the EPA. All of these technologies have been tested and are effective. Polymet possesses all these technologies and is committed to put them to use in a way that they can mine in a cost-efficient manner and protect northern Minnesota's environment at the same time. The only addition I suggest is the use of hydrogen fuel cells to generate electricity for the Erie plant as well as returning it to the grid. The byproduct of hydrogen fuel cells is pure water. There is no air pollution whatsoever. I can recommend Fuel Cell Energy (FCEL), of which I am also a shareholder, as the company that can be consulted concerning electrical generation at the site. Polymet has demonstrated they have the technology to mine Northmet in full compliance with guidelines as established by the Environmental Protection Agency, and will provide funding to continue these environmental processes long after mine closure. They have committed to leave the Northmet site cleaner than it is now and in full compliance with EPA standards for as long as it takes. With the above in mind it is requested Polymet be awarded their permits to mine the Northmet site. If permits are denied and Polymet walks away from this project, no other company is waiting to take their place. Non-ferrous mining in Minnesota will have no champion, and mining will be denied and the environment will remain endangered as it is now. Thank you. Steven M. Ulmen, Mankato, MN 56001

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Steven Wiese

39987

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Steven Wiese 2543 Nicollet Ave Minneapolis, MN 55404-4249 (612) 870-0029

Stewart Crosby

11339

Dear Sir/Madame, I have many concerns regarding the NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). To sum up my concerns, I am not confident that the proposed water treatments will work over the timeframe needed to protect existing surface and subsurface water. It is too risky, in my opinion, to allow this kind of industrial mining in an area as environmentally sensitive as the surrounding landscape is in this part of Minnesota. I am opposed to any copper-nickel mining as proposed because I do not believe adequate protection of the surrounding landscape can be guaranteed and I do not believe Minnesotans should have to take such a risk for the benefit of a small number of corporations. Sincerely, Stewart Crosby 3965 Princeton Avenue St Louis Park, MN 55416

Stewart Mills

18112

Thank you very much. My name is Stewart Mills. And I'm from Crow Wing. And my story is very similar to the people of Northern Minnesota. Our family came to Northern Minnesota in the 1870's and worked the timber industry. My great, great grandfather mined on the Iron Range. And my grandfather was one of the last people to move logs in Northern Minnesota. And what we are about, why we came to Northern Minnesota is about natural resources and jobs and growing the economy and growing prosperity. And this project, PolyMet, is a great harbinger of things to come. We have tremendous opportunities to grow jobs, to grow prosperity, and grow our economy not only in this area but all across Northern Minnesota, because we have a very interconnected economy. But on top of working here and growing prosperity, growing our families, and becoming more interconnected, we also hunt, we also fish here. This is our backyard. And the PolyMet project is so well thought out and is so well engineered, and the oversight is so extraordinary, there is absolutely no reason why we cannot have both economic prosperity and clean water so we can hunt and fish and not only enjoy the economy but also enjoy ecology. Go PolyMet.

Stu Astleford

18283

My name is Stu Astleford from Minneapolis, Minnesota. I am anti open-pit mining. I believe that the water quality degradation is permanent to the environment and it is not worth polluting a pristine environment that future generations can enjoy for years to come. I frequently go to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and I recognize this mine is near the Boundary Waters area. And it is just too risky to put a mine so close to the Boundary Waters, where it will do permanent damage, in my opinion, for generations to come. I guess that's it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stu Farnsworth

16672

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Stu Farnsworth 1646 Donald Ct Eagan, MN 55121

50049

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Stu Farnsworth 1646 Donald Ct Eagan, MN 55121

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Stuart Blee 38496

To Whom it May Concern, I would like to submit a comment in support of the Polymet SDEIS. I understand that this project will have an impact on the environment, everything we do does. However, I also trust that Polymet has met the State and Federal requirements regarding what they will do to safeguard the water and air. I understand that nothing is fool proof and there are risks. However, I feel that this project is too important on many levels to not move forward and trust that the agencies involved will do their jobs in monitoring and regulating this industry. It is time to move forward into the next phase of this project. Thank You Erika Bradach, 5172 Rd 54 Aurora, MN 55705

Stuart Chastain 47659

I believe that the proposed NorthMet copper/nickel mine is important both for its economic benefit to Minnesota and for its strategic/geopolitical value to the United States. However, there is one remaining technical issue relating to environmental protection that has not been satisfactorily addressed. Polymet's proposal to ensure there is no long-term seepage of sludge into aquifers is not adequately redundant. The redundancy of the actual sludge barrier is more important than any long-term financial arrangements to cover environmental damage. Thank you. Stuart Chastain

Stuart Lahti 42546

See attachment

Sue Bowman 18108

Good evening everybody. My name is Sue Bowman. And I'm the general manager of the Country Inn of Hoyt Lakes. I was born here up on the Iron Range. First generation of Hoyt Lakes. My father came here from St. Paul working at the Whirlpool plant in St. Paul. Brought his five children up. I was the first born in Hoyt Lakes. And I have a younger brother also born in Hoyt Lakes. I wholeheartedly support moving forward with the PolyMet project. It is healthy when it comes to these kinds of projects and these claims. We are operating in an environment of tremendous knowledge and experience and technology. The EIS process is in place to ensure any and all projects meet Minnesota's tough environmental status. If you read the EIS, you will see that PolyMet has addressed all the potential issues and proves that copper-nickel mining can be both pro-environment and pro-jobs. PolyMet will bring some 360 direct jobs and hundreds more spinoff jobs to the area of the state that needs them. And, of course, managing a hotel in Hoyt Lakes this will provide many, many jobs. I'll be able to hire more employees. It will be filled every day. We all like that. And so even I can give jobs to a lot of people that wouldn't be working in the mines. We know how to mine in Northeastern Minnesota. And we do under the strictest standards. If we don't utilize this great resource of mining copper and nickel in Minnesota, these minerals will continue to be mined in places around the world that have little or no environmental regulations whatsoever causing massive pollution to the earth. They will be mined in places around the world that offer no safety protection to workers. Where employees are routinely put in danger by being forced to work in unsafe conditions, and where workers are exploited by being paid inhuman wages and do not allow them to feed their families. The alternative to mining in Minnesota is to mine in places that have none of our safeguards. Does that make sense? I have confidence in the co-lead agency conclusions. I believe they have been thorough and thoughtful and taken their time to get it right. Let's mine metals here where we need and want the jobs and we know we can do it right. Thank you.

Sue Carver 15750

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sue Carver 18271

My name is Sue Carver, like a wood carver. I live in Plymouth, Minnesota. I am speaking as a grandmother. I have lived many, many years and know that there is long-term consequences for what we do in our life. I would love to see what I do or can make a voice about in my life to protect the land for my grandchildren. I really feel strongly that we need to think long-term for the decisions we make. And in having lived this long, it makes more sense to me. I would like to say that I don't see the benefit for the majority of the people in the State of Minnesota for these sulfide bearing ore mines. I just don't see how it can possibly benefit us. The ore is going to be taken out and given to China. The companies that -- are owned by foreign nationals, who will benefit from the money earned. And a few Minnesotans in the northern part of the state will have jobs, but the jobs will be short-term. And I can see a lot -- I just can see what is going on in South Dakota and I can just see a lot of people coming in to the state to work up there that are not Minnesotans. So, that idea of having good jobs for Minnesotans is really going to be diluted by all of the people that are going to pour into the state to get those few jobs. And so in the long-term, I just can't see any benefit for us, except the long-term pollution that is going to happen that we are going to have to clean up and use our tax dollars for. And the loss of the pristine environment that is up there in the northeast section of our state and the beauty that is there for our children and for our grandchildren. So, I don't support these mines. And I would like to see them not get the chance to mine in our state.

Sue DeNio 42606

See attachment

Sue Evert 42036

Although I understand people needing jobs in northern Minnesota, I am wary about this risky mining proposal. Is it a US company. Are the standards very high to ensure no pollution of this area. Perhaps just saying NO and protecting this area is a better solution. I do not pretend to be an expert here, but the risks of contamination of beautiful areas and much needed wetlands seems too great to allow this proposal to go through. Best wishes on your decisions.

Sue Goodin 32510

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. As a child I visited my grandparents MN farm every summer. I remembered all my adult life the beauty of this state. Now I live here and am again discovering the care folks here have taken (ore mining notwithstanding) of their gorgeous inheritance. Please do not let greed destroy one of the loveliest parts of this state. Nor endanger its wildlife. Folks come here to remember or experience how beautiful the USA once was. Let us not be destructive of that beauty. Sincerely, Sue Goodin PO Box 295 Carlton, MN 55718-0295

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sue Halligan

16941

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sue Halligan 1190 Schooner Way Woodbury, MN 55125

50234

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Sue Halligan 1190 Schooner Way Woodbury, MN 55125

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sue Hatcher 42615

See attachment

Sue Jeffrey 18296

My name is Sue Jeffrey. I am representing Friends of Cold Water. We are concerned about water quality. We think the PolyMet mine is a dangerous idea because the jobs really aren't there. They are only there for 20 years, and then 500 years of cleanup. What? 20, 500 years? The problem is that nature doesn't negotiate. Nature is not passive. There will be unforeseen circumstances that will be there and there will be unanticipated consequences, and corporate apologies for poisoning the water. We can't afford to do that. We also can't afford to have a lot of unemployed people. So, I'm looking for a middle path, a middle path between yes and no. We need good jobs. We need jobs for women, as well as for men, who are relatively the miners. More tourism. But mostly I would love to see the retrofitting of every single building in America. Do you think that's enough jobs? There is a middle path. We need to explore that. We need to get together. Because I speak for the 70 percent. I'm 70 percent water. The surface of the earth is 70 percent water. We are all 70 percent water. So let's get together and figure out a way to have full employment with retrofitting jobs and becoming more environmentally sensitive and being smart.

Sue Jensen 48179

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Sue Jensen 221 Koski Road Esko, MN 55733

Sue Lommen 42156

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sue Lommen 12479 River Rd North Branch, MN 55056-6243

Sue Ponsford 20069

--Original Message-- From: sue@thedatabank-com [mailto:sue@thedatabank-com] Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 2:58 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: PolyMet would operate for 20 years but, according to PolyMet's own data, would pollute water for over 500 years at the tailings basin, and over 200 years at the mine pit. The modeling results provided in the SDEIS show that PolyMet and the DNR simply did not look beyond 500 years. The fact that the SDEIS does not say when the mine pit and tailings basin will stop polluting our water is a major and apparently intentional failure that needs to be corrected by the DNR. Please run the models . or require PolyMet to run the models . long enough to show when pollution of our water by PolyMet's mine would cease. Long after the mining has stopped, PolyMet would pose an ongoing risk to fresh water. The Embarrass, the Partridge, and the St Louis Rivers, as well as Lake Superior, are far too precious to be put at risk for so long by PolyMet in its present form. PolyMet should not be permitted unless, when the proposed mining stops, the groundwater and surface water is left in a clean condition, and surrounding streams, rivers, and Lake Superior are safe from risk of sulfide mine pollution. The PolyMet SDEIS suffers from many major failings. The SDEIS needs to be withdrawn, sent back, and fixed before it is returned for public comment. Sincerely, Sue Ponsford 4129 Portland Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3134

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Sue Ramthun

14631

Dear DNR, I am an avid MN angler and BWCA traveler. I am writing to express concern about the proposed Polymet sulfide mine in NE Minnesota. I've read information about the sulfur mining process and it is scary. As a state that prides itself on its pure natural resources, I can't believe we are even entertaining the thought of sulfide mining (like we shouldn't allow frac sand mining in SE Mn). The risks that come with sulfide mining far outweigh any economical benefits proposed by Polymet. The major downside of sulfide mining is the water pollution risk (acid and increased mercury emissions). This includes drinking water and fishing waters. No amount of money can replace or "fix" our clean water supply and damaged wetlands. Our clean water is worth more than its weight in gold and we should be protecting it with our lives. The SDEIS acknowledges that water from the Polymet operation will need to be treated for at least 500 years. What if there are leaks. How do we sustain clean water and good quality natural resources with that risk hanging over our heads. That is a horrible legacy to leave for future generations. The DNR is supposed to help protect our natural resources, so preventing any sulfide mining would comply with that directive. Please help us. Sue Ramthun 117 18th St SE Rochester Mn 55904

Sue Rengstorf

39341

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Sue Rengstorf 590 Suzanne Ave Saint Paul, MN 55126-2310 (651) 483-8538

Sue Sojourner

11361

Dear Department of Natural Resources, Having read a description of the probable ramifications of PolyMet's proposed sulfide mining, I am—and we all should be—appalled and leery of the five centuries of hazardous water treatment violations that will affect us. Proposed mines should keep Minnesota's waters clean and safe. Plans should put safeguards in place to avoid things going wrong. The plan should leave the site clean, maintenance-free, and should protect Minnesota taxpayers. May the DNR lead the way in safeguarding our people from the destructive dangers of copper sulfide mining. Thank you. Health. Susan H. Sojourner 315 N. Lake Ave, #501 Duluth, MN 55806 _____ HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "<http://www.avast-com/>"avaSt Antivirus protection is active.

Sue Weinauer

21630

It seems a blindness comes over folks when there are some jobs coming to a community. It's happening again in Ely. It's unbelievable that mining anywhere near the Boundary waters is even being considered. Has there ever been a mining operation that has not caused long term damage to the land and a job situation that does not die after a couple decades. Anyway, though I don't live anywhere near the area considered, I can't see ANY sense in it. Please please consider the impact. Make us proud to live in Minnesota and stand up for our resources that would otherwise probably go over to China or at least out of the country. No Mining Please Sent from my iPad

suehawkeleven@yahoo.com

43209

Poly Met Destruction of all North Americas Aquifers. Water sold to Canada and China. A few jobs for miners. Who's gonna pay for all our healthcare? What we gonna drink? What about foliage? Animals? Rice? Air? What the Hell are greedy bastards thinking?!?...

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sun cho

39762

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According to the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms sun cho 1207 Estates Ln Bayside, NY 11360-1141

39767

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms sun cho 1207 Estates Ln Bayside, NY 11360-1141

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sun cho 39769

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms sun cho 1207 Estates Ln Bayside, NY 11360-1141

Superior Water, Light & Power 38907

Dear Ms Fay, Please see the attached letter in support of PolyMet's proposed NorthMet mining project. Thank you, - Bethany Owen Bethany M. Owen President Superior Water, Light and Power Direct: (715) 395-6355 E-mail: HYPERLINK "blocked::mailto:bowen@swlp-com"bowen@swlp-com

superspanke 44593

As a seventeen year old student in Minnesota I believe that allowing of the construction of this mine would be a grievous mistake. We stand the possibility of destroying that areas environment for centuries to come. Although the mine is not in the Boundary Waters its proximity to this state park should be concerning. The company might promise full responsibility for the mess it creates but it is not certain. If they can't clean up the mess like a lot of mining comapnies multiple generations of Minnesotans would be left to clean the problem. Please protect our future generations enjoyment of this areas natural wonders not leaving them with a disgraceful legacy. Kathryn Sent from my Samsung Galaxy S@4

Susan A Anderson 54495

See attachment

Susan Abrahamsen 54777

See attachment

Susan Agrimson 45190

I'm totally confident the company will protect the environment. there are plenty of safeguards in place. plus the new jobs will be a great benefit to northern Minnesota. Gerald Agrimson 13520 greenwood tr n stillwater, mn 55082

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan and Herb Lasch 47542

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are concerned about this project's potential impact on our region's natural resources and the public's health. Have the following been fully considered as environmental impact. 1- Negative environmental impact in other geographic areas that have been subjected to this type of mining that could apply here 2- The track record of PolyMet Mining Corporation in previous mining operations 3- The unknown capability of future generations of oversight to monitor water quality in the 500+ years to come. So much is riding on an honest, reliable environmental assessment. Our precious environment is being assessed for generations of potential devastation for short term profit. Thank you for your consideration Sincerely, Susan and Herb Lasch 25 Lake St N Unit 202 Forest Lake, MN 55025-2538

Susan anderson 42891

The following is a letter I mailed - but may not reach you in time. Thanks, Susan Anderson

Susan Armington 57202

Where will the money come from to ensure the waste water treatment plants will continue to operate for 200 at the mine site and 500 years at the plant site? How can we ensure the PolyMet will meet its share of these costs, and not for instance, default or go bankrupt or whatever, before it pays its share? Susan Armington 5005 15th Ave SoMinneapolis, MN 55417

susan bauer 39449

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Boorsma 39748

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Boorsma 513 E 11th St Duluth, MN 55805-1319

Susan C Flesvig 54479

See attachment

Susan Claire Nelson 54559

An environment that is healthier than it is today should be our goal. But Americans will not stop using the minerals of the earth. Rather than despoiling a third world country and exploiting its people, let's do our mining here in our own backyard using the best science and environmental protections we can.

Susan Conlee 57881

I ask you to oppose PolyMet's proposal for sulfide ore mining in the Superior National Forest at the headwaters of the St. Louis River. They plan to excavate or fill 900 acres of wetlands directly during mining, while indirectly draining or poisoning (with wind-blown toxic metal dust) an additional ten square miles of wetland habitat in the area. The mining will leave square miles of talcum powder-fine waste, piled high. Unlike taconite, sulfide mining waste, when exposed to air and water forms sulfuric acid. The acid will leach toxic metals such as mercury, copper, silver and nickel from the waste rock. PolyMet suggests that to prevent pollution of the St. Louis River watershed they will collect the hundreds of millions of gallons of rain and snowmelt waters that filter through the waste every year and run them through water treatment plants ... for up to five centuries. The risk of long-term negative impacts to the wildlife and people of Minnesota is reason to oppose this project. The cost liability for cleanup over centuries is also a great cause for concern. Please oppose this project.

Susan D Blom 57940

I oppose PolyMet. The long term consequences to wildlife and public health are really not known, despite the research done so far. We love this part of the state for its beauty & would hate to see it destroyed. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan D. Lannin

35133

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept my comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There is no history of sulfide mining in Minnesota for good reason: Acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination pollute waters in all places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I urge you to reject PolyMet Mining Corp NorthMet's proposal because such mining operations will pollute Lake Superior, jeopardize clean water and wildlands, and endanger public health. Approving PolyMet's proposal would give an unwise signal for more sulfide mining near Lake Superior, a vast freshwater resource unique among the Great Lakes, and endanger millions of acres of wildlands, including 1,000 pristine lakes and streams, and threaten the 1,500 miles of canoe routes, now a major recreational draw within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Please act now to protect Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Destruction of fish and wildlife habitat from polluted lakes and rivers, contaminated drinking water, immense cleanup costs and hundred-year recovery times make sulfide mining too dangerous for this region. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine definitely is NOT in the public interest Please reject this first and any subsequent sulfide ore mining proposals that industry may present and instead vow to protect one of the most important freshwater resources in the world. Thank you for considering my comments in your decision-making process. Sincerely, Susan D. Lannin 7100 N Greenview Ave Chicago, IL 60626-2629 (773) 381-9738

Susan Darley-Hill

39553

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this SDEIS. This type of mining should not be allowed to move forward in our water-rich area of Minnesota. And rich is an understatement, given the prospect of an increasingly-shrinking supply of clean, fresh water within the next 50 years. Water is a resource far, far more precious than any metal - now - and especially in the future when nothing will be more precious or valuable to our descendants. This kind of mining poses a such a threat to our wetlands, running waters, and lakes throughout NE Minnesota. These mining operations have a proven track record of consistently producing destructive heavy metal contamination and acid drainage that causes irreparable damage to once beautiful and pristine waters. Those impacts persist long after the ore deposits have been exhausted and the mineral wealth extracted, benefiting the few while robbing the generations to come, whose fresh water "deposits" have been rendered worthless or at best impaired. It is a fact that, time after time, in every place where sulfide-rich rocks have been exposed through ore mining, the waters have been impaired. This project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health include direct damage through disruption of habitat of threatened species such as lynx and moose, destruction of wetlands, and impairment of water quality. And, secondarily but with even more widespread consequences for our descendants hundreds of years into the future, the burning of fossil fuels necessary to power the extraction and then maintain the system constructed to handle the acid drainage will release a staggering amount of carbon dioxide, particulates and mercury- all detrimental to the health of virtually every living thing. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Darley-Hill 1710 E 7th St Duluth, MN 55812-1217 (218) 728-1139

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Darley-Hill

48784

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this SDEIS. This type of mining should not be allowed to move forward in our water-rich area of Minnesota. And rich is an understatement, given the prospect of an increasingly-shrinking supply of clean, fresh water within the next 50 years. Water is a resource far, far more precious than any metal - now - and especially in the future when nothing will be more precious or valuable to our descendants. This kind of mining poses a such a threat to our wetlands, running waters, and lakes throughout NE Minnesota. These mining operations have a proven track record of consistently producing destructive heavy metal contamination and acid drainage that causes irreparable damage to once beautiful and pristine waters. Those impacts persist long after the ore deposits have been exhausted and the mineral wealth extracted, benefiting the few while robbing the generations to come, whose fresh water "deposits" have been rendered worthless or at best impaired. It is a fact that, time after time, in every place where sulfide-rich rocks have been exposed through ore mining, the waters have been impaired. This project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health include direct damage through disruption of habitat of threatened species such as lynx and moose, destruction of wetlands, and impairment of water quality. And, secondarily but with even more widespread consequences for our descendants hundreds of years into the future, the burning of fossil fuels necessary to power the extraction and then maintain the system constructed to handle the acid drainage will release a staggering amount of carbon dioxide, particulates and mercury- all detrimental to the health of virtually every living thing. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Darley-Hill 1710 E 7th St Duluth, MN 55812-1217 (218) 728-1139

Susan Dunne

36036

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, We cannot allow more pollution into our Great Lakes. The Boundary Waters canoe experience must be protected. When you have the opportunity to bring city people up there, those that have never left the city cannot believe their eyes. The fishermen on Lake Superior and those who operate lakeside resorts would agree - allowing mining would negatively impact their lives and livelihoods. The purity of our lakes is a tremendous asset. Please do risk our drinking water and so much more. Sincerely, Susan Dunne 4308 Bobolink Ter Skokie, IL 60076-2004 (847) 982-1903

Susan Faulkner

40270

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Susan Faulkner 736 Currey Rd Nashville, TN 37217 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Frame

10758

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Susan Frame 1010 Washburn Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55411

18397

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Susan Frame 1010 Washburn Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55411

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Frame

50516

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Susan Frame 1010 Washburn Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55411

Susan Garado

41921

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Susan Garado Minneapolis, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Greene

40351

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone to assess the impacts of slope and dam failure at the mine site waste rock piles and the tailings piles, instead of just assuming that no failure can happen. (SDEIS, p. 5-546). PolyMet's tailings would be placed on top of huge, leaky and unstable existing tailings piles. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Susan Greene 5510 Upton Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55410

Susan Greer

39905

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Susan Greer 3816 24th Ave S Apt 2 Minneapolis, MN 55406-3073

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Hawthorne

43126

Polymet's SDEIS has numerous shortcomings. Among the most serious is the inadequate consideration of future risk. It is well known that open-pit hard rock mining produces sulfuric acid, itself a pollutant that also causes leaching of dangerous elements like cadmium and mercury. The Polymet SDEIS specifies that containment will be required for at least 500 years, and it details containment strategies. However, the plan does not adequately consider catastrophic possibilities—infrastructure failures, loss of funding for containment due to (inevitable) government change, changes to waterflow subsequent to usage and global warming, etc, etc None of these risks is directly foreseeable or calculable, but that is exactly the point: we cannot see 500 years into the future, so the SDEIS cannot adequately plan ahead. Given that the SDEIS cannot be adequate, given the 500+ year time frame for hazards and the unforeseeable risks, and that approval sets us down an unnecessary and dangerous course, the DNR should reject Polymet's SDEIS. Susan Hawthorne Philosophy Department St Catherine University St Paul, MN 55105 [HYPERLINK "mailto:schawthorne@stkate-edu"](mailto:schawthorne@stkate-edu)

Susan Hoppe

57711

Greetings. I have patrons who would like to review the NorthMet SDEIS. Can you tell me how we can get a hardcopy for our library. Thank you very much.
Sincerely, Susan J. Hoppe Reference Services Librarian Virginia Public Library 215 5th Ave S. – Virginia, MN – 55792 [HYPERLINK "http://www.virginia.lib.mn.us/"](http://www.virginia.lib.mn.us/) <http://www.virginia.lib.mn.us> Read our blog. Like us on Facebook.

Susan Jane

43093

Dear Ms Fay, My husband and I moved to Saint Paul in January 1994- The following summer, we discovered the BWCAW. Over the past twenty years, we have explored much of this special wilderness area in small, lightweight solo canoes, relishing its extraordinary beauty. We've also witnessed the obvious economic struggles of many who live just outside of this protected natural region and understand their strong drive for more and better jobs. We know that it's easy for us to reside in a comfortable financially secure situation here in the Twin Cities and question the wisdom of a copper-nickel mining venture that might mean at least a short-term boon to the northern Minnesota standard of living. The promise of 350 jobs for 20 years has to be a tempting possibility. But, weighed against the extreme environmental risks that inevitably accompany the Poly-Met mining proposal, the hoped-for benefits of sulfide mining seem hopelessly short-sighted to me. Pristine water is the essence of the BWCAW. From my understanding of the proposed mining processes, water quality degradation is almost unavoidable, and the company's assurances to remedy any and all resulting water pollution are simply unfeasible. However well-intentioned Poly-Met might be, adequate safeguards for protection of northern Minnesota natural resources is impossible to guarantee and the potential for environmental damage and its cost to the area is too great. While I do not possess technical mining expertise, some specific facts and simple common sense make it crystal clear to me that the proposed mines are undesirable, and, what's more, truly threaten the future health of those who reside in the vicinity of the proposed site as well as individuals who might work or visit this area when mining is underway and even after the mines have shut down. I would like to make the following points to support my opposing stance: 1- First, it is my understanding that Poly-Met's open-pit copper-sulfide mining plan does not include any analysis of potential risks to on-site mine workers from exposure to asbestos-like amphibole fibers, which have been linked to the fatal lung cancer mesothelioma, that are present at the site. In addition, the plan does not include a Health Risk Assessment of the effects of mercury, manganese, lead, arsenic and other pollutants on people who live downstream from the site, such as the town of Hoyt Lakes, downstream from the proposed site's waste piles. The sulfate discharge and deleterious impacts to wetlands of the proposed mining may result in an increase in levels of mercury to fish and contamination of drinking water with toxic levels of other substances that will jeopardize the health, particularly, of bottle-fed babies, children and the elderly. 2- Sulfide mining appears to be especially unsafe in a water-rich area such as our State. This type of mining has not previously taken place in Minnesota, and there appears to be a high probability of eventual pollution of the groundwater, which would require literally hundreds of years of treatment (even after the mines are no longer active) – if possible to remedy satisfactorily at all. 3- Poly-Met is highly unlikely to satisfactorily remediate environmental damage. This international firm has no great commitment to the proposed mine region. As we have seen in many recent environmental disasters, such as in West Virginia, the responsible corporate parties typically declare bankruptcy or find another "escape route," leaving local communities to contend with the devastation. 4- Finally, the idea that the proposed mining operation will provide a significant boost to the northern Minnesota economy is not a sure bet. There is no guarantee that all jobs will be filled by local workers – and the majority of profits from this enterprise will certainly benefit distant shareholders. Minnesota is the steward of an enormous amount of this

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan K

41922

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Susan K Richfield, Minnesota

Susan Kane

54735

See attachment

Susan King

16230

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Lanes

29659

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have been going to stay on islands in this area for 43 years, even spending my honeymoon there in 1970 at which time we were drinking pure water right from the lake. My husband's family and in-laws (Canadians) have roots back to the 1800's being commercial fishermen. This is a beautiful pristine place, where they made all of us American's who had cabins on leased land move out to help preserve it. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Susan Lanes 2321 Fairview Ave Johnsburg, IL 60051-2539

susan langston

17167

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, susan langston 5517 twin lake blvd. e. brooklyn center, MN 55429

Alphabetical by sender's first name

susan langston

50433

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, susan langston 5517 twin lake blvd. e. brooklyn center, MN 55429

Susan Leaf

9767

DNR: When the completed EIS was first released, I expected pro-mining factions to take issue with the estimates that monitoring and water treatment at the site would last for centuries- 200 and 500 years, depending on location. Since they have not, nor have they taken issue with the estimate that the mine would be productive for a mere 20 years. So these number seem to be more or less firm. Since there is no copper/nickel mine with sulfide ore that has not polluted the water around it, we can assume this will happen to Minnesota, too. There is nothing that I have read to make me believe otherwise. It is nearly beyond belief that rational people are even weighing these facts against one another: a mine that will offer a few hundred people jobs for less than one work-life- a 20 year old man beginning at the proposed mine would be out of work at age 40- versus the pollution (worst case) or 500 year monitoring (best case) of a cherished wilderness area and the world's largest freshwater lake. Untold millions will be affected by a polluted Lake Superior, since in the centuries to come when fresh water is scarce, it will most certainly be looked to to provide drinking water. Come to your senses. Say no to those with limited vision who ask the state to maintain "their way of life" on the Range. A vibrant, thriving tourism industry today provides the best promise of continuing economic health in that region. Sue Leaf 314450 Oasis Road Center City, MN 55012

Susan Leek

38715

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Susan Leek 591 Desnoyer Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-4917 (651) 210-6727

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Leibowitz

40849

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Susan Leibowitz 732 W Schubert Ave Chicago, IL 60614-1507 (773) 549-7517

Susan Licari

1853

I live just north of the polymet site in Embarrass. They have sent out engineers to monitor our wells on our property and to install new ground water monitors. They sent me detailed analysis of the results of the tests. I am totally confident of their process and believe this will be done correctly. They have been very upfront when questioned. If I wasn't absolutely confident of the process I would not be writing this or would I support it. This mine will extend the long legacy of mining in the area and provide important employment for the young folks in the area. Mining has been ongoing for over a 100 years on the iron range and we can only hope it continues. Some of my best hunting and fishing areas are old mines that have grown in where wildlife and fish flourish. Sincerely yours Anthony Licari Embarrass mn Sent from my iPad

Susan Lick

40913

Before DNR issues permits to mine Cu, Pd, Ni, Pt at the Polymet site all measures to provide reclamation and recycling to outdated electronic gadgets should be instituted. Polymet may be able to mine as safely and environmentally sound as they propose but to allow a mining operation of this sort in the ecologically sensitive region proposed without a full fledged program to glean all used precious metals is mindless. I am not proposing that Polymet be forced to advocate this endeavor, this must be done by state government. Currently there is a half hearted program in operation to reclaim these metals but it is by no means adequate to retrieve all metals used to manufacture phones, computers, cars, etc. A deposit should be paid by any consumer when purchasing an item that necessitates the use of any of these metals in order to make sure that the item is fully recycled at the end of its lifespan. Without taking this action prior to the advent of a new mine we are acting without foresight and wasting the exact metals that are going to be needed as we continue to grow our technology base. This endeavor would certainly add to the workforce and send a message to the buying public that the days of throw away no longer exist. In addition the reclaiming would be done with strict environmental regulation much like the proponents of the Polymet plan are proposing. It needs to be done where the consumer decides the lifespan of the gadget is over. David Lick 36514 Birch Trl. Grand Rapids, Mn. 55744

Susan Louis

39571

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Louis 4420 Chicago Ave Minneapolis, MN 55407-3522 (612) 824-4290

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Lynn

16876

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

39528

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Lynn 2728 Humboldt Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-1067 (612) 306-0306

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan M Smith

40666

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mrs Susan M Smith PO Box 48303 Minneapolis, MN 55448-0303

Susan Maas

9620

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I understand that the economy in northern MN is in dire straits, and area residents are desperate for decent-paying jobs. I understand that finding new sources of employment in the region is imperative - and that new mining operations may be part of the solution. But not THIS project - NOT SULFIDE MINING. I'm flabbergasted that we can even be considering a project that, by all accounts, will require 500 years' worth of cleanup. Pollution seeping from mine pits into the Partridge River surficial waters "would continue in perpetuity." As a Minnesotan, a wilderness lover and a taxpayer - history suggests we taxpayers will be left holding the bag for cleanup if/when the company folds - I am horrified by the PolyMet proposal. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Susan Maas 4846 33rd Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Susan McCabe

40259

Dear Ms Fay, Dear State and Federal Leaders: I am most concerned with the mercury contaminants which will be going into the groundwater and Lake Superior. It is not right for a company to be allowed to pollute our environment and harm our infants and children. Kids in this area already have a higher level of mercury in their bodies. It is very shortsighted to allow this to happen. We will be trying to contain this problem for centuries to come. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water. Sincerely, Susan McCabe St Paul Susan McCabe 1455 Grantham Street St Paul, MN 55108 651-642-9619

Susan Mcknight

42456

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Susan Mcknight 5025 Baker Rd Minnetonka, MN 55343-4553

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Miner 4664

excuse me, but what are you thinking. Is everything all about money.. If so, then realize the cost in cleaning up the leftover disaster when you are done destroying the pristine area. Remember the Love Canal. Remember the terrible state Lake Superior was in thanks to the Silver Bay Mining along with many others. We seem to have enough problems keeping our waters, wetlands, and our land in general pollution free. The people of Minnesota do not need to add another clean-up bill to our already high taxes. I vote NO. Susan Miner, 5040 184th Ave NW, Anoka Mn.55303: HYPERLINK "mailto:sminer110@hotmail-com"sminer110@hotmail-com Sent from Windows Mail

Susan Murray 14645

Susan Murray 5325 Highpointe Drive Bloomington, MN 55437 February 12, 2014 RE: \$650 million copper-nickel mine proposed by PolyMet in Hoyt Lakes. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Ms Fay: I write to express my opposition to the the \$650 million copper-nickel mine proposed by PolyMet in Hoyt Lakes. Because this region contains an underground aquifer, NO AMOUNT of money will ensure an adequate clean-up/disaster leak contingency plan. Make no mistake about it Ms Fay: potable, fresh groundwater is Minnesota's best, most profitable and most lasting natural resource. Allowing the PolyMet mine project to go forward in Hoyt Lakes.would be a huge mistake. Thank you for listening. s/Susan Murray

Susan Narayan 39974

Dear Sir or Madam: I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal. I urge you to reject this risky proposal to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you, Susan Narayan

Susan Newman 39682

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Susan Newman 1425 W 28th Street #508 minneapolis, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Newman

48855

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Susan Newman 1425 W 28th Street #508 minneapolis, MN 55408

Susan Nordin

18365

My name is Susan Nordin. I live in Duluth. My background is I'm a family physician. I work here in Duluth and I also work in Virginia several times a month. My main interest is human health and the impacts that this mining project would have on the human health. There's been a lot of speaking about pollution and pollution runoff, heavy metals, and mercury. And this impact and the impact on human health. And I have a deep concern about that. I also have a deep concern about the complex ecosystems on which our health depends. Our health does depend on what goes into our bodies but also these ecosystems and the other living things that we share this earth with. One thing that is noted in the plan is that already there are currently 16 main thoroughfares for large mammals to traverse at this point remaining across the Iron Range area. This project would do away with two of those permanently. I would specifically like to speak about the permitting for the permit to destroy wetlands. These require more scientific data about that before approving that. This is a high-quality wetland that we're talking about. This is pre-settlement wetland that cannot be replaced. It's 1,000 acres. We're talking about trading that for -- trading land that is ours under the Forest Service for mine pits and low-quality wetlands, which is not going to be supportive of our health. I have one minute left. Okay. On the Forest Service website I looked up what their mission was because of this land exchange that is proposed, which I am opposed to; and their national themes when it focuses on projects states that they should shape, influence Forest Service land use on a scale in a way that optimizes public benefits from trees and forest for both current and future generations. They specify that these projects should have outcomes that protect and enhance water quality and quantity; energy is conserved; and air quality is improved, wildlife and fish habitat is protected, concerned, and enhanced. And people are connected to trees and forests and are engaged in environment stewardship activity. This land exchange does not appear to support that in my opinion. And I would please request that the land exchange not take place, the Permit 404 be denied.

39495

Please see the attached letter intended for all of you included in this e-mail. Thank you. - Susan Nordin, MD UMD Health Services 615 Niagara Court Duluth, MN 55812 phone (218) 726-6973 fax (218) 726-8515 HYPERLINK "<http://www.d.umn-edu/hlthserv>"www.d.umn-edu/hlthserv

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Nordin 48161

See attachment

54908

See attachment

Susan Padgett 40889

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Susan B. Padgett 413 E. 16th Ave #2 Anchorage, AK 99501 Sincerely, Susan Padgett 413 E 16th Ave Apt 2 Anchorage, AK 99501-5255 (907) 258-1620

susan prom 38836

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs susan prom 189 Sag Lake Trl Grand Marais, MN 55604-2057 (218) 388-9930

Susan Rom Zuriff 20045

I'm no expert, but I grew up in Ely. I can't envision that any amount of economic development, especially toxic mining, can make it into thriving commercial center. It's too far from business activity, with only 2-lane road access, no commercial airport, no long-distance buses and no rail connection. It's sad, but to think that the only activity that will keep it going is mining that may pollute a national treasure for up to hundreds of years is senseless. The effect on long-range state finances is imperiled if that happens. And the number of jobs may be many fewer than anticipated with the expansion of technology, especially robotic. Susan Rom Zuriff 4300 W. River Parkway, #253 Minneapolis, MN 55405

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Rowe

39547

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Susan Rowe 6401 Bethia Ln Brooklyn Park, MN 55428-1716 (952) 303-2902

Susan Scherer

16178

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Scherer

41663

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

54830

See attachment

Susan Schneck

54134

We DO NOT support Polymet mining. There are other ways to grow our economy safely with respect to the environment. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Schurke

18080

My name is Susan Schurke. I'm from Ely, Minnesota. Most of us will never work for a copper mine, however -- most of us in Northern Minnesota, anyway. However, all of us are taxpayers. I'm very concerned about the financial assurance in the SDEIS. Who can ever figure out what the cost of the cleanup will be for 500 years. Who will pay this? Who -- what is the amount they could possibly -- that can be put forward to replace something that can never be replaced; our clean water that we desperately need? Copper mining in a watershed does not seem to be a good idea. The proposed sulfide mine and tailings dump would pollute streams, wetlands and drinking waters for hundreds if not thousands of years. I believe that issues that haven't been analyzed at all in the SDEIS, like impacts on workers' health, be studied before the EIS is finalized. I request that common-sense alternatives like putting liners under the permanent waste-rock pile and the tailings piles be analyzed before the EIS can be finalized. I am concerned that the high value peat lands on the mine site are irreplaceable. The vast majority of wetlands mitigation is outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no plan to replace most of the indirectly-affected wetlands. I am concerned that cumulative impacts of the PolyMet Project, and other existing and expanding mines, would impair wild rice, fish and aquatic ecosystems and violate the treaty rights of Indian tribes to hunt, fish and gather in the Superior National Forest lands ceded to the United States. I'm concerned that PolyMet's water and air pollution from mine pit, waste rock and tailing piles, and PolyMet's excavation and changing hydrology and wetlands would increase mercury loading to wetlands and streams and increase mercury bioaccumulation in fish putting human health at risk. I'm concerned that PolyMet's discharge would increase carcinogenic arsenic in Hoyt Lake's drinking water and release arsenic, lead and manganese, chemicals that impair brain function, into the ground water. I am concerned that PolyMet's water pollution from the permanent mine site waste-rock pile would need treatment for at least 200 years and pollution from the tailings piles would require treatment for at least 500 years. Pollution seeping out of the pits would continue in perpetuity, forever. Who is going to pay for this and how can we ever replace our precious water? I am not against iron ore mining, but copper mining does not seem to be a reasonable thing in the watersheds of North America.

Susan Shawn

52212

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Susan Shawn 13939 SE Fair Oaks Way Oak Grove, OR 97267

Susan Solterman Audette

43313

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I am writing to register my opposition to the permit for the PolyMet Mine. Northern Minnesota needs economic development that does not risk polluting surrounding surface waters with a mix of acid and heavy metal. PolyMet, as proposed in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, creates a new ongoing water pollution source in the headwaters of the St Louis River, the largest American tributary to Lake Superior, which contains 10 percent of the world's fresh water. PolyMet's own data show it is expected to generate water pollution for more than 500 years. Treating the polluted water requires a complex and untested mechanical system of pumps, pipelines, and filters, which would need to operate indefinitely. The plan does not consider the possibility of mechanical or human failure. PolyMet has no contingency plan for predictable mechanical problems such as pipeline failures, extreme weather or human error. These considerations remain unaddressed in the SDEIS and should not, ultimately, be overlooked by our State's designated environmental managers and stewards. Susan Solterman Audette [HYPERLINK "mailto:ssolterman@gmail-com"](mailto:ssolterman@gmail-com)ssolterman@gmail-com 651-260-7040

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susan Soule 38413

As a Minnesota resident and northern Minnesota native, I want to express my strong opposition to the Polymet mining project for the following reasons: WATER is a precious resource. Besides being the foundation for much of Minnesota's recreational industry, it is essential to the life of our entire ecosystem from the lowliest life forms to human beings. Its scarcity is already a source of friction, concern and conflict worldwide. Look at California's current and frequent droughts and past proposals that a pipeline be built from Lake Superior to the desert southweSt The idea that we would risk centuries of pollution and the staggering costs of cleanup (provided that is truly possible) to one of our most basic and essential resources for a few hundred jobs lasting two or three decades is beyond belief. The idea that we would allow Polymet and its affiliates to do this, with their horrendous track record, is equally terrible. I implore you to stop this project. Sincerely, Susan Soule 7324 West Shore Drive Edina, MN 55435

Susan Stanich 42683

See attachment

Susan Tincher 58074

Please do not allow the pollution & destruction of Minnesota's natural resources. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Susan Valley 39890

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. Please leave the most revered and wonderful asset that Minnesota has to offer. ALONE.. As if the mining of years gone by have not done enough damage , please do not use that destruction as a precedent to further this horrific use of our land. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Susan Valley 555 McKnight Rd S Saint Paul, MN 55119-6911 (920) 728-4663

Susan Williams 54846

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Susie Kleusch Parkhurst

40104

From: Susie Parkhurst [susieparkhurst@msn-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 3:10 PM To: *Info (DNR) Subject: SDEIS-PolyMet Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155
HYPERLINK "mailto:info.dnr@state.mn.us"info.dnr@state.mn.us Dear Lisa Fay, My name is Susie K Parkhurst and after many years living away from the Iron Range, I have returned home and now live in Palo MN. I would like to submit my comments concerning the environmental impact of the proposed PolyMet Mining project. First I would like to say that while I am not an advocate of Local, State or Federal Government regulating our entire lives, I do trust and rely on entities such as the FDA, EPA and MN DNR to have done their due diligence to assure that they have done all they can to protect and preserve all that they are charged with protecting. An example would be that if the MN DNR states that they need to limit the number of deer hunting licenses because of an overall drop in the deer population, I trust that the MN DNR to have done their due diligence to impose the restrictions for the good of our eco system. I feel comfortable with the levels of guidelines that are currently enforced and that will be enforced in the future to protect our environment and the environment of the world. Currently we depend on foreign countries for so many of the precious metals that are vital for technology, equipment and industry. The more precious metals we can mine and process here in the United States, the less we are dependent on other countries to provide the vital precious metals. Those precious metals are needed for components that are used for such things as personal and business computers, iPads, cell phones, televisions and all manner of personal and industrial equipment. I am not comfortable with the levels of restrictions and guidelines enforced to protect the environment in other countries. The more we depend on foreign countries to provide vital metals the more we rely on them to be good stewards of our environment. The world is truly a small place. Consider the fact that the debris in the ocean from the Sendai Japan earthquake took just 1 year to reach Hawaii and California. It has polluted the Oceans and Seas and is having a negative impact on fish and mammals worldwide. The radiation of the Fukushima Power Plant arrived much more quickly. My brother lived in China for a time and saw mercury being dumped in a local river. It is better for the environment of the Iron Range, the United States of America and the entire world that we mine these minerals locally where we can be monitor whether we are being responsible stewards for the environment. The positive economic impact of a PolyMet Mine on the Iron Range and Minnesota relates to the environmental impact in that the more economically stable an area is, the more highly educated that population is. The more highly educated a population is, the more they become good stewards of their environment and humanity at large. Susie Kleusch Parkhurst 5660 Palo Rd 41 Aurora MN 55705 218-780-0628



Susu Jeffrey

10741

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: 20 YEARS of MINING 20 GENERATIONS of CLEAN UP Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine plan in Northern Minnesota's water-rich territory. Sincerely, Susu Jeffrey Susu Jeffrey 1063 Antoinette Av Minneapolis, MN 55405

42474

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, PolyMet copper/nickel mining in the headwaters of the Great Lakes-. NO. 20 years of mining 20 generations of clean up (the water study was arbitrarily stopped at 500 years) -More money in clean up than extraction -Foreign-owned, therefore profits go away How about a solar panel industry. Sincerely, Ms Susu Jeffrey 1063 Antoinette Ave Minneapolis, MN 55405-2102

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Suzanne Birch

39633

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Do not do this in Minnesota-we should be leaders in clean environmental issues. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Suzanne Birch 16015 Elgin Ct Faribault, MN 55021-8568 (507) 334-3023

Suzanne Bowman

4038

To Whom it May Concern: As the General Manager of the Country Inn of Hoyt Lakes, I would like to express my strong support for Polymet Mining to open a plant in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota. I am very anxious to hire new employee's as the result of Polymet opening. Not only will the plant hire, but the vendors who supply the mine will hire, and we will see a much needed increase in hotel stays therefore I will be able to hire. I trust our EPA and other government agencies that we will be as environmentally safe as can be. I love the idea that the plant will be recycled from the old LTV plant. - Suzanne Bowman General Manager Country Inn of Hoyt Lakes t:218-225-3555 f:218-225-3234

18237

Suzanne, S-U-Z-A-N-N-E, Bowman, B-O-W-M-A-N. I'm from Hoyt Lakes. I moved away from Hoyt Lakes for quite a while, ended up going to Florida and to Pennsylvania because my husband worked in the mines and because of the difficult times in the '80s and him not being able to keep a job. My family became ill and I moved back and took care of them. Why I'm for PolyMet is because I am an environmentalist, also. I want to use the environmental statement that they did and trust the -- I want to trust the scientists and what they've done for the statement. I want to keep it in Minnesota where we have the strict environmental. I do not want it to go to another country where they'll pollute the whole world and they don't have environmental regulations at all. I believe that we need the precious metals very much and we cannot have it dependent on another country, especially China and Japan because they are looking to go to war between them. It was just announced. And I'm a cancer survivor and all of the copper and the precious metals that are needed for medical reasons, I really think that it should come from the United States and from Minnesota, especially with our strict regulations, and I think they did a wonderful job on the environmental statement. Thank you.

Suzanne Candell

34383

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have spent much time in the wilds of Northeastern Minnesota over the 40+ years I have called Minnesota my home. There is no place on earth quite like it. I am terribly saddened by the prospect of possibly hundreds of years of environmental contamination due to this project. Although the project offers jobs in the immediate term, they are transitory. The long-term damage that such a project will inflict environmentally and economically on the area means that the legacy to future generations may be a loss of tourist income, illness and spoilage of the natural beauty of the area. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Suzanne Candell 15804 Holdridge Rd E Wayzata, MN 55391-2146

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Suzanne Dunham 42426

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Suzanne Dunham 518 S Blackhawk St Janesville, WI 53545-4204

Suzanne Glad 41949

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Suzanne Glad Bloomington, Minnesota

Suzanne Maras 41894

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Suzanne Maras Welcome, Minnesota

Suzanne Michael 30499

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Is there anyplace you would try to pollute to get your holy dollar. We here in MI. are proud of our Great lakes and want to keep them perfect and you're coming in and ruining it all isn't in any of plans. Get out and stay out and take your pollution right along with you along with all your destruction. Sincerely, Suzanne Michael 12401 Railroad Rd Clio, MI 48420-8231 (810) 547-1496

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Suzanne Ross

40107

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Suzanne Ross 11840 Falls Trl Lonsdale, MN 55046-4530

Suzanne Sette

16169

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Suzanne Shuckhart

16632

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Suzanne Shuckhart 3169 230th St Marshall, MN 56258

50020

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Suzanne Shuckhart 3169 230th St Marshall, MN 56258

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Suzanne Steinhagen 54757

See attachment

Sven Hoaglund 44459

Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to show my opposition to the PolyMet NorthMet Mining Project. As someone looking to relocate to the Arrowhead, it's an important issue for me. I think that its great that for 20 years there might be a few more jobs in a pretty cash strapped region of our state, but in all reality it is not sustainable and after the 20 years of mining are up the residents of northern MN will be in the same place they were before this. It' also absurd that we might be cleaning up waste from these 20 years of mining for an eternity or 500 years which is close enough. None of this mentions the possible environmental effects, not just the ones we know will happen. I just don't think that it's worth it and I think that a majority of the citizens of MN agree with me. - Sven Hoaglund Wild Moon LLC C: (608) 799-9731 F: (270) 342-3505
Representing: Woolrich Outdoor Research Eagles Nest Outfitters Farm To Feet Optic Nerve / M-Shades Exped USA

Sydney Fisher 43356

Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Sydney Fisher 210 Meserole St Brooklyn, NY 11206

Sylvia Ruth Gray 38723

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sylvia Ruth Gray 315 E 1st Ave Apt 5 Salt Lake City, UT 84103-2609

Sylvia Winkelman 40734

Mar 10, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Sylvia Winkelman 6337 Orchard Ave N Brooklyn Center, MN 55429-2057 (763) 533-8381

Alphabetical by sender's first name

sylvie carpentier

40271

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, sylvie carpentier aloe paris, ot 75018 FR

T & S Wright

38976

My Name is Shirlee Wright and my address is:315 S. 2nd St E., Aurora, MN 55705 I am totally and 100% behind Polymet and have been since the very beginning. Both my husband and I were born and raised on "The Range". In 1984, after the mines went down in 1981, and my husband had been laid off, and finished a 2 year program at the local vo tech, we moved to the Minneapolis area. Our dream was always to move "back home" to "The Range" but we never knew if it would ever happen or not, because economics on The Range in our area was very "Iffy" at beSt BUT after 26 years and our 2 daughters raised and through college .in 2010 we made the BIG move "back home" to Aurora. Especially because of where we've been and lived .I truly believe that PolyMet is vital to our region's longevity and the future is depending on Polymet to help breathe life back into the local economy that has NOT been here since the late 1970's.. Just take a ride down Main Street of Aurora or Hoyt Lakes any given Saturday night .OMG it almost makes this native Auroran cry to see such a desolate economy. And while I have no background in environmental in any way, I have to trust, and I do trust that Polymet has done all of the reasearch and environmental studies required to ensure complete safety in all areas of environment and personal well being for all involved. This company has invested so much money in this project by all of its studies, proposals and lobbying that I would find it hard to believe it would jeopardize that all by not being environmentally responsible in the end. Please, please, please listen to us that live here now and who have had to move away once because of economics, don't force us to have to do that again. We are here because we truly believe in this region and we too love this region for its woods, water and air quality and know that Polymet is doing all it can to help re-vitalize what our forefathers built and believed in also. Thank You..

T J Walters

54843

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

T Olsen

44213

I strongly oppose the idea of mining. The fact that we need to discuss and learn about how to clean up this toxic process and consider clean-up efforts for at least the next 100 years, likely more if it's possible at all, should be reason enough to stop this conversation here and now. Can anyone provide substantive proof that no harm will come to the areas proposed in the mining. I have not heard any such evidence. What I have heard is evidence that this type of mining allowed in other states has resulted in significant damage and pollution. We have taken far too much for granted in terms of our environment and now some people want to consider purposely harming and polluting it further. It seems to me the answer is obvious, stop it now and do not let the process of mining to continue. It will be a very sad day for MN and for human kind if this is allowed. Shame on us for thinking we can destroy the beautiful space in which we live without having long-term and significant consequences. This land and our environment belongs to everyone, not just those who want to profit from it regardless of impact. Thank you for your time and consideration. Tammy Olsen 1710 Broadway Street N Stillwater, MN 55082

T Pratt

57282

Please accept these comments on the Poly Met Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as lynx and moose, exchange of federal land within the Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts from mining. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities, and I support the No Action Alternative.

T Wilson

36936

Since we have spend billions chasing around Afghanistan, a country rich in Copper, why does poly met not go there and obtain the copper. Please show me a study which displays the demand for copper and the need to destroy our ecology for this myopic enterprise. Also, I feel the offshore companies should not be allow to mine on US soil. They too easily escape the responsibility for proper clean up after the rape has occurred. Jobs. the few actual jobs for the locals is far outweighed by the damage to the ecology for what 20 jobs. Nonsense. We know and see exactly what this is.. Shame on you, you greedy bastards Todd Wilson 130 Manor Circle Orono, MN 55356

Alphabetical by sender's first name

T. Chandler

44182

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement is Inadequate This mine will result in hundreds of acres of permanent habitat destruction. Important natural resources, from clean ground water to animals such as moose and lynx, will be permanently affected or destroyed. Many costs associated with this project have not been addressed: costs of health effects due to increased pollution in water and air, depressed real estate values (which has already occurred in the area), costs of future perpetual cleanup which will be born by taxpayers (this site will end up as a Superfund site costing billions of dollars), costs of lost influx of revenue (new residents/tax base, tourists), costs of road and other public infrastructure maintenance, costs of abandoned buildings/homes when the mining company stops operations, and all other costs that will be born by taxpayers. These and all other external costs must be calculated and defined in the SDEIS. Air, ground water, and surface water pollution will all occur if sulfide mining is allowed. No state or federal rule or law can prevent it from occurring. No company or government action has ever prevented water contamination from sulfide mines from occurring. No company has ever been able to completely clean up the contamination once it occurs nor is it possible for any company to continue with cleanup for the hundreds of years remediation would take. Once the ground water and surface water contamination starts, it will not be possible to stop it. The SDEIS does not address how contamination will be prevented, nor does it adequately address how clean up of the certain contamination will be handled. The SDEIS provides no details on the impacts to water quality, wildlife, or human health if the water treatment system ceases operations at some time during the 500+ years during which the polluted water is being discharged. The SDEIS does not address how on-site or off-site spills or leaks of fluids, ore and waste materials and other accidents will be handled to prevent contamination. The SDEIS does not adequately address the prevention of air contamination from dust, particulates, emissions from machinery, and emissions from power generating plants. Just one of many examples as to how the SDEIS is inadequate and deceitful has to do with blasting and excavation. The SDEIS states “The NorthMet Project Proposed Action would cause noise, affecting some sensitive receptors. Nearby residences or other permanent sensitive receptors would not be affected, and some wildlife may avoid the area at times.” Yet the SDEIS also states that blasting will occur every 2-3 days. It is clear that sensitive receptors, including wildlife, residents, and tourists will be affected by the blasting and will permanently avoid the area, not just avoid the area “at times.” The SDEIS fails to provide details of how the monitoring and maintenance of pollution prevention measures would be handled for the hundreds of years needed to Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 requires that the site must be maintenance-free at closure, but the PolyMet mining plan calls for at least 500 years of active water treatment. The stockpile covers and liners are not adequate to prevent migration of contaminants to air, surface water, and groundwater. The SDEIS fails to address how the pollution prevention measures would be maintained over the hundreds of years necessary to prevent contamination. Mining companies are notorious for abandoning projects once the ore is extracted, leaving cleanup to the taxpayers. The EPA currently lists 547 non-NPL abandoned mine sites on the CERCLIS list – these are mine sites that have had removal or emergency response cleanup action undertaken on-site. The EPA also lists 117 mining sites proposed for and listed on the NPL as well as mining sites being cleaned up using the Superfund Alternative Approach. These numbers do not include Superfund sites being handled directly by the stat

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tahir Hassan

16211

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

40009

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Tahir Hassan 464 Dogwood Ct NW Saint Michael, MN 55376-1020 (612) 532-0442

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tam McGehee

15894

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to disclose, with objective data, how much water would go where, what pollution levels would be at each pond, sump, waste pile, waste facility or seep, and what actual field experience shows that its plan would meet water quality standards. Minnesota should not be an experiment for untested technologies. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. As a long time resident of Minnesota, I am saddened and frightened by the lax enforcement of environmental standards, and the weakening of our processes for oversight at the state, local, and citizen level. Please do not continue down the path of unsustainable damage to our environment and rape of our lands. Do not approve the PolyMet mine request Sincerely yours, Tamara McGehee Tam McGehee 77 Mid Oaks Lane Roseville, MN 55113

Tamara Few

41864

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tamara Few Burnsville, Minnesota

Tamara L Kaiser

54698

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tami Limberg 45247

Good Evening, Please do not mine for copper sulfides in the BWCA. It is a beautiful, pristine landscape, a treasure of our great state. This type of mining has never been done without pollution and our land cannot take the hit. Yes it would bring in millions of dollars to our state in revenue, but at the expense of one of the last remaining wild places. All of our children and their children need to experience this natural area at least once in their lifetime - do not take that opportunity away. Sincerely, Tami Limberg - Tami Limberg Great River School A2 Science Guide, A1 Occupations Guide

Tammy Ashley 40429

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

Tanner Bailey 43742

To whom it may concern, I believe no mining should be allowed in our National Forests. Please keep the forests in their natural state. Thank you. Tanner Bailey 19476 Halwood Road Glenwood, MN 56334 Tanner J. Bailey Eagle Insurance Agency PO Box 217 Glenwood MN 56334 (P)320-634-5153 (F)320-634-4155
Notice of Confidentiality: The information in this e-mail is confidential and intended only for the use of the person or business named above. Any improper use, disclosure, or copying of this information is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender and delete all copies and attachments to this e-mail.

Tanner Bong 18070

My name is Tanner Bong. I would like to say I live in Duluth, Minnesota, and I work for Northland Constructors. And we're part of a union. And I support the whole mining situation because it will help with the outcome of jobs and people. That's basically all I have to say.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tanner Lucas

20081

Feb 27, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Metals and Teck American projects are listed as "speculative" in Section 6-2-2-1-21 and are not analyzed for their cumulative effects. No evidence or rationale for excluding these projects from the cumulative effects analysis is offered. In Section 6-2-3-6-4, the Gray Wolf is the only "Special Status Species" for which even limited analysis of cumulative effects is conducted, despite the Canada Lynx's status as a federally threatened species. Please take the following actions: 1) Include the Twin Metals and Teck American projects as reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative effects analysis in section 6-2-2, since the disposition of the NorthMet SDEIS and subsequent permitting decisions could make these projects more likely to be built. 2) Include the Canada Lynx as a "Special Status Species" in Section 6-2-3-6-4 and conduct a cumulative effects analysis of the impact on Canada Lynx. 3) Analyze and include mitigations such as tunnels and fencing to limit the possibility of incidental take of Canada Lynx by increased road traffic associated with the NorthMet proposed action. 4) Remove contradictory language in SDEIS about Canada Lynx utilization of roads as travel corridors. For example, on p. 5-628 the SDEIS states "Lynx utilize snow packed trails and roads as travel corridors," while on p. 5-366 it says "this species does not rely on roads for travel." 5) Analyze and include mitigation such as accelerated re-vegetation of the mine site after closure to decrease the amount of time the mine site would be inhospitable to Canada Lynx. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. We need to learn to share do not destroy my back country Sincerely, Mr Tanner Lucas 3070 202nd Ln NW Oak Grove, MN 55011-5011

Tanya Bachmann

54563

Please, please, please do NOT approve SDEIS! As a mother, daughter, and grand daughter I am VERY concerned about PolyMet's proposal and the impact on Minnesota's water, Minnesota's environment, and Minnesota's citizens/guests for years and years to come! DO NOT TRUST their proposal!! Our water will not remain safe, clean or maintenance free! As a taxpayer of this great state I beg of you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tanya Beyer

17137

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. Here below are my own words on the proposal: Last night my friend and I went to the hearing in Duluth, a first of three around Minnesota, about the proposal to let a big mining conglomerate, Polymet, leak sulfuric acid and a mess of other toxic overflow into the Lake Superior watershed in order to get at the copper, nickel, platinum and other mineral wealth that underlies this area our hearts draw sustenance from. She said we were witnessing a piece of history. It's left me with the same feeling I think I remember from when I first heard on TV that people are warming up earth's climate, or when as a girl I first heard my dad say the builders were coming sooner or later to put apartments in the pasture. Selfish, said one of the men who testified at the hearing last night, critiquing the motive of everybody taking a stand on whichever side of the debate, but I mostly disagree; I think everyone who takes a stand in a public controversy feels like a representative for some group of others who aren't vocal or privileged enough to be there. The others can be people or they can be manifold living things with whom we don't share a language. The non-profit organization WaterLegacy in a brief emailed review of the hearing pointed out that about two thirds of the testimony given was from opponents of the mine, and that while many opponents cited specific flaws or gaps in Polymet's supplemental draft environmental impact statement, the supporters just called on their faith or intuition that the review, the future mining technology or the industry in its great professionalism could be trusted. I was glad of the evidence that somebody else had been keeping track of opinions for and against the project, since I had been keeping my own tally on paper during the testimonies my friend and I heard from about 7 p.m. till nearly 10:00- For most of the evening I found that the opponents led by nearly two to one, but as the room emptied it seemed more and more the boosters for local mining were the people remaining. At the crux of the proposed mining scheme is that the various metals termed sulfides, including copper, gold, nickel and platinum become toxic, turning to sulfuric acid, when exposed to air and water after being dug from the open pit mines. I say mines because Polymet's proposed mine located near the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers, which would wash the pollution into the St Louis River and thence Lake Superior, is not the only proposed sulfide mine. Twin Metals is a joint venture between a Canadian and a Chilean company that wants to dig another mine barely three miles from the Boundary Waters Canoe Area near Ely, Minnesota. Yet-to-be-named venture capitalists are and will be watching. To them, sulfuric acid is a risk factor, an abstract liability in a bright-eyed betting game. Not vinyl, not clay, not metal set in the ground to hold the drainage in storage ponds or divert run-off from towering piles of dug-up rock, wood rubble and dried-out peat will keep the acid waste water from where we don't want it to go. The soils are largely sand and peat, boulder and gravel. The questions are when, how soon and how much effluent will make its way where-all and how far. No company, whatever formal arrangements it puts on record, will retain squadrons of river guardians or pit watch personnel past its own dissolution, or past all caring once the blue coldwater lakes of legend or the fishing streams are discolored or pretty well devoid of healthy aquatic life. Arguments made by citizens in favor of mining are that we need the copper that the region has, that no other mining region of the world has the robust environmental oversight found among Minnesota agen

48954

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. My whole life has been a love affair with this region. I cherish its spectrum of birds and wildlife, including fish, none yet driven to extinction. Also I use its fish for food in summer. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. There is every assurance that despite all promises and prescriptions they will here too. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health. This whole region is underlain by percolating water which will begin to run with soluble metals including mercury, getting into lakes, marshes and rivers, harming wildlife scarce already including the threatened lynx and our declining moose populations. The Polymet scheme is a rich corporate affair that in no way benefits anyone except those who measure well-being in dollars. A hoax is being perpetrated on the job-poor promising them work at the expense of everything else in the region. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Tanya Beyer 10431 Bachelor Square Rd Meadowlands, MN 55765-8103 (218) 260-6767

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tanya Beyer

51037

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. Here below are my own words on the proposal: Last night my friend and I went to the hearing in Duluth, a first of three around Minnesota, about the proposal to let a big mining conglomerate, Polymet, leak sulfuric acid and a mess of other toxic overflow into the Lake Superior watershed in order to get at the copper, nickel, platinum and other mineral wealth that underlies this area our hearts draw sustenance from. She said we were witnessing a piece of history. It's left me with the same feeling I think I remember from when I first heard on TV that people are warming up earth's climate, or when as a girl I first heard my dad say the builders were coming sooner or later to put apartments in the pasture. Selfish, said one of the men who testified at the hearing last night, critiquing the motive of everybody taking a stand on whichever side of the debate, but I mostly disagree; I think everyone who takes a stand in a public controversy feels like a representative for some group of others who aren't vocal or privileged enough to be there. The others can be people or they can be manifold living things with whom we don't share a language. The non-profit organization WaterLegacy in a brief emailed review of the hearing pointed out that about two thirds of the testimony given was from opponents of the mine, and that while many opponents cited specific flaws or gaps in Polymet's supplemental draft environmental impact statement, the supporters just called on their faith or intuition that the review, the future mining technology or the industry in its great professionalism could be trusted. I was glad of the evidence that somebody else had been keeping track of opinions for and against the project, since I had been keeping my own tally on paper during the testimonies my friend and I heard from about 7 p.m. till nearly 10:00- For most of the evening I found that the opponents led by nearly two to one, but as the room emptied it seemed more and more the boosters for local mining were the people remaining. At the crux of the proposed mining scheme is that the various metals termed sulfides, including copper, gold, nickel and platinum become toxic, turning to sulfuric acid, when exposed to air and water after being dug from the open pit mines. I say mines because Polymet's proposed mine located near the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers, which would wash the pollution into the St Louis River and thence Lake Superior, is not the only proposed sulfide mine. Twin Metals is a joint venture between a Canadian and a Chilean company that wants to dig another mine barely three miles from the Boundary Waters Canoe Area near Ely, Minnesota. Yet-to-be-named venture capitalists are and will be watching. To them, sulfuric acid is a risk factor, an abstract liability in a bright-eyed betting game. Not vinyl, not clay, not metal set in the ground to hold the drainage in storage ponds or divert run-off from towering piles of dug-up rock, wood rubble and dried-out peat will keep the acid waste water from where we don't want it to go. The soils are largely sand and peat, boulder and gravel. The questions are when, how soon and how much effluent will make its way where-all and how far. No company, whatever formal arrangements it puts on record, will retain squadrons of river guardians or pit watch personnel past its own dissolution, or past all caring once the blue coldwater lakes of legend or the fishing streams are discolored or pretty well devoid of healthy aquatic life. Arguments made by citizens in favor of mining are that we need the copper that the region has, that no other mining region of the world has the robust environmental oversight found among Minnesota agencies and that

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tanya Koester-Radmann

39764

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Tara Skar

54537

The Boundary Waters and the surrounding National Park/Forests are more than important tourist attractions and recreation areas—they are historically and culturally integral to Minnesota's identity. Our solution to low employment can't infringe on future generations' environmental health.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tara Westerlund

48203

25 people recently add their names to Students Against Sulfide Mining 's petition "HYPERLINK "http://www.change-org/petitions/lisa-fay-tell-the-dnr-you-think-polymet-sulfide-mining-is-a-bad-deal-for-minnesota/responses/new.response=d218e047517bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=one_thousand"Lisa Fay: Tell the DNR you think PolyMet Sulfide Mining is a bad deal for Minnesota.". That means more than 500 people have signed on. There are now 325 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Students Against Sulfide Mining by clicking here: HYPERLINK "http://www.change-org/petitions/lisa-fay-tell-the-dnr-you-think-polymet-sulfide-mining-is-a-bad-deal-for-minnesota/responses/new.response=d218e047517bandutm_source=targetandutm_medium=emailandutm_campaign=one_thousand"http://www.change-org/petitions/lisa-fay-tell-the-dnr-you-think-polymet-sulfide-mining-is-a-bad-deal-for-minnesota/responses/new.response=d218e047517b Dear Lisa Fay, Polymet's plan acknowledges that millions of gallons of polluted water will seep into the environment untreated, and the water they contain will need active treatment for hundreds of years. Polymet does not have a plan for mediating environmental disasters if they occur. Polymet's primary investors have a long history of environmental destruction and failure to clean up messes such as the BP oil spill. If any contaminated water is released (which Polymet acknowledges will occur), the wild rice crop will see severe negative effects. Wild rice is a cultural and economic staple to many native communities in Northern Minnesota. The majority of profits will not remain in the state of Minnesota, and Polymet provides insufficient details as to financial assurance needed to protect taxpayers in the future. Its not worth the risks, Poly-Met sulfide mining as currently planned should not occur in Minnesota. Minnesota's young people want a clean and vibrant future void of pollution. The youth say no to sulfide mining. Sincerely, 325- Tara Westerlund Andover, Minnesota 324- Rachel Eckert Flagstaff, Arizona 323- Michael Engler Morris, Minnesota 322- Alyssa Powell Chicago Heights, Illinois 321- Sidney Paulson morris, Minnesota 320- Jack Jepsen-DeSpiegelaere Saint Paul, Minnesota 319- Jared Jerzak Cedar, Minnesota 318- Elise Moonen Minneapolis, Minnesota 317- Kayla Kampa Foley, Minnesota 316- Patrick Walsh Montevideo, Minnesota 315- Peter Kvale Duluth, Minnesota 315- Alice Barnett Wildwood, Florida 314- Tiernan Lenus Mpls, Minnesota 313- bonnie betts morris, Minnesota 312- Amber Compo Morris, Minnesota 310- Trey Goodsell Morris, Minnesota 309- Adele Subola Minneapolis, Minnesota 308- Kennedy Erdmann Rosemount, Minnesota 307- Hannah Goemann Morris, Minnesota 306- Amy Lamb Bloomington MN, Minnesota 305- Maddy Lerner Saint Paul, Minnesota 304- Hazen Fairbanks Bemidji, Minnesota 303- Ross Penning Harrisburg, South Dakota 302- daniel mielke stillwater, Minnesota 301- William White Morris, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Ted Heller 47702

1- We use many products using copper/nickel 2- MN has deposits of copper/nickel 3- MN has a reputation for environmental integrity and oversight Unless you want to ban copper/nickel products in the state, MN needs to live up to it's responsibility to responsibly mine these minerals. It is hypocritical to use these products but declare it is unsafe to mine them. MN can do this better and safer than probably most states/countries in the world. I support the project with rigorous oversight applied. Ted Heller 1021 7th St S Waite Park Mn 56387

Ted Mattison 38954

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Ted Mattison 95006 Grassy Pt Tower, MN 55790-8470

Ted Mattson 23911

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Isn't it time we humans started thinking about the earth. Fresh water and topsoil give us life. Without them, humans would cease to exist All the money in the world will not bring them back. There has NEVER in history been a "safe" sulfide mining operation. Do us all a favor and find 10 mines whose operations were successful ten years after they closed up. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Ted Mattson N10794 Karnopp Road Wausaukee, WI 54177 Sincerely, Ted Mattson N10794 Karnopp Rd Wausaukee, WI 54177-9109

Ted Wahl 44589

As a young youth in Minnesota, building a mine close to the boundary waters that's only providing 50-100 jobs for the economy, is NOT worth the 500 years of clean up. I hope the DNR makes the right choice Thank you for your time. Ted Sent from my iPod

Alphabetical by sender's first name

tegwin moye

19088

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, tegwin moye 3310 69th st e inver grove heights, MN 55076 6515527148

Terence H Cooper

42710

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Teresa / Aaron Alto

45519

Name: Teresa Alto Legal mailing address: 21995 Mishawaka Rd, Grand Rapids, MN 55744 I felt it was important to write as a resident of the Iron Range who feels we must go only slowly, cautiously, and skeptically into copper and nickel mining in our region-if at all. It seems almost criminally shortsighted to go into a mining project forecasted to operate and provide jobs and extract resources for just 20 years and that requires a period of cleanup too long to adequately plan for. The mining of these metal resources threatens another resource: water and clean and healthy watersheds and watershed ecosystems, which are truly becoming scarce and invaluable globally. Not only should it cause us grave concern that the company has provided no information on its methodology and no explanation of its estimated projected costs, but it is patently impossible to plan for 500 years of cleanup, no matter how much funding the company puts aside as financial assurance. Five hundred years ago there was no United States, nor was there any significant European settlement in the Americas; democratic government did not exist in any developed society, and the population of the world was a tiny fraction of what it is now. How can we plan for continued cleanup for the next 200 years on some parts of the mining area and for 300 more years after that on other parts. Already, we know that aquifers and freshwater worldwide are dwindling and cannot meet the projected growth in demand. How can we know how that will affect governments and water resources even 100 years in the future. How can we know that we will have a stable economy and national government for all this time. And yet the rivers and lakes and land will still be here, and animals and plants and forests will still be here, and we hope that people will still be here. The land has a moral claim on our actions, and so do future people and the world they will inherit from us. Northern Minnesotans want economic opportunity and stability, but we also want to be able to fish and hunt and canoe and ski and enjoy the outdoors. People here have a strong culture of living in part off the land, and a strong culture of valuing the recreation, bounty, solace, and beauty of the land and water around us. It is the land and sense of community that make people want to stay here and to move here. The beauty and outdoors recreation are key to the economic and social vitality of our communities. And they are one of the most significant contributors to our economies through tourism and related industries. So this is not a "jobs v. the environment" issue, and I certainly do not believe the "jobs and the environment" image touted by Polymet. We are talking about short-term jobs, so the jobs are not offering long-term vitality to our communities. And we are talking about a necessary cleanup—according to the company's own materials—required for too long for human companies or governments to plan for or fund. The unknowns are impossible to account for. I am adamantly opposed to the Polymet mining project.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Teresa Bredahl

16249

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

teresa haskell

40337

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, teresa haskell 3800 14th ave D168 lacey, WA 98501 US

terra forshier

42079

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, terra forshier Minneapolis, Minnesota

Terrell Brown

57945

The idea that we would allow a project that may require 500 years of remediation is crazy. There is no way to guarantee that the money will be available in even 100 years or project what the costs may be at that time. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Terrence and Marge Smith

57200

We have 4 grandchildren, and our vision for them is clean waters, clean air, and land. We oppose sulfide mining for the dangers it presents on so many levels. Please Protect! Terrence & Marge Smith 1428 Belmont Rd Duluth, MN 55805

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terri Fogarty

52224

PLEASE SAY NO to the proposed land exchange by the US Forest Service (USFS) with PolyMet for 6,650 acres of federal public land within the Superior National Forest to private ownership for the development of a copper-nickel sulfide strip mine. Protect our natural resources - not their pocketbooks .. There is NO price you can put on our natural resources. Please do this for us and for our children and our children's children. Do the right thing. Terri Fogarty 13712 Anderson Lakes Parkway Eden Prairie, MN 55344

Terri Murphy

41918

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Terri Murphy Harmony, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terri Reischl

16127

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Terry

38473

Polymet mining will provide a much needed economic boost for northern Minnesota lasting many years. As long as Polymet can prevent permanent damage to our lakes and streams, Polymet should be given the right to mine.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Cooper

19067

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Terence H. Cooper Terry Cooper 2744 Cedar Lake Road Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry D Welander

6074

Regarding: Big Picture considerations and actions for immediate permits issuances for the Northmet/PolyMet East Iron Range Minnesota Project and all others similar. With over 1200 active volcanoes on Earth and over 25,000 miles of ocean volcanic rift emissions, all of humanities emissions are less than 1% of Earth nature's emissions. From Wikipedia on line, probably any encyclopedia and google search under "ocean rift volcanism", first two pages of 20 plus below. It is beyond foolish and extremely wasteful to remove toxins from industrial or any other human process unless they are a direct health threat. Or trying to clean or clean up 1% of any problem will not and can not clean up the remaining unrelated 99% natural pollution; leaving nature's 99% pollution still there causing the same problems. The EPA and the MPCA have now wasted over 8 years of study on a less than minuscule part of the less than 1% human part of the problem. This is fraud by any definition. Fortunately for these obstructionists, they will all likely be dead from old age before government agencies will be able to prosecute this fraud. But worse, future generations will look at this incredible foolishness and obstructionism with at least great disdain, probably outright contempt for acting so outside the law, or not accounting for the above reality in decision making. I urge all organizations everywhere to bring these facts out everywhere possible to help stop the foolishness and the fraud in air and water pollution control. Because nature is the 99% problem, except for direct health threats, humanity's pollution will never be an issue compared to the 99% pollution output of nature. Please urge everyone to demand the necessary permits for the Northmet/Polymet Project be issued immediately to put a stop to this environmental fraud and farce obstructing the Northmet/Polymet Project in Northeastern Minnesota and others. Open circulation of this letter and submission to the environmental reviewers is strongly urged to put a stop to this criminal obstructionism of the Polymet Project and others. Terry D. Welander 2 West Parkway Virginia, MN 55792 email: HYPERLINK "mailto:tdwelder@gmail-com"tdwelder@gmail-com Google Search below on "ocean rift volcanism", 2 pages below of over 20 available; for everyone's reference in support of the above letter. PS Snowfall in this area and other areas on Earth has around 50 parts per billion Mercury. Or after a dozen or so snowfalls, particularly during snow melt, the amount of natural Mercury can approach toxic levels for humans and animals. Why any consideration of human Mercury sources is irrelevant to the point of fraud. Rainfall in this area and other areas on Earth is around 25 parts per billion Mercury. Or after a rainfall season, natural Mercury levels can approach toxic levels for humans and animals depending on distribution. Also why any consideration of human Mercury sources is irrelevant to the point of fraud in nearly all instances. And with all the volcanic sourced atmospheric toxins raining down on the planet downwind from all volcanic eruptions, any human sources are almost always less than insignificant. Or in practically all instances, human sources of pollution are irrelevant compared to nature. HYPERLINK "http://www.elmhurStedu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf"Plate Tectonics HYPERLINK "http://www.elmhurStedu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf"www.elmhurStedu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf. http://www.google-com/search.client=safariandrls=enandq=oceanic+rift+volcanismandie=UTF-8andoe=UTF-8# http://webcache.googleusercontent-com/search.q=cache:4Rcwsa_1jecJ:www.elmhurStedu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf+oceanic+rift+volcanismandcd=1andhl=enandct=clnkandgl=usandclient=safari http://www.google-com/search.client=safariandrls=enandq=related:www.elmhurStedu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf+oceanic+r

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry D Welander

9605

NorthMet SDEIS The US Corps of Engineers jurisdiction is limited to commercially navigable waters. The closest being the Duluth docks and harbor 60 miles away from the project. Or the US Corps of Engineers does not and has never had jurisdiction on this project. The US Army Corps of Engineers needs to remove themselves on jurisdiction and other grounds as necessary. A completely acceptable mining and refining plan was in place before the MN DNR became involved in the Polymet project. And the MN DNR, not being or having pollution jurisdiction should not be involved in the Polymet permitting. Any land swaps must be treated separately, the sole reason the MN DNR would be involved; and at the sole convenience of Polymet. The MN DNR needs to remove themselves from this project permitting. Only the MPCA should be involved and should immediately issue permits based on the 99% pollution sources on the planet being the 1500 active volcanoes and their beyond huge emissions affecting practically all air on Earth. Nothing in the Polymet process even registers on the total pollution rained on the planet from these 1500 active volcanoes. Since the big picture and most relevant pollution problem of the 1500 active volcanoes on Earth have been ignored to date by this highly erroneous review process, the only realistic alternative is immediate issuance of the Polymet permits by the MPCA; all other entities not having any jurisdiction due to pollution considerations being the only relevancy for this project. Snow fall in NE MN and other places has 50 parts per billion Mercury; most likely from all those 1500 natural volcanic emissions. Or after a dozen or so snow falls and some snow melt, nature provides a nearly toxic environment making nearly everything humanity does irrelevant and less than miniscule on any total and big picture measure of pollution. A variety of other volcanic toxins precipitate out of the atmosphere during snowfall and rain further negating any consideration of the less than miniscule contribution of humanity to any pollution. Stop the foolishness and irrelevancies of humanities less than miniscule pollution emissions compared to nature now, now, now, not later, to keep future generations from viewing this process and the people involved in it with utter contempt for being so selectively biased and blind not considering the 99% natural Earth pollution problem silently and hiddenly causing death and destruction everywhere. Based on nature being the 99% pollution problem as detailed above, all government agencies except the MPCA need to remove themselves from this review process immediately. And the MPCA needs to issue the necessary permits for the Polymet project immediately. Terry D. Welander email: [HYPERLINK "mailto:tdwelder@gmail-com"](mailto:tdwelder@gmail-com)tdwelder@gmail-com 2 West Parkway Virginia, MN 55792 PS Google Search below on " Earth Volcanism", 2 pages below of over 20 available; for everyone's reference in support of the above letter. [HYPERLINK "http://www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf"](http://www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf)Plate Tectonics [HYPERLINK "http://www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf"](http://www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf) www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf. <http://www.google-com/search.client=safariandrls=enandq=oceanic+rift+volcanismandie=UTF-8andoe=UTF-8#> http://webcache.googleusercontent-com/search.q=cache:4Rcwsa_1jecJ:www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf+oceanic+rift+volcanismandcd=1andhl=enandct=clnkandgl=usandclient=safari <http://www.google-com/search.client=safariandrls=enandq=related:www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/102/Lectures/PlateTectonicsII.pdf+oceanic+rift+volcanismandtbo=1andsa=Xandei=g9LNUvTDDeHOyAH2hIDYcQandved=0CC8QHzAA> Volcanoes tend to erupt at plate margins as a result of a process "Hot Spot"Volcanism . Mid-oceanic ridge (rift zone) with basaltic pillow lava volcanoes. [HYPERLINK "http://academic.emporia-edu/aberjame/student/june3/767june.html"](http://academic.emporia-edu/aberjame/student/june3/767june.html)Rift Zones - Emporia State University [HYPERLINK](#)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry D Welander

14793

Negation and Refutation of the suggested Bonding Requirements for the Proposed Polymet/Northmet Hoyt Lakes Copper Nickel Project. Where is the accounting of the emissions from the 1500 volcanoes dropping toxins everywhere downwind (which is nearly everywhere on Earth) and on the surface in NE MN in particular. It has not been provided and is 99% source of the surface toxins problem coupled to natural daylighted (surface exposed) ore toxins. Where is the accounting of the emissions from the daylighted natural ore bodies in numerous locations in NE MN. It has not been provided and is part of the 99% surface toxins, particularly nitrates; and practically all other toxins of the periodic table of elements. Or nature or natural pollution is the 99% problem negating the need for bonding of any human projects. Nature has and will clean up all of human pollution problems over geologic time; as nature has cleaned up its own environmental messes over time. Also why bonding of humanities projects is not required. The deliberate ignoring of the 99% plus natural pollution problem from nature by supposed environmental groups is criminal negligence and needs to be exposed as high negligence of reality and needs to be set aside from consideration for ignoring the 99% natural Earth pollution problems in the Polymet/Northmet NE MN Copper Nickel project and all similar. Additionally; copper is a sanitizing (anti bacterial and anti viral) agent for all of the animal and plant kingdoms Or limited copper exposure as nature provides is a cleansing agent for all of the animal and plant kingdoms is highly desirable. Mimicking nature by adding limited amounts of copper to the environment will make it a better environment for plants and animals. There is currently no nickel mine in North America. Providing nickel production in North America is a national security requirement negating practically all of the environmental concerns. Nickel is a civilized world necessity from food tin can linings to any machine requiring heat resistance. Modern humanity can not live without a supply of nickel. Immediate issuance of the necessary permits by the MPCA to Polymet is urged in the strongest possible terms to make this review lawful and avoid formal criminal court complaint from local governments for the deliberate ignoring of nature's 99% pollution reality. Terry D. Welander 2 West Parkway Virginia, MN 55792 --- Forwarded message --- From: Terry D Welander Date: Wed, Jan 29, 2014 at 11:40 AM Subject: Additional Details on the Followup Plan on the Big Picture Support of the PolyMet East Iron Range Minnesota Project and all others similar- Urging immediate permit issuance by the MPCA and removal of all other government agencies from this process as detailed below To: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us NorthMet SDEIS The US Corps of Engineers jurisdiction is limited to commercially navigable waters. The closest being the Duluth docks and harbor 60 miles away from the project. Or the US Corps of Engineers does not and has never had jurisdiction on this project. The US Army Corps of Engineers needs to remove themselves on jurisdiction and other grounds as necessary. A completely acceptable mining and refining plan was in place before the MN DNR became involved in the Polymet project. And the MN DNR, not being or having pollution jurisdiction should not be involved in the Polymet permitting. Any land swaps must be treated separately, the sole reason the MN DNR would be involved; and at the sole convenience of Polymet. The MN DNR needs to remove themselves from this project permitting. Only the MPCA should be involved and should immediately issue permits based on the 99% pollution sources on the planet being the 1500 active volcanoes and their beyond huge emissions affecting practically all air on Earth. Nothing in the Polymet process even registers on the total pollution rained on the planet from these 1500 active volcanoes. S

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Ford

9776

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Terry Ford 3404 Aldrich AveS. Minneapolis, MN 55408

18589

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Terry Ford 3404 Aldrich AveS. Minneapolis, MN 55408

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Ford

50665

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Terry Ford 3404 Aldrich AveS. Minneapolis, MN 55408

Terry Houle

42618

See attachment

42970

Please accept these written comments into the recoRd Terry Houle [HYPERLINK "mailto:terry99@gmail-com"](mailto:terry99@gmail-com)terry99@gmail-com 952-686-1493 Blog; <http://greenmanonearth.blogspot-com> <http://www.flickr-com/photos/119608607@N06/>

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Houle

43622

Mar 13, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. -This project is a violation of section 404c under the Clean Water Act and should not be allowed. 2-As taxpayer, voter and resident I do not want any land trade. The US Forest Service should not swap any land. 3-DNR Commissioner Landwehr comments about the SDEIS comment process I believe have tainted the entire SDEIS process and unduly influenced people. 4-Minnesota Superfund Sites in St Louis County are already numerous. To add more potential risk to a sensitive area in not acceptable. Sites in St Louis County listed below: SR67ARROWHEAD REFINERY CO.Refinery SR370Boyer LumberOther SR381Bulinski Point - WittrupSolvent Site SR1238 DNR-NETT LAKE/ORR PESTICIDE SITE SR367DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE - MANG Military Munitions Response Prog. 5 OusOther SR95DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU1Military Base SR260DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU10Military Base SR321DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU12Military Base SR267DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU20Military Base SR269DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU23Military Base SR270DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU24Military Base SR271DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU26Military Base SR320DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU27Military Base SR354DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU28 - BUILDING 500, JET FUEL RELEASEMilitary Base SR255DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU5Military Base SR256DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU6Military Base SR258DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU8Military Base SR259DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU9Military Base SR252DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 2 - MANG fire training PFCsMilitary Base SR366DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 21 - MANG TCE Plume (OU31)Other SR355DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 29 - (FUDS)Site 102 TCE PlumeMilitary Base SR253DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 3 - DPDO Storage AreaMilitary Base SR356DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 30 - (FUDS)Former Solvent Wash Rack and Fueling AreaMilitary Base SR368DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 32 - MANG AOC CMilitary Base SR254DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 4 - MANG Tank FarmMilitary Base SR257DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 7 - (FUDS) TCE PlumeMilitary Base SR93DULUTH CITY DUMP FORMER #1Dump (Unpermitted) SR161EAST MESABA SANITARY LANDFILL Landfill SR1137ELY MUNICIPAL LIGHT AND WATER DEPARTMENTOther SR1006GULF OIL CO EXPLOSIVES DIVChem Mfg. SR361Hibbing Gas Manufacturing Plant SiteMfg. Gas Plant SR1037HYMAN MICHAELS COREcycling/Salvage SR1021KOTULA IRON and METAL (SF)Recycling/Salvage SR158NORTHWOODS SANITARY LANDFILL Landfill SR350Peter Pan (SF)Dry Cleaner SR1271PROCTOR CAR SHOP Railroad SR1328PROCTOR LOCOMOTIVE SHOP Railroad SR347RIVERSIDE SALVAGE (SF)Motor Veh. Salvage SR345Sargent Creek DumpDump (Unpermitted) SR371St Louis River AOC/Corps of Engineers DuluthOther SR275St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-A SoilsOther Mfg. SR327St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-E Coke Oven Gas LinesOther Mfg. SR273St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-J,I,L,M Steel CreekOther Mfg. SR274St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-K Dr SpoilsOther Mfg. SR190St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-PandOUQ Wire Mill PondOther Mfg. SR272St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-RMN SedimentsOther Mfg. SR276St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL Site WideOther Mfg. SR149St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU Sed (Sediment and Ground Water)Other SR284St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU-S (Soil)Mfg. Gas Plant SR283St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU-TS (Tar Seep)Mfg. Gas Plant SR179West Duluth Industrial SiteOther SR154WLSSD LANDFILL/ DULUTH DUMP #2Landfill 5-The St Louis River Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Report published in March 2013 stated: "However, historic and current land use changes throughout the watershed have proven to be damaging to the many lakes, rivers and streams within the St Louis River watershed." Therefore already a fragile area with a proximity to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and with all the uncertainties on copper nickel mining that may leave pollution for hundreds of ye

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Houle

48490

Mar 13, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. -This project is a violation of section 404c under the Clean Water Act and should not be allowed. 2-As taxpayer, voter and resident I do not want any land trade. The US Forest Service should not swap any land. 3-DNR Commissioner Landwehr comments about the SDEIS comment process I believe have tainted the entire SDEIS process and unduly influenced people. 4-Minnesota Superfund Sites in St Louis County are already numerous. To add more potential risk to a sensitive area in not acceptable. Sites in St Louis County listed below: SR67 ARROWHEAD REFINERY CO. Refinery SR370 Boyer Lumber Other SR381 Bulinski Point - Witttrup Solvent Site SR1238 DNR-NETT LAKE/ORR PESTICIDE SITE SR367 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE - MANG Military Munitions Response Prog. 5 Ous Other SR95 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU1 Military Base SR260 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU10 Military Base SR321 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU12 Military Base SR267 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU20 Military Base SR269 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU23 Military Base SR270 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU24 Military Base SR271 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU26 Military Base SR320 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU27 Military Base SR354 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU28 - BUILDING 500, JET FUEL RELEASE Military Base SR255 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU5 Military Base SR256 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU6 Military Base SR258 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU8 Military Base SR259 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE OU9 Military Base SR252 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 2 - MANG fire training PFCs Military Base SR366 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 21 - MANG TCE Plume (OU31) Other SR355 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 29 - (FUDS)Site 102 TCE Plume Military Base SR253 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 3 - DPDO Storage Area Military Base SR356 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 30 - (FUDS)Former Solvent Wash Rack and Fueling Area Military Base SR368 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 32 - MANG AOC C Military Base SR254 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 4 - MANG Tank Farm Military Base SR257 DULUTH AIR FORCE BASE Site 7 - (FUDS) TCE Plume Military Base SR93 DULUTH CITY DUMP FORMER #1 Dump (Unpermitted) SR161 EAST MESABA SANITARY LANDFILL Landfill SR1137 ELY MUNICIPAL LIGHT AND WATER DEPARTMENT Other SR1006 GULF OIL CO EXPLOSIVES DIV Chem Mfg. SR361 Hibbing Gas Manufacturing Plant Site Mfg. Gas Plant SR1037 HYMAN MICHAELS CO Recycling/Salvage SR1021 KOTULA IRON and METAL (SF) Recycling/Salvage SR158 NORTHWOODS SANITARY LANDFILL Landfill SR350 Peter Pan (SF) Dry Cleaner SR1271 PROCTOR CAR SHOP Railroad SR1328 PROCTOR LOCOMOTIVE SHOP Railroad SR347 RIVERSIDE SALVAGE (SF) Motor Veh. Salvage SR345 Sargent Creek Dump Dump (Unpermitted) SR371 St Louis River AOC/Corps of Engineers Duluth Other SR275 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-A Soils Other Mfg. SR327 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-E Coke Oven Gas Lines Other Mfg. SR273 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-J,I,L,M Steel Creek Other Mfg. SR274 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-K Dr Spoils Other Mfg. SR190 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-PandOUQ Wire Mill Pond Other Mfg. SR272 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL OU-RMN Sediments Other Mfg. SR276 St LOUIS RIVER/US STEEL Site Wide Other Mfg. SR149 St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU Sed (Sediment and Ground Water) Other SR284 St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU-S (Soil) Mfg. Gas Plant SR283 St LOUIS/INTERLAKE/DULUTH/TAR SITE - OU-TS (Tar Seep) Mfg. Gas Plant SR179 West Duluth Industrial Site Other SR154 WLSSD LANDFILL/ DULUTH DUMP #2 Landfill 5-The St Louis River Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Report published in March 2013 stated: "However, historic and current land use changes throughout the watershed have proven to be damaging to the many lakes, rivers and streams within the St Louis River watershed." Therefore already a fragile area with a proximity to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and with all the uncertainties on copper nickel mining that may leave pollution for hundreds of ye

Terry Illegible

58110

This seems like a short-sighted project that could be very detrimental for our environment. There does not seem to be a reasonable plan for all the harm that could ensure. No one will be responsible for 500 years. This is not a reasonable or practical or responsible proposal. I would vote no until the company can find a way to mine without producing pollutants.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry J. Williams

10064

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Based on my reading, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my conclusion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on accepted science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its optimistic predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real base flow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Base flow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Terry J. Williams 4170 Brigadoon Drive 4170 Brigaoon Drive, Shoreview, MN 55126 Shoreview, MN 55126

18808

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Based on my reading, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my conclusion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on accepted science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its optimistic predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real base flow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Base flow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Terry J. Williams 4170 Brigadoon Drive 4170 Brigaoon Drive, Shoreview, MN 55126 Shoreview, MN 55126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry J. Williams

50882

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. Based on my reading, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my conclusion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on accepted science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its optimistic predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real base flow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Base flow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone using a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Terry J. Williams 4170 Brigadoon Drive 4170 Brigadoon Drive, Shoreview, MN 55126 Shoreview, MN 55126

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry J. Williams

51294

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The proposed Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement [SDEIS] does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights:

- Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines.
- Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes.
- Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected:

- The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands.
- The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense.
- The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lyn

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Miller

21890

To All Concerned: I am a small-business owner of a family-owned company in Hibbing that has been in existence for 50+ years, and am writing to you to comment on the SDEIS for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. We are impressed with the great deal of depth contained in the completed study and are convinced it shows the safety and viability of the project. We also believe that the future of Northeastern Minnesota and those of us who choose to live and work here need this project to be allowed to go ahead in order to secure our future viability, as long as reasonable environmental safeguards are met. I am concerned that some media have misconstrued the data regarding the groundwater flow model, giving the general public the impression that the 200 to 500 year figures indicate that the project will still need expensive treatment 500 years from now. On the contrary, the thorough study indicates the extremely slow rate of travel that the water will filter down through the bedrock, and that water quality standards will still be met even that far out on the timeline. We are blessed with a rich deposit of minerals in northern Minnesota, and the minerals that would be mined by PolyMet are and will be in high demand by the world's economy. Let's not squander the opportunity to be the suppliers of these precious resources that will also bring to our state so many new jobs (360 full-time and 600+ related) and considerable added revenue for the State of Minnesota. Because of stringent oversight and federal and state regulations of our environment in Minnesota, as demonstrated by the thoroughness of this study, we in Northeastern Minnesota can produce and supply these needed resources in a much safer and more environmentally friendly way than anyone else in the world. PolyMet and companies like them that comply with all state and federal regulations should be granted the necessary permits to conduct their operations in our state. My review of the EIS and the great amount of detail included within it tells me that you have thoroughly evaluated this potential project and its impact, and I strongly urge you to permit this project to go ahead. Sincerely, Terry Miller
cid:542390115@02102013-2AD6 1723 First Ave – PO Box 544 Hibbing, MN 55746 tel: 218-263-8958 fax: 218-263-8583 cell: 218-969-0949 HYPERLINK "mailto:tmiller@bmillerproducts-com"tmiller@bmillerproducts-com HYPERLINK "http://www.bmillerproducts-com/"www.bmillerproducts-com

Terry Nevalainen

21992

To Whom It May Concern: After reviewing the SDEIS and visiting the Polymet site, a former mining site, I support the regulatory process in approving the Permits necessary for Polymet to begin operations in the State of Minnesota. Further negativity from the opposition is unfounded. Polymet has more than answered all questions asked of them and addressed all regulatory requirements. Why should Polymet be further subjected to previously addressed issues and unfounded opinions. It is time the MNDNR, EPA, MNEPA and the USACOE move forward and provide Polymet with its needed "Permits to Operate". Allowing Polymet to operate will definitely help the local, state and federal governments fund further projects and aid with financial support from Polymet and local businesses through taxes created from the employment of the public. At this time in our age we need all the employment help we can get. PLEASE, ALLOW POLYMET TO HELP US HELP OURSELVES. Terry Nevalainen Civil Engineer 217 NW 10th St Chisholm, MN

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Olsen

40759

---Original Message--- From: archtttmo@hotmail-com [mailto:archtttmo@hotmail-com] Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 10:30 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet's SDEIS is poorly planned and needs to go back to the drawing board Dear Ms Fay: The PolyMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is fatally flawed . We should not burden future generations with toxic water pollution and cleanup costs from a sulfide mine. Once our sacred and natural Minnesota lakes, rivers and aquifers are polluted from a toxic spill, there is no way to ever recover what we lost PolyMet would operate for 20 years but, according to PolyMet.s own data, would pollute water for over 500 years at the tailings basin, and over 200 years at the mine pit. The modeling results provided in the SDEIS show that PolyMet and the DNR did not look beyond 500 years. The SDEIS does not say when the mine pit and tailings basin will stop polluting our water. This is a major and apparently intentional failure that needs to be corrected by the DNR. Please run the models . or require PolyMet to run the models . long enough to show when pollution of our water by PolyMet.s mine would cease. Again, we can not recover what we could lose from quality of life, natural habitat, economic benefits of tourism and the livability of the local communities. PolyMet proposes a complex mechanical system of pumps, pipelines, and filters that it says will capture and hold back the water pollution from getting into our rivers. PolyMet assumes the proposed expensive and complicated water treatment system will continue to operate effectively for long after the mining has stopped. Mechanical systems like pumps, filters and pipes eventually fail. In a 2007 report, an organization called Earthworks analyzed the records of 14 modern copper mines in five states found that 100% of these mines experienced pipeline spills or other accidental releases. 92% had failures of water collection and treatment systems that resulted in releases of contaminated mine seepage that significantly impacted water quality. Polymet's SDEIS lacks contingency plans for predictable failures in the proposed piping, pumping, and filtration equipment. By assuming that a complicated water treatment system will function indefinitely without fail, the SDEIS has failed to take the hard look required at the proposed PolyMet sulfide mine. In addition, if the company declares bankruptcy, who would be left to repair the damage and restore the communities and habitat. Please reject the SDEIS. Reject PolyMet's plans flawed with predictable failures in the water pumping and treatment system and the power supply to run that system. Reject the lack of fiduciary responsibility for a failure that is irreparable to OUR delicate balance in Minnesota. Long after the mining has stopped, PolyMet would pose an ongoing risk to fresh water. The Embarrass, the Partridge, and the St Louis Rivers, as well as Lake Superior, are far too precious to be put at risk for the profit of PolyMet. PolyMet should not be permitted. There is no way to guarantee when the proposed mining stops, that the groundwater and surface water would be left in a clean condition, and surrounding streams, rivers, and Lake Superior would be safe from risk of sulfide mine pollution. The PolyMet SDEIS suffers from many major failings. The SDEIS needs to be withdrawn and rejected. Sincerely, Terry Olsen 542 Pelham Blvd Saint Paul, MN 55104-4938

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Olsen

52544

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Bruner, Ms Fay and Mr Dabney, I'm writing to ask you not to let the PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine destroy irreplaceable wetlands in the Partridge River watershed of the Lake Superior Basin. My comments are made both on the PolyMet SDEIS and the Army Corps "Section 404 " Clean Water Act Permit that would allow wetlands destruction in the Superior National Forest PolyMet should not be allowed to destroy high value wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and the Partridge River headwaters for its open-pit sulfide mine. The SDEIS admits that PolyMet would directly destroy 913 acres of wetlands and as much as 7,351 acres of wetlands due to air and water pollution, mine dewatering and diverting water from wetlands. That could be the single largest wetlands loss ever proposed in Minnesota in the history of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands in the 100 Mile Swamp and Partridge River Headwaters have been changed very little for thousands of years, long before human settlement. They are important for water quality and as a habitat for moose and other at-risk species. Wetlands at the PolyMet mine site also bind up mercury, so it doesn't get into downstream fish and harm the brain development of our children who eat St Louis River and Lake Superior fish. Wetlands that would be harmed or destroyed by the PolyMet mine are water resources of national and international importance. The environmental review process is supposed to let us weigh alternatives. The PolyMet SDEIS doesn't suggest any alternatives to reduce impacts on wetlands at the mine site. The SDEIS rejects underground mining without studying how avoiding an open-pit could reduce environmental harm. It doesn't look at alternatives that would restore wetlands on site or clean up mine water and keep it in the Partridge River watershed. The "compensation " wetlands plan proposed by PolyMet is also completely inadequate. More than 2/3 of the replacement wetlands are outside the Lake Superior Basin and there is no mitigation at all for indirect wetlands loss. Monitoring and maybe doing something later is not an answer, especially since the Army Corps has never required mitigation for dried out or polluted wetlands after-the-fact. Under federal and state environmental laws and Clean Water Act Section 404, please: • Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine due to its unacceptable impacts on wetlands and water resources of national and international importance. • Reject the PolyMet SDEIS as inadequate due to the fact that no alternatives that could reduce water pollution and wetlands destruction are analyzed in the SDEIS. • Deny the Section 404 permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine plan, since it would destroy irreplaceable wetlands, peatlands and wetlands functions. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit, since the PolyMet SDEIS plan provides no mitigation for thousands of acres of foreseeable "indirect " wetlands losses. • Deny the PolyMet Section 404 permit unless all "compensation" mitigation for wetlands is provided within the Lake Superior Basin. • Require the SDEIS to be redone to analyze alternatives that could avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on Partridge River watershed wetlands and water quality. These alternatives should be considered: 1- Underground mining, looking at the full ore deposit and PolyMet's real costs; 2- Putting a liner under the Category 1 waste rock stockpile; 3- Placing all tailings on a new completely lined facility; 4- Returning the Category 1 waste rock to the West Pit to reclaim 500 wetland acres; 5- Building the reverse osmosis on the mine site in year 1 to treat (up to standards) and discharge runoff and pit water on site to minimize impacts to wetlands. Please reject PolyMet's SDEIS as inadequate and reject PolyMet's sulfide mining plan. Please also deny the Clean Water Section 404 permit and require PolyMet to analyze alternatives that would reduce harm to wetlands and nationally and internationally important waters. It is our job to protect irreplaceabl

Terry Piercy

24014

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Please do not. Sincerely, Terry Piercy PO Box 2512 Olympia, WA 98507-2512

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Richmond

42111

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Terry Richmond 2900 County Road 19 Maple Plain, MN 55359-9386

Terry Smith

13656

I will be gone the week of 2/11/14 through 2/18/14 .please hold all email. Thank you. Terry

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Terry Sovil

16221

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Terry Williamson

27011

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. On a personal note, my son canoed in this area two summers ago and it continues to be one of his most memorable experiences as an adolescent. As an adult providing supervision to Boy Scouts on their trips into the outdoors, I am always impressed about the maturity they exhibit and the growth that happens when these young men are given the opportunity to govern themselves in wilderness areas. I don't know of any other place where this happens on this scale. All of our communities will be lessened to the extent that we allow the limited wilderness that now exists to be further diminished by mining and industrial pollution. Sincerely, Terry Williamson 768 Belhaven St Jackson, MS 39202-1705

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tersenia Schuett

46588

The MN Department of Natural Resources must guard and protect our most valuable resource above all-water. Down the road the value of water will pale compared to "precious metals." Water is indeed precious. Unforseen, predictable and unpredictable incidents and accidents are not addressed in Polymet's proposed water treatment plan. All the financial assurance dollars in the world are not worth taking the risk of impairing MN waters. In light of this, I see JOBS as a four-letter woRd Don't let ~350 short-term jobs, the heft of big business, and dollar signs cow the DNR into submission. Sincerely, Tersenia Schuett 1410 Goodrich Ave StPaul, MN 55105

Tess Zangrilli

34016

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We are heading in a direction of severe water shortages across the world due to global warming and population explosion. It is in the public's interest that water, which is vital to life be protected. I know this on a personal basis, living in the fracking hellscape that is Pennsylvania. We need to have one part of this country where water is protected. Sincerely, Tess Zangrilli 203 Lytton Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15213-1409 (614) 725-2911

Tessa Hill

16165

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tessa Larson 54737

See attachment

54738

See attachment

Tevin Grant 44606

Hi there, I am a young student at prior lake high school. To be completely honest with you guys although this May look like a good idea now, I am way too nervous to take action. I don't trust the possible outcomes that this could create/affect in the long run. Thank you for hearing what I have to say. Sent from my iPhone

The Bremicker-Bartels 42963

the Maloney Family 43254

Opposed. Minnesota does not need the open pit copper-nickel mine. This potential mine is not a good investment in our state's future. Four hundred jobs for twenty years traded for a sulfide tailings is not worth it. It is not even going to produce that much in minerals. The mine is a short sighted silly idea. I have stood in the bottom of Bingham Copper Pit. Nothing grows around these mines. The pH is wrong for plants. The ore deposit is not going anywhere. Let us leave it for our future Minnesotans with improved technology to decide if they want to mine the ore. Ann Maloney 8293 Paradise Beach Court Brainerd, Mn. 56401

The Mowans 38548

A nightmare is about to happen if the Northmet Mining Project is approved. I cannot add anything to the science as a concerned citizen. I read the facts and listened to experts who will not profit financially, I am saying that the facts of science prove this project should never be allowed. History of copper mining must be included because the price was paid elsewhere and there is no going back. We are fools not to learn from the pain of others. Water is one of the most precious commodities on this Earth. This fact appears everyday in news reports when disaster after disaster created by human beings has spoiled our waterways. I do not believe any mining company should be permitted to desecrate the forests and watersheds of our beautiful state. 90% of everything mined will produce tailings in an untold volume. How many piles 20 stories high. How much water is used for the chemical bath. What are the chemicals in the bath. Is it a secret like the chemicals used in fracking which is legally kept a secret from the people whose land is being flooded. Right now tailing piles from the old LTD taconite site create pollution that is exceeding current MN water quality standards. Mercury has been found in children. What will it cost MN in health care for known health concerns. Polymet is the next "invasive species" leaving the increasing devastation forever and ever. Three-hundred jobs will never justify what the pits, up to 700 feet deep and the sulfur piles 20 stories high will do to the environment, FOREVER. After the 20 year run when all the wealth leaves this country these miners will again be jobless. Hy-Vee will build a grocery store in New Hope MN that will hire 400 employees. How can anyone with a conscience use jobs as an excuse to ruin MN. Only a few jobs for a few years what is left is the Hell that would be created in our Northland. The DNR should be the guardian of our natural resources for all Minnesotans. Lost to profiteering is unforgiveable. We need pristine places to live and retreat to. What has been saved for us took some warriors in the past Please don't be responsible for 500 years of destruction by sulfuric acid. The loss of forests that filter our air is another important factor in pollution. I do not believe any politician or state employee has the right to give away MN. I think of Judas, what price to pay for materials to manufacture products that will eventually end up in landfills. Why does Polymet a foreign corporation that has a history of ravaging the earth in Canada deserve the right to reap havoc here. Their financial backers have a history of illegal dealings and world wide pollution. These facts are a part of the entire package. F. Sigrid Mowan 4186 E Shamaineau Dr Motley MN 56466

The Nature Conservancy 18855

Please see the attached document.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

The Nature Conservancy 42982

Please accept comments from The Nature Conservancy on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Douglas T. Shaw, Phd, Assistant Chapter Director The Nature Conservancy in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota 1101 West River Parkway, Suite 200 Minneapolis, MN 55415-0705 Please consider the environment before printing this email _____ Douglas T. Shaw, Ph.D Assistant Chapter Director dshaw@tnc-org (612) 331-0705 (Phone) (651) 900-0652 (Mobile) HYPERLINK "https://home.tnc-org/,DanaInfo=nature-org+"nature-org The Nature Conservancy in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota 1101 West River Parkway, Suite 200 Minneapolis, MN 55415-0705 TNCLogoPrimary_RGB

43054

December 19, 2013 VIA U.S. MAIL Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-4025 Douglas Bruner, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers- Saint Paul District 180 5th Street East, Suite 700 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1678 Tim Dabney U.S. Forest Service- Superior National Forest 8901 Grand Avenue Place Duluth, Minnesota 55808 Dear Ms. Fay, Mr. Bruner, Mr. Dabney: On behalf of the Minnesota/North Dakota/ South Dakota Program of The Nature Conservancy, I request an extension to the public review and comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for an additional 90 days beyond the current end date of March 13, 2014. The Nature Conservancy is a nonprofit conservation organization that works in all 50 states and 35 countries and has a membership of approximately one million. The mission of The Nature Conservancy is to conserve the lands and waters on which all life depends. The longer review and comment period is warranted by the length and complexity of this document. The quality of comments that the Conservancy and the public will be able to provide will improve with additional time. Sincerely, Margaret Ladner Minnesota State Director

Theo 43082

Do not allow the copper mines in Minnesota. It will wreck everything-such as the land, water and tourism. I worry about what it will be like when I am an adult, will the BWCAW still be the same. will I be able to go swimming and eat the fish I catch. No safe gaurd is 100%. The mines are also ugly and destroy the land. Theo Anderson (8th grade) 2150 Mailand Road St Paul, MN 55119

Theodore Gorney 39614

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Theodore Gorney 5572 Brookdale Dr N Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-3015

Theresa Flynn 38948

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Theresa Flynn 794 Holton St Saint Paul, MN 55104-1315

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Theresa Gerber

33046

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am proud to be a Minnesotan because of this state's history of valuing nature and the preservation of our natural resources. To allow copper nickel mining, especially when this mine's projected lifespan is only twenty years, destroys my trust in the DNR and makes me question the values of my fellow Minnesotans. It is the DNR's job to protect Minnesota's environment and take care of our natural resources, and allowing mining that has the potential to pollute for hundreds of years is a direct contradiction of this. I do not understand how anyone, especially a government agency that is supposed to put public interest first, can think that a relatively small increase in jobs and economic output for twenty years outweighs the potential for catastrophe and pollution for hundreds of years. Minnesota is known for its clean lakes and rivers, but fresh water is not an infinite resource and we should not be actively working to jeopardize the local watershed and Lake Superior, which is what would happen if the PolyMet mine is approved. I am extremely disappointed that the state government, which is supposed to act in the public's best interests, could consider this mine to be a viable option. It is absolutely not in the public's interest to allow mining that could pollute any watershed for hundreds of years. Even if there is some way that PolyMet could guarantee it can pay for clean-up of a catastrophe, Minnesota has only been a state for a little more than 150 years and it would be crazy to knowingly create a situation that leaves us cleaning up water pollution for twice as long as we have been a state. Sincerely, Theresa Gerber 817 Hilltop Rd Mendota Heights, MN 55118-4324 (651) 788-2484

57983

I don't understand how someone can look at the numbers objectively and feel it makes economic sense to go ahead with this project. How can the mining company guarantee that if something does go wrong, they can pay for cleaning water for 200-500 years? Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Theresa Johansen

10691

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Theresa Johansen 10355 Greenfield Rd Greenfield, MN 55357

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Theresa Johansen

18401

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Theresa Johansen 10355 Greenfield Rd Greenfield, MN 55357

50520

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Theresa Johansen 10355 Greenfield Rd Greenfield, MN 55357

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Theresa Nelson

43232

To The State of Minnesota's DNR, It is inconceivable to me that anyone who has any concern for the natural resources of Greater Minnesota, would allow or would ever think of allowing mining to occur in this irreplaceable environment. Please be a leader, please think of future generations, please think BIG .big enough to understand that the ways of the world are changing, and people need and want us to take care of our resources. And they are resources, it is why I live in this state. I spend \$1000 every year in Greater Minnesota exploring natural area's, patronizing local businesses and paying permits. So far I estimate I have spent \$20,000 in the BWCA area in my adult lifetime, and I plan to spend just as much and even more in my years to come. And let's be clear here, my annual salary is \$40,000 .I'm by no means rich, but choose to spend my money here in order to experience the BWCA as it is. BUT not if, I even think for a moment that the water is being contaminated, the animals lives are being compromised or the local economy doesn't value protecting this most incredible resource. Think about it, there is a lot at stake, and you and I am responsible for what happens. Say to NO to Polymet in Minnesota. "The eyes of the future are looking back at us and they are praying for us to see beyond our own time. They are kneeling with hands clasped that we might act with restraint, that we might leave room for the life that is destined to come. To protect what is wild is to protect what is gentle. Perhaps the wilderness we fear is the pause between our own heartbeats, the silent space that says we live only by grace. Wilderness lives by this same grace. Wild mercy is in our hands." - Terry Tempest Williams Sincerely, Theresa Nelson HYPERLINK "mailto:theresa.f.nelson@gmail-com"theresa.f.nelson@gmail-com HYPERLINK "http://www.linkedin-com/in/theresanelsonmn"www.linkedin-com/in/theresanelsonmn 612-655-5662

Theresa Rokusek

14955

Dear Theresa, Thank you for contacting me about the proposed PolyMet copper-nickel mine. I appreciate your email and the Star Tribune article link. As you may know, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) can authorize the mine without legislative approval. However, a project of this size is required to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under state and federal law to evaluate the comprehensive effect of the project on the environment, local communities, and the economy. Currently, the DNR is taking public comments on the proposed EIS HYPERLINK "x-apple-data-detectors://0"until Thursday March 13, 2014- More information about the project, including submitting your comments, here: <http://dnr.state.mn.us/input/environmentalreview/polymet/index.html> Thank you again for your email. For my part, I will continue to support policies that protect our state's world-class lakes, rivers, and groundwater for generations. Best wishes, Debra Hilstrom >>> 2/9/2014 2:51 PM >>> <http://m.startribune-com/news/.id=244570531andc=y> Please refer to above article. My husband Dennis Johnson and I, Theresa Rokusek, are vehemently opposed to this or any other company coming into MN to do mining. They will promise to follow safe rules and policies should they be okayed to do so. Of course they promise all kinds of jobs to the financially depressed region. How many are guaranteed to US citizens. Allowing this potentially environmental killer into our beautiful state is ludicrous based on dollars and cents. Haven't we learned enough from the BP explosion, the recent chemical disaster in Virginia releasing deadly chemicals in the river nearby, and the opposition to building the KXL pipeline thru our country by a Canadian company. If it's so safe, why not build it through their country.. If we care anything about keeping our waters and lands safe, we cannot allow promise of big \$\$\$ to cloud Minnesota's safety and beauty. From: Theresa Rokusek and Dennis Johnson 2557 Brookdale Lane Brooklyn Park HYPERLINK "tel:55444-2336"55444-2336 763-560-0169

39361

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Theresa Rokusek 2557 Brookdale Ln Minneapolis, MN 55444-2336 (763) 560-0169

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Theresa Sprung

42083

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Theresa Sprung Center City, Minnesota

Theresa Zaydel

30091

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, I submit these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement because of serious concern for the health of the Great Lakes region of the United States and Canada. Sulfide mining threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on the Great Lakes fresh water system, the Great Lakes region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, and the cumulative impacts from mining. It is not in the public interest or the best practices to protect our natural and fragile environment to allow a Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine. Sincerely, Theresa Zaydel 13967 Ashton Rd Detroit, MI 48223-3531

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Therese Gimmestad

41668

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Thom Nelson

39560

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thom Nelson 2084 123rd Ln NW Coon Rapids, MN 55448-7087 (612) 817-1397

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas & Susan Smith

39787

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Thomas and Susan Smith PO Box 48303 Minneapolis, MN 55448-0303

Thomas A Leaf

40931

Ms Lisa Fay and DNR, I am writing to express comments on the SDEIS for the proposed NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. We Minnesotans have before us a proposed project from an outside company which stands to obtain large economic gain. This corporate gain comes at the expense of Minnesotans permanently selling off one of our natural resources. The benefits for Minnesotans are some construction jobs for a few years and a few mining jobs for a twenty year time period. There appears to be no pressing need at this time for copper and nickel. These metals are not being mined for use by our state. The detriments of this project as I see them are; We will soon be left with an abandoned mine, the transient jobs are gone and we have clean up and monitoring of the site for centuries. We will have spent our resource. The amount of money to be set aside has been only vaguely defined. It is quite impossible to plan monitoring and clean up for several hundred years. Recent water quality data regarding sulfate water contamination confirm original studies that suggest we have native wild rice and potentially many other species are very sensitive to increased sulfates in the water. We are contemplating the possibility of adding pollution to the largest freshwater lake in the world. The detriments in my opinion would appear to far outweigh the short term benefits. We do not have an economy that is so destitute that we need to consider this project. The decision needs to be based on science and a clear thinking view to our state's future, not to short sighted political or economic gain. Sincerely, Thomas A. Leaf 31450 Oasis Rd Center City, MN 55012 The information transmitted in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material, including 'protected health information'. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy and delete this message from any computer and contact us immediately by return e-mail.

Thomas and Charlotte Meinz

39998

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The dollars earned by providing jobs for a number of people pales when you consider the damage to the environment and the potential cost of cleaning up the water and land that will result for MANY YEARS. The studies that say we could subsidize a number of people for as many years as they would make a living on jobs provided would be much fewer dollars spent by our taxpayers than what will be needed if and when the mining companies disappear from the scene. **MINNESOTANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG AND OUR PRISTINE LAND AND WATER WILL BE RUINED. PLEASE STOP THIS PROJECT NOW** Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thomas and Charlotte Meinz 210 9th Ave S Princeton, MN 55371-1723 (763) 389-1660

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas and Charlotte Mainz 49040

Mar 10, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The dollars earned by providing jobs for a number of people pales when you consider the damage to the environment and the potential cost of cleaning up the water and land that will result for MANY YEARS. The studies that say we could subsidize a number of people for as many years as they would make a living on jobs provided would be much fewer dollars spent by our taxpayers than what will be needed if and when the mining companies disappear from the scene. MINNESOTANS WILL BE LEFT HOLDING THE BAG AND OUR PRISTINE LAND AND WATER WILL BE RUINED. PLEASE STOP THIS PROJECT NOW Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. We have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thomas and Charlotte Mainz 210 9th Ave S Princeton, MN 55371-1723 (763) 389-1660

Thomas Aro 42514

See attachment

Thomas Bergum 54168

I believe the risks or potential risks are too great. Northern MN may be forever changed struggling with ground water pollution for hundreds of years. But I fear big money & promises to care for our land will win out! [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Brown

16194

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Thomas Cahoy

45444

Greetings, Please do not approve the PolyMet sulfide mine plan. There are waaaay to many unanswered questions. PolyMet says waste water will need treatment for 500 yrs minimum. How much longer after that. Where are the assurances from PolyMet that treatment will be financed for a minimum of 5 centuries. Where are the contingency plans or financial guarantees in case of accident or emergency. I attended the 1/28/14 RiverCentre public meeting. I have read up on the issue. I consider myself well informed. I have concluded that those that supporting the mine are willing to risk anything for jobs for 20 years. The risks that sulfide mining poses are often acknowledged and not refuted. No sulfide mine has ever been operated without polluting. PolyMet should be required to prove themselves elsewhere prior to operating in Minnesota. Our state's heritage should not be put at risk in perpetuity for a mere 20 years worth of jobs. Do not approve the PolyMet sulfide mine plan. Thank you, Thomas Cahoy 16501 30th Ave N Plymouth, MN 55447 (612)616-0507 tommycaho@Q-com

Thomas Donaghy

15304

Please reject the PolyMet mine. The economy of northern Minnesota is now built on tourism, which is based on the natural beauty of the area. PolyMet would undermine that beauty - and the economy that relies on it - for centuries. The Boundary Waters and surrounding areas are also a Minnesota treasure that, once destroyed, could not be restored in our lifetimes or even the lifetimes of our grandchildren. We need to think long term. We need to stop this mine before it starts. Tom Donaghy Saint Paul resident

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Donofrio

21724

I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all state and federal regulations. Our society has come to expect a standard of living and quality of life dependent upon the critical metals PolyMet will supply. I believe it can be done right in Minnesota. Thomas Donofrio 3985 Willow Place Hermantown, Minnesota 55811
The views and opinions expressed in this message my own. I am solely and individually responsible for the content. This is not intended to represent or reflect anyone else's views or opinions, including those of my employer, ALLETE, Inc.

thomas erzar

41086

My name is Tom Erzar and my address is 1163 Jesse L Blvd., Eagles Nest, Minnesota. My mailing address is 1163 Jesse L Blvd, Ely, MN 55731 I'm submitting a comment regarding the SDEIS for PolyMet Mining's proposed North Met project. I trust your agency will thoroughly evaluate the project and address any environmental concerns. I believe the environmental review process has been very thorough. I know that your agency and the federal agency will make sure that the project design will address any possible environmental impacts so it meets with all applicable state and federal regulations. All projects have risks. There are many kinds of risks but today we are focusing on environmental risks. I believe that PolyMet has addressed the environmental risks and with modern- day technology will mitigate those risks. State agencies will make sure that there is compliance with the most stringent regulations in the country. We have an asset of a world- class deposit of copper , nickel, platinum, palladium and gold . This should be mined; it is an opportunity that should not go untapped. PolyMet can mine these metals in an environmentally sound way with the use of modern technology. This mining project would create hundreds of jobs for the middle class and an economic stimulus for the local communities and the state of Minnesota. We need these jobs .We want these jobs. It is time to permit this project and enjoy many of the benefits it will provide. By the way I am a person who enjoys and uses the BWCA and Lake Superior and am not concerned that this project will have any adverse affect these natural resources that I love and enjoy. Sincerely' Tom Erzar

Thomas Geiger

44314

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Thomas Geiger Rr1 Box 1000 Kingshill, VI 00850

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Geiger

44318

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Thomas Geiger Rr1 Box 1000 Kingshill, VI 00850

Thomas Gillach

42527

See attachment

Thomas Gille

41615

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Thomas Gille Cromwell, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Gretch 42436

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Thomas Gretch 3030 Cavell Ave S Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-2916 (612) 735-5959

Thomas Griffin, PhD. 44545

From: Tom Gmail [mailto:tomgriffin612@gmail-com] Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 9:00 AM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: Fwd: Mining in Minnesota Sent from my iPhone Begin forwarded message: From: Tom Gmail <HYPERLINK "mailto:tomgriffin612@gmail-com"tomgriffin612@gmail-com> Date: March 12, 2014 at 8:46:44 PM CDT To: "HYPERLINK "mailto:lisaFay@state.mn.us"lisaFay@state.mn.us" <HYPERLINK "mailto:lisaFay@state.mn.us"lisaFay@state.mn.us"> Subject: Mining in Minnesota Ms Fay It seems clear to me that there are too many unanswered questions about the impact of proposed mining plans in northern Minnesota on water quality in our state to allow these plans to move forwaRd I strongly encourage the department to protect Minnesota's natural resources including water quality and reject PolyMet plans. Thank you. Thomas Griffin, PhD. 4720 11th Ave So Minneapolis MN 55407 Sent from my iPhone

Thomas Howes 42619

See attachment

Thomas J Arneson 54638

See attachment

Thomas Jeffery Heinonen 57258

Ponder the SDEIS while reading the 2/3/14 Nation magazine article – page 22. After 100+ years the river in El Salvador runs red in toxicity. With several companies also waiting (Duluth NewsTab 1/17/14) we'd be overrun with such mining. Just as all the waters in northern MN are interconnected, Polymet's promo campaign and all the heavy hitters brought in to replace all form of CEOs and department heads are interconnected to push their mining through; sparing no cost, even to new/ads on AM radio touting that of 10,000 comments no question has seen unanswered. The greatest presumption is the kids hockey games shamelessly co-opted with their ads, and they're not even up and running yet. History repeats itself at the expense of the last of our clean water in a region held hostage by perpetual economic blackmail. Like all that oil being pipelined, trucked across the country and shipped off for profit to China while our gas prices only rise. Who is really getting the minerals and the profits. Thomas Jeffery Heinonen 101 Artavia St Duluth, MN 55811

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Johnson

41751

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Thomas King

39167

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. We know with past experience of the iron mines that there will be accidents and spillage of toxic chemicals. Check out lake Vermillion for evidence. We cant risk this kind of exposure with sulfide mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Thomas King 7259 Old Number 7 Rd Virginia, MN 55792-8017 (218) 741-5960

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Koehler

9306

I attended the January 16th meeting in Duluth and was not chosen to speak. I have read the portions of the SDEIS of concern to me and believe I have good understanding of what I read. My concerns are these: Past experience with mining companies has indicated to me that any entity engaged in sulfide mining will escape any responsibility, whether legal or financial, by simply dissolving or filing bankruptcy, as has happened in our paSt In the case of a projected 200 year or 500 year liability, I am saying that all entities will escape ANY liability with the simple stroke of a pen. There is no provision whatever to assure and insure that any entity of any kind will actually be forced to exist and remain liable for all costs that will otherwise be externalized as has always happened in the past and to date. The proposal is to use reverse osmosis for the removal of certain mining-caused pollutants from the water effluent. This process is clumsy, expensive and extremely high maintenance, as is resin bed ion exchange. I am distressed that more effective chemical buffering methods have not been proposed. At least one such method has been used in former sulfide mining operations in Montana. ref. CESR process of Hydrometrics, Inc., 2727 Airport Road, Helena, MT 59601; wateronline-com/doc/a-new-process-for-sulfate-removal-from-indust-0001 Why isn't any limestone placed with all sulfur-bearing rock to neutralize subsequent acid formation. Will any limestone be placed in the tailings basin. There is no mention of the location of the Poly-Met hydromet facility, where phase two nickel concentrate will be sent, nor any description of the chemical nature of that treatment and its wastes. Autoclaving of concentrate and oxidation under pressure is mentioned, but no description of the chemical nature of the solutions used. Limestone is apparently added to this spent solution, but what of the consequent sulfates. Pit linings are notoriously short-lived and leaky, as demonstrated by other pit linings. There is no mention of mitigation of other heavy metals that will be released in the water effluent, in excess of current water quality standards. The parent rock body will be fractured by blasting, and there is no mention of how to prevent ground water from entering these fractures and producing acidic drainage into the aquifer. I am a simple railroad track worker, retired. If a layman like me can find weaknesses and complaint with one small portion of the SDEIS, just how flimsy is the actual fabric of the entire document. The foremost and greatest weakness and objection is the inability to hold any entity responsible for the proposed duration of this enterprise - by its own definition, up to 500 years.. Reserve Mining evaporated out from under its financial obligations in less than sixty years. I am strongly opposed to the proposed sulfide mining enterprise mainly because I know that no one but the taxpayers will end up paying for the damages that will absolutely happen as a direct consequence of sulfide mining as currently proposed. Respectfully, Thomas V. Koehler
814 5th Avenue Two Harbors MN 55616 218 834 4891 - home landline voice

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Koehler

19038

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Thomas Koehler 814 5th Avenue, Two Harbors, MN Two Harbors, MN 55616

Thomas La Point

13907

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, The SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for-information that is necessary to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the direct impacts to the 900 acres of wetlands and indirect impacts to an additional ten square miles of wetlands. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream to Lake Superior. Four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Dr Thomas La Point 1900 Highland Park Cir Denton, TX 76205-6932

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Lambrecht

20229

Hello, Please accept my support for this project and the economic impacts resulting from this investment in NE Minnesota. The reason below will highlight our general support for the acceptance of the SDEIS report and the next steps required to move the project forward I trust the DNR and Federal Agencies to study copper-nickel mining and keep our communities safe. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough; the supplemental draft EIS addresses potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. Copper-nickel mining will contribute to the local and state economy at a time when we really need the jobs and economic benefit. Copper-nickel mining will provide millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support our communities and education system. The SDEIS points out that cumulative impacts have been adequately reviewed. Thanks, Tom Lambrecht, LEED AP Manager Economic Development Services Great River Energy 12300 Elm Creek Boulevard Maple Grove, MN 55369 direct: 763-445-6105 / fax: 763-445-6905 / cell: 612-850-3660 www.GreatRiverEnergy-com * Please consider the environment before you print this e-mail. NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: The information contained in this message from Great River Energy and any attachments are confidential and intended only for the named recipient(s). If you have received this message in error, you are prohibited from copying, distributing or using the information. Please contact the sender immediately by return email and delete the original message.

Thomas Latham

23745

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest I have personally been to Boundary Waters, and spent seven days there in a canoe. I have never seen a more pristine area before in my life and I believe that nothing should be allowed to jeopardize this. I am a 64 year old electrician at The City of Atlanta Aviation Department and have beautiful memories of my experience there. Recently I have had thoughts of revisiting that area with another canoe trip. To think that that area may not be there as I remembered would be devastating to me and I know may others. Don't let this happen PLEASE Sincerely, Thomas Latham 6530 Rivertown Rd Fairburn, GA 30213-2729 (770) 617-5549

Thomas Lichtenstein

39611

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thomas Lichtenstein 11520 Ravoux Ave Burnsville, MN 55337-3232 (952) 890-5069

Thomas Moen

54507

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Morgan

19473

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS seems to be one-sided. Well-documented tribal Major Differences of Opinion call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles and tailings heaps won't seep pollution, that mining won't dry out wetlands and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they are not available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and putting public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seems designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Tom Morgan - [HYPERLINK "http://resources.css-edu/collegetcomm/images/StandardLogo_fullcolor_Fill.png"](http://resources.css-edu/collegetcomm/images/StandardLogo_fullcolor_Fill.png) signature Dr Thomas W. Morgan Director, Alworth Center for the Study of Peace and Justice Associate Professor of Russian 218-723-6442 Duluth, MN 55811 [HYPERLINK "mailto:tmorgan@css-edu"](mailto:tmorgan@css-edu)tmorgan@css-edu

Thomas Nelson

45805

I support the Polymet project. The technology is there to protect the water and provide much needed resources and provide good paying jobs. As a Superintendent of a wastewater treatment and water treatment facilities in the Great Lakes Water shed if we can keep Mercury out with limits as low as 1-8 ppt we can keep the effluent from the Polymet project clean. This letter is not part of a mass e-mailing campaign. Thomas Nelson Wastewater/Water Superintendent Grand Marais, MN

Thomas Normile

44203

Do not pollute or kill our Lakes, Aquifers, Rivers and Swamps. Thomas Normile (nephew of Mary Molish, former resident of Butte, MT).

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Rosch

40156

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Thomas Rosch 1840 Wisconsin Ave N Golden Valley, MN 55427-3963 (763) 591-1610

Thomas S. Falkowski

14836

My Name is Thomas S. Falkowski, 12260 Ash Dr, Rogers, MN 55374 My Comment: I am concerned that the official report does not clearly identify the costs associated with the ongoing monitoring of both the mining site and the plant site, as well as what may be required as potential remedies if monitoring identifies problems The significant lengths of monitoring would require a financial reserve that would likely exceed both the revenues of the state from the mining company and any economic stimulus of employees that would pay state or local taxes. There should be adequate financial reserves that are both prepaid prior to initiation, and also accrued during the years of operation that account for all 500 years of MN tax payer exposure. I am also concerned that although the report identifies the communities and water sources that may be affected by the movement of water during and after operations, I did not see a clear statement as to the populations of the communities and the total number of people that could be affected for the duration of the exposure. By highlighting only the number of jobs to be gained for the relatively short productive years of the operation, the potential negative impact to many more people is not stated or estimated. Thank you.

Thomas Schellinger

41058

I support the PolyMet Mining project and believe that the environmental review process has been carried out thoroughly. Please enter my name in support of the PolyMet plan. This project will be of benefit to the State of Minnesota and provide jobs and a source of income to the area without undue damage to the environment. Thomas P. Schellinger 13951 Falcon Avenue Apple Valley, MN 55124 tpschellinger@prodigy-net

Thomas Scott

21247

Feb 24, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a Minnesota citizen who loves our state I urge you to act in the best interest of our natural resources and reject the proposed permit for an open pit sulfide mine in the Arrowhead. The inherent incalculable risks will extend for many generations to come, and these are simply not worth undertaking. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thomas Scott 3515 Harriet Ave Minneapolis, MN 55408-4248 (612) 670-3464

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Scott

50987

Feb 24, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a Minnesota citizen who loves our state I urge you to act in the best interest of our natural resources and reject the proposed permit for an open pit sulfide mine in the Arrowhead. The inherent incalculable risks will extend for many generations to come, and these are simply not worth undertaking. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thomas Scott 3515 Harriet Ave Minneapolis, MN 55408-4248 (612) 670-3464

Thomas Sullivan

9581

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Thomas Sullivan 3467 Wilshire PL NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Sullivan

18496

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Thomas Sullivan 3467 Wilshire PL NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

50580

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Thomas Sullivan 3467 Wilshire PL NE Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Thomas Switzer 11509

See attachment

42563

See attachment

Thomas Wallace Morgan 57141

I'm very concerned over the prospects of copper-sulfide mining in Minnesota. Please consider your responsibility to safeguard the environment and to assure quality of life for the seventh generation. Our water is too precious to gamble with. I have little confidence in the promises of mining companies. Thomas Wallace Morgan 4801 Tioga St Duluth, MN 55804

Thuan Thai 54230

Dear Ms. Fay It has come to me and other students concern that the mining company drawing the map was not credible and was cut off of original map. The map was cut off so that the people look at the mine site and would think that the mine site would not affect other lakes, swamps or rivers. From that point of view, people would approve of the mining construction but the map was correct to the BWCA which is could affect to environment. And the mine releases phosphate to the swamp which will react with water and form sulfuric acid and if the sulfuric acid goes to the BWCA and eventually will pollute those BWCA. And as the student of Humboldt High School, I would really like to go to boundary water to visit and enjoy the nature. But if the mining begin the sulfuric acid would go to BWCA which could destroy the ecosystem. This is unacceptable to destroy the nature which and where we are living in. Sincerely, Thuan Thai Humboldt High School Student 449 Sherburne Ave Saint Paul, MN 55103

Thue Rasmussen 39622

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Thue Rasmussen 1666 Coffman St Apt 219 Falcon Heights, MN 55108-1339

Tierney Bartell 54164

Do not allow another mine to ruin our beautiful landscape. It is too much of a risk and will have a disastrous long term outcome if allowed. Money & greed are driving this mine and I oppose it. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

tiffany breiner

42064

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, tiffany breiner minneapolis, Minnesota

Tiffany Wang

41825

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tiffany Wang Minneapolis, Minnesota

Tim Coglianese

39993

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Tim Coglianese 5839 Sunrise Dr Minneapolis, MN 55419-2059 (612) 354-3197

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tim Gihring

15345

Dear DNR, As a Minnesota journalist for nearly 20 years, I have traveled all over the state, reporting on the people and places that make this region special. And perhaps no place is more special than the Boundary Waters ecosystem that would be affected by the proposed Polymet mining. Those who support the mining in the Ely area remember the iron mines of a generation ago, long for those boom times, and in many cases feel compromised already by environmental protections that they feel have yoked them to a tourist economy. But as the environmental review makes clear, the proposed Polymet mine is not like the old Pioneer or Zenith mines. The costs are greater, the stakes much higher. The wilderness, if it's protected, is forever. The mine is for a few decades and the damage potentially forever. This is not just the wrong place, it's the wrong mine. It's not right to risk the benefits of future generations to appease the narrow, nostalgic demands of this one. Thank you for listening. Tim Gihring 241 Russell Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55405

Tim Glenn

38785

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Tim Grebner

10196

I think it unwise to jeopardize water supplies for 500 years for short term jobs. Mining built the iron range communities and Minnesota has benefited from mineral extraction. But this type of mining is simply too risky. How can we sacrifice the water quality for 500 years. Who will pay for the ongoing water treatment. The length of water treatment is longer than our nation has existed. The proposed mine is simply wrong for our state and future generations.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tim Harrison 38378

Go Polymet. Minnesota with out mining would be much different, it's what has allowed generations to live in this great state. Now we are faced with a new type of Minnesota mining with more oversight than ever before. Mining, it's in our blood, culture, it's who we are. Go Polymet. Tim Harrison 612-363-6496

Tim Haussner 39143

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Tim Haussner 205 Fireweed Ln Grand Marais, MN 55604-2153 (218) 370-2154

Tim Iverson 44267

Dear Sir or Madam - I am very skeptical that Polymet's projected environmental impact will be minimal. You can count me in as a citizen against the mine going forwaRd I am originally from the Iron Range, and actually worked for a period of time at the old Erie Mining Company located where Polymet wants to mine now. LTV took over the Erie mine. After LTV closed, 6-5 million has already been spent to deal with the sulfide runoff from the Dunka mine pit. The original estimate was far less, as I'm betting the same for the cost of environmental cleanup with Polymet. No one can be sure of the consequences when copper and other like metals are mined. The backbone of the Iron Range, the mining of iron ore, is far less passive than the natural oxidation of metal sulfide materials resulting in sulfuric acid. The Dunka mine proves that mining even iron ore can result in the release of sulfuric acid, due to trace metals in the exposed waste rock. So, we get 300 new jobs, in exchange for decades of inevitable cleanup of the water, soil, and probably air. That hardly seems like a good tradeoff. I've been told by my brother-in-law, who lives in Virginia, to butt out because I live in Duluth and the mining is done on the Range. Well, my answer to that is the exposed rivers, Partridge and Embarrass eventually flow into the St Louis River, which flows into Lake Superior, which Duluth is located on. Lake Superior is now just getting her health back after years of dumping by other mines and Honeywell barrels. And now we are asked to trust Polymet. Tim Iverson Duluth MN

Tim Johnson 42999

Dear Ms Fay, Last night a group of us met at our church as part of our faith in action work during Lent. We took time during worship to write letters about issues of particular concern. I have chosen to write to you about the PolyMet mining issue. That letter is attached. Sincerely, Dr Timothy M. Johnson Cherokee Park United Church 371 W. Baker St St Paul, MN 55107 cpuc@usfamily-net 651-227-4275 www.cherokeeparkunited-org

Tim Karst 38647

To Lisa Fay, I am writing this email in support of PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. The jobs that will be created and the taxes that will be collected are needed to keep Minnesota an economic leader. I am not from northern Minnesota but these jobs are needed for the livelihood of the families that live there. The Minnesota DNR has the most stringent mine permitting process in the country and I have confidence that this mining can be done safely with no damage to the enviroment. Hopefully this will be decided by good science and not be political. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Tim Karst 3180 Abert Ave NE Buffalo, MN 55313

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tim Lundahl 15404

I have reviewed the scientific documentation regarding the PolyMet copper nickel mining proposal and I do not believe that approval of this project is in the best interests of Minnesota. As a supporter of iron and taconite mining, I understand the challenge of balancing of environmental concerns and local economic interests. The PolyMet mining proposal, however, has far more long range negative environmental impacts than iron mining ever has. Water quality will be impacted for centuries and we have no experience in knowing how to deal with this for such an extended time. The track record for similar mining operations in our country is filed with failures. These failures include serious water pollution, corporate bankruptcies, insufficient dollars for environmental remediation and mismanagement. It is folly to even suggest that the DNR or any other agency can develop a plan that will "guarantee" water treatment for centuries to come at no cost to the taxpayer. The relative few number of jobs this project would create and the fairly short life span of the mine do not justify the long term financial and environmental liabilities that this proposal would create for Minnesota's citizens. It is for these reasons that I firmly oppose this PolyMet project. Please reject this and all cooper nickel mines in this part of Minnesota for the good of all Minnesotans. Thank your for considering my views. Tim Lundahl Lakeville, MN Sent from my iPad

Tim Melby 42651

See attachment

tim mikkelson 12156

TIM R. MIKKELSON, 813 Olaf Ave NW. Willmar, Mn. 56201 I will keep this short. I am greatly opposed to sulfide mining in northeastern Minnesota. This area is one of Minnesota's finest and is visited by people from the world over. To think that the mining would produce millions of pounds of material that would have to be monitored and treated for many, many lifetimes (and would most likely end up being the taxpayers responsibility, as with most mines) is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

Tim Minotas 23726

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt I simply can not let you pollute such a pristine lake and any water way. Everything on this planet is interconnected. Humans are not above everything else. We need the environment and its healthiness in order to survive in the long run. Enough is enough with dirty mining and energy practices that not only contributes to climate change, but damages many people's and species way of life and health. The Great Lakes and its surrounding systems are one of our most vital resources, we can't afford to degrade. Sincerely, Tim Minotas 3622 Oakmonte Blvd Rochester, MI 48306-4791

Tim Nesbitt 44971

Sent from Windows Mail

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tim Peschman

38454

I work within the Environmental Remediation field; providing services, equipment, and technologies for removal of organics and inorganic contaminants from contaminated groundwater and surface waters for potable, non potable, NPDES discharge, and water reuse. In my experience, I have not seen ANY hard rock mining operations that have successfully provided treatment during and after their mining operations. The 30+ Superfund hard rock mining sites that the EPA has is testament to this. Though I make my living treating this contamination, it makes more sense to me to eliminate the contamination in the first place; ie remove or completely eliminate the source. The various hard rock gold and precious metal mines, dating back to the middle 1800's have proven that our human nature is to make a profit irrespective of the environmental impacts. And their legacy is being borne on the backs of taxpayers, based upon ARRA funding, local bond issues, increased local water costs, etc The ASARCO and Anaconda mines continue to be problems without (easy) solutions that, because of their chemistry, will continue to generate soluble heavy metals into already contaminated discharge. Only recently, the Pebble Mine, a precious metal mine proposed in Alaska, but located near a strategic salmon fishery, is being reviewed and/or delayed/restricted because of its potential environmental impacts. Why, I ask therefore, are the impacts to the Superior National Forest and/or the Boundary Waters Canoe area, if PolyMet is allowed to do their open pit mining, not of the same strategic value. Clearly, these were designated as strategic wilderness areas and in this evaluation, went through years of public and private scrutiny for this designation. The coals mines within British Columbia, operated by Teck Coal have contributed significant heavy metals contamination to the various watersheds that drain into Lake Koochanusa in NW Montana. Though this is not hard rock mining, the resultant heavy metals released into the environment are having a significant effect. This is also true for the phosphate mining occurring on the Snake River in ID. My point is that the mining industry is only recently working to start compliance with their discharges. Heretofore, it has been too easy for them to litigate for delays or claim insolvency to avoid their environmental responsibilities. I believe that PolyMet has included all of the "patently right" answers to questions in their SEIS review. These are more politically correct than environmentally correct. I don't believe that taking the waste sulfide-bearing rock and encapsulating it with water within a pit is the best or even a good alternative for disposal. There is no GOOD disposal alternative to eliminate the possibility of anoxic growth of sulfur-reducing bacteria, outside of maintaining an aerobic environment and/or presence of some sort of bacteriostat. I work with Reverse Osmosis systems all of the time and I can testify that they 1). Require a significant amount of maintenance, 2-) Have a long track record of plugging from precipitation of inorganics and silicates on the membrane surface, and 3-) Are prone to bacterial fouling, particularly in bacterially active waters, such as will be developed at this site. Without some sort of additives (pH control, sequestrants, cleaning systems, etc) which could impact the environment (I didn't see any discussion of this within the SEIS), they will fail. Without some form of redundancy, they are not reliable. The SEIS indicates that there will be no impact to water flow within the Boundary Waters - that all water flow will be to the St Louis river watershed and ultimately to Lake Superior. Given the volume of water to be used within this facility and the wastewater discharge points, there will be considerable reversal of flows within the various rivers, changing the hydrology of the area. There is proof of this in many of the hard rock mines that are presently operating and/or disch

Tim Stevens

39810

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Tim Stevens PO Box 602 Cloquet, MN 55720-0602 (218) 879-0227

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tim Wallace

4143

Dec 22, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. If this mining ;proposal is allowed to go forward it will only be the beginning for how do you stop future proposal when this one gets approved. Impacts are cumulative as well as specific for each mine regardless if it is surface or underground. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands and harm to fish and wildlife. I own a nice piece of property on the St Louis River and I will be directly affected by the discharge of contaminants from the PolyMet Mine for the rest of my life if it is allowed. PolyMet has a short life, the rivers and water are needed forever by all life in and near the river. This project must be measured by the standard of short term vs. long term. The decision will be easy and it will be NO if this metric is used. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Tim Wallace 8982 Norway Ridge Rd Zim, MN 55738-8037 (218) 744-4206

51599

Dec 22, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. If this mining ;proposal is allowed to go forward it will only be the beginning for how do you stop future proposal when this one gets approved. Impacts are cumulative as well as specific for each mine regardless if it is surface or underground. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands and harm to fish and wildlife. I own a nice piece of property on the St Louis River and I will be directly affected by the discharge of contaminants from the PolyMet Mine for the rest of my life if it is allowed. PolyMet has a short life, the rivers and water are needed forever by all life in and near the river. This project must be measured by the standard of short term vs. long term. The decision will be easy and it will be NO if this metric is used. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Tim Wallace 8982 Norway Ridge Rd Zim, MN 55738-8037 (218) 744-4206

timlndbrg@yahoo.com

46090

Lets get this done and try to help the folks in northern mn with gainful employment, help our ayates economy lord knows it wouldnt hurt, and help mn be a bigger player in the global market place. Lets get this done and get it up and running. HYPERLINK "<https://overview.mail.yahoo-com/mobile/..src=Android>"Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Timm Frankowski

9749

Dear Minnesota DNR, My Wife Susan and I are unable to attend the St Paul River Center meeting concerning Polymet's Open Pit proposal for mining in Northeast Minnesota but we want to go on record in opposition to Polymet's proposal. As land owners in Lutsen Township in Cook Co., we know first hand how precious and fragile the water resources are in the Lake Superior watershed, the surrounding Superior National Forest and the BWCA. We oppose Polymet's proposal for the following reasons: 1) Polymet's SDEIS water model is seriously flawed. The most recent MN DNR report shows the actual rate of groundwater base flow is 200-300% higher than the rate used in Polymet's SDEIS. Accurate groundwater rates are crucial to predict pollution and seepage of waste into the Partridge River. The SDEIS must be re-modeled to make it accurate. 2) The long term treatment of waste water at the mine sites and processing plant of possibly hundreds of years and the cost of which that would be put on the backs of future MN generations is outrageous. The jobs that Polymet is proposing are far outweighed by the environmental cost of the cleanup that will have to take place over a very long time. 3) Lake Superior is an international gem bordered by exceptional lands in Northeast Minnesota. The Lake is under siege in so many ways. Water compacts between the Great Lake States and Canadian Provinces in the Great Lake watersheds are trying to protect these natural wonders. The BWCA is Minnesota's most pristine wilderness area. Why would we want to risk this truly special area to the degradation that this type of mining would certainly impose. Please extend the comment period and take a closer look at the true impact that Polymet and those mining companies that will follow on our state's precious water resources and our most pristine wilderness areas. Sincerely, Timm and Susan Frankowski 4928 Chowen Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55410 e-mail: [HYPERLINK "mailto:frankowtimm@gmail-com"](mailto:frankowtimm@gmail-com)frankowtimm@gmail-com 24 Alpine Overlook Lutsen, MN 55612

Timothy Bassett

16504

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Timothy Frantzich 38768

Please do not allow Polymet on National Forest land. It's really a crime to think this is being considered. Lake Superior and the BWCA are gems, not just of MN, but of the whole world. Water is becoming a very important future issue. This is a no brainer. Timothy Frantzich 6122726265 Sent from my iGnome On Mar 11, 2014, at 6:15 AM, "*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR)" <HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

39552

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. This mine is slated to be built on pubic land. We do not want it. This is not right. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Timothy Frantzich 11586 Palisade Ave N Stillwater, MN 55082

Timothy G Lerrick 54646

See attachment

Timothy Larson 43967

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I lived through the Reserve Mining controversy of the 1970s and hope we will never see such abuse of our waters by the mining industry in our state again. The PolyMet proposal and others could create less direct but equally significant probleMs One issue that concerns me is mercury. The SDEIS briefly claims that that mercury will not leach into the Partridge River at the site of mines and waste rock sites, but the assurances are contradicted by admissions that metals could be affected by groundwater flow-which has not been adequately assessed. What really concerns me is the source of power for this very energy-intensive kind of mining. The state of Minnesota has clean energy standards that we should be striving to meet, including reducing emissions from coal-fired power plants in a part of the state that is already troubled with mercury in our waters. This issue needs discussion. Mining in Minnesota should make our state a better place. The mineral resources of our state could help us to achieve our clean energy goals. Owners of mineral rights do not have the right to pollute our land, air, and waters-directly or indirectly. The issue of mercury is not adequately described in the SDEIS. The PolyMet SDEIS is still inadequate. Thank you for considering this comment. . Respectfully, Tim Larson Duluth, Minnesota Timothy Larson 3113 Wellington Street Duluth, MN 55806 (218) 724-6963

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tina Keller

41997

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tina Keller Cottage Grove, Minnesota

Tina King

41869

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tina King Minneapolis, Minnesota

Tina Kuzminski

39874

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mrs Tina Kuzminski 401 41st Ave NE Columbia Heights, MN 55421-2866

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tina Miranda

40705

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Tina Rhea

26344

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, These are my comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining, never done before in Minnesota, threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Everywhere else sulfide ore has been mined, it's polluted the waters with acids and heavy metals. I have serious concerns about this project's potential impacts on the region's natural resources and public health, including risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Tina Rhea 3 Ridge Rd Unit E Greenbelt, MD 20770-2958

tisa paradox

46042

Thank you for responding. I look forward to future updates. Sincerely, Julie A. Jeatran On Tuesday, March 11, 2014 5:09 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Todd Ballen

16205

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Todd Bergerson

39902

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Todd Bergerson 3191 1/2 Domich Rd Ely, MN 55731-8405

Todd Burras

38834

To whom it may concern: As property owners on White Iron Lake near Ely we believe the PolyMet SDEIS is inadequate and we oppose any mining project, including the one being proposed, that threatens the water quality of the Kawishiwi watershed and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Todd, Stephanie, Andrew and Elizabeth Burras 116 Sunset Road Ely, Minn. 55731 and 2304 Van Buren Ave Ames, Iowa 50010

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Todd Ernest Barkus

57240

I think the PolyMet operation, and all similar proposed operations do not adequately address the long term and short term impacts of the pollution that will be produced. I think these operations should not be allowed to proceed. We cannot build an economy on processes that destroy the environment. Thank you. Todd Ernest Barkus 4570 Merganser Dr Minnetrista, MN 55375

Todd Johnson

40283

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Todd Johnson 322 River Woods Ln. Burnsville, MN 55337 US

Todd Lyden

7399

To Whom it May Concern, I am confident that the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) gives regulators the information they need to issue PolyMet Mining permits to operate while protecting natural resources. The PolyMet project has been designed to minimize environmental impacts. It reuses an existing site (the old LTV mining site) and existing infrastructure, minimizes the disturbance of wetlands, and utilizes multiple safeguards to protect the environment. PolyMet will also have dramatic, positive socioeconomic impacts to a region that has been built on mining. This project is located in an area that supports mining and the jobs it will bring. An added benefit is the land exchange with the US Forest Service will open up new public recreational opportunities for all Minnesotans. Todd Lyden | Vice President - Industrial | HUNT ELECTRIC CORPORATION NORTH DIVISION | 4330 WEST FIRST STREET, SUITE B | DULUTH, MN 55807 (PHONE 218-624-6513 | (CELL 218-348-1024 | (FAX 218-624-6534 * EMAIL: HYPERLINK "mailto:tlyden@huntelec-com"tlyden@huntelec-com | " HYPERLINK "http://www.huntelec-com/"Website | " HYPERLINK "http://www.facebook-com/#./pages/Hunt-Electric-Corporation/119124678110398-ref=ts"Facebook P Please consider the environment before printing this email. _____ *CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*: This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete all copies. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not keep, use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or the information it contains without the author's prior written permission. The information contained in this communication may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege. If you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages from us in the future then please respond to the sender to this effect. We cannot accept liability for the content, views or opinions expressed in this e-mail. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

TODD M 45408

Todd Flankey 19996 Rendova ST NE East Bethel, MN 55011 Bullet points that I feel are important and in support of Polymet are as follows: *I support PolyMet Mining and believe they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. *PolyMet will contribute to the local and state economy at a time when we really need the jobs and economic benefit. *I'm proud that my investment dollars are being spent here in Minnesota by Minnesotans. Our economy needs these jobs. *PolyMet will be a domestic supply of critical metals needed in medical applications, electricity, catalytic converters, cell phones, computers and other essential products. *Enough is enough; let's get on with permitting this mine. We want jobs. Regards, Todd Flankey

Todd McGillivray 10721

Ms Lisa Fay I am writing in support of the PolyMet project and the SDEIS. My family and I live on Sabin Lake (the 1st of the chain of lakes on the Embarrass River). We have been following the project for 9 years. We built our dream home there 3 years ago. We support the project. The SDEIS is an amazing document. Comprehensive, informative, complete. It's time to move on to the Permitting process. One comment about the Public meeting system. I don't believe people should be allowed to speak when their presentation is full of lies and inaccuracies. Public comment at the meetings would be much more informative and useful if one or all of the lead agencies would have time to respond to the speakers presentation with factual information. The system that was used was very unfair to the PolyMet project. Todd McGillivray 6525 Voyageur Trail P.O. Box 531 Biwabik, MN 55708

Todd Saatoff 47150

I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. I'd also like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. Companies that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. P.s I was laid off last march after working in the printing industry for over thirty years. I am attending Hibbing community college and taking the industrial system technology program in hopes that I can find a local job in mining, we need these jobs. I can't count on getting unemployment like I was promised while I'm in a retraining program that I now can't afford thanks to my government. Having never drawn on unemployment, after working for over thirty years, where is my aid when I need it. I don't want a hand out, I want a job. Todd Saatoff 510 east 25th street Hibbing MN 55746 Sent from my iPod cause I can't afford an I

Tolvo Sober 54157

Poly Met's proposed copper-nickel mine has the potential to pollute our environment for hundreds of years, far beyond the life of the company. The mine should not be allowed. [Text of original "I support PolyMet Mining" card crossed out, altered, or clearly disagreed with.]

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom 20080

I am writing this email comment in support of the Polymet Mining project. I am a geologist who has worked in the environmental consulting industry for the past 20 years, and have lived on the iron range most of my life. Although my employer has no contracts with Polymet and I have not worked on any projects for Polymet, I support the project based on a review of the SDEIS documents. Minnesota has some of the most protective environmental regulations in the nation, and the SDEIS outlines how Polymet's mine and plant operations will meet these standards. I believe the plans for the lined stockpile areas, in-pit subaqueous waste disposal, and treatment of tailings pond effluent provide key methods for reduction of potential impacts of waste rock and wastes generated by the project. In addition, the land swap provides for mitigation of biologic and wetlands impacts. Financial assurance laws in Minnesota outline standards that will ensure Polymet will honor its responsibility for long-term treatment and reclamation of the site. As a geologist I see the value of mining these strategic metals, especially Ni, Co and PGE elements, of which the US does not have a ready domestic supply. The Polymet project will provide valuable jobs on the iron range, where metal mining has been conducted in a safe, sustainable manner for over a century. I believe that the Polymet Mine will be an asset to the state and the country, and can be operated with an eye toward environmental stewardship. Respectfully, Tom Muhich, PG, CHMM 7957 Horseshoe Lake Dr Eveleth, MN 55734

Tom and Dana Vogen 43570

Comments submitted by; Thomas Vogen 21621 Oldfield Ave N., Scandia MN 55073 I believe it is unconscionable to create pollution that would need to be treated for centuries if it can even be done effectively. If we make decisions based primarily upon jobs and money, the destruction of the earth will continue unabated. My opinion is that a healthful and beautiful planet will take care of us physically and psychically and I sincerely hope this mine permit is not approved.

Tom and Julayne Johnson 45248

The answer to mining for copper and nickel and other minerals by PolyMet is very simple: If they cannot 100% guarantee that there will be no environmental damage and especially to our water supplies and Lake Superior, then mining should not be and never be allowed. Even though employees will be living in the affected areas, I'm sure the upper management will not be and therefore not be affected by any damage. My drinking water comes before any job. Tom and Julayne Johnson

Tom and Mary Schutz 44295

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I feel very strong that there should be NO MINING I support the MEPA and the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act (MERA) prohibit state agencies from permitting projects that will cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the environment. Just because they can does not mean they should. Our country does not need this mineral. This is just another get rich quick idea that will leave pollution expense that they, the company, will not be around to clean up and pay for the pollution expense later. We the people, our country and the planet earth does not need this kind of waste and havoc to our land, water and environment. Thank you for hearing my concerns. Sincerely, Mary Schutz 03-13-2014

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom and Sandy Ahlstrom

15552

Feb 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Tom Anderson

7145

Three hundred some jobs for twenty years . For the trade off of polluted sulphite contaminated water that will possibly need to be treated for up to four to five hundred years The proposal would be laughable if it weren't being actually seriously considered. At what point do you just say no It is Minnesota Water Not some murky crappy silty Colorado River water. It is the North woods The Land of 10,000 Lakes NOT the land of 10,000 sulfite mining polluted lakes. Despite the "best" safeguards industrial accidents happen all the time. Spills happen. No matter how careful companies say they can and will be, there continue to be spills and accidents. Is one of the states most precious resources worth tainting and polluting. Since every living thing cannot survive without water, just how much pollution is acceptable for the entire ecosystem If you are truly the Department of Natural Resources, then you would do well to protect the RESOURCE that no living thing can live without . Water "The best way to keep the camel out of the tent is to not let him put his nose in to begin with." I say no to this kind of mining in the State of Minnesota. Most sincerely, Tom Anderson 10745 Penn Ave South Bloomington, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Anderson 46869

To Whom it May Concern, As complex an issue this is, and without sounding absurd, I feel it is my responsibility to voice an opinion that might reflect the voices of the mute. . . the flora and fauna of northern Minnesota. We are the only species on the planet that can declare the health of the planet. That is a might responsibility. Consequently, I am opposed to any mining that compromised the natural systems found there. I realize I am part of the problem because like all Americans, I am a consumer. But I am willing to step back, consume less, cheer for innovation and work towards a future that honors all life. Thanks for the opportunity to share. my best, Tom Anderson 8010 275th Ave NE North Branch, MN 55056 - Tom's Blog: <http://www.aligningwithnature-com/> Buy this book from: AMAZON HYPERLINK "http://www.amazon-com/s/ref=nb_sb_noss.url=search-alias%3Dstripbooksandfield-keywords=Things+that+Bite.+.+Great+lakes+editionandrh=n%3A283155%2Ck%3AThings+that+Bite.+.+Great+lakes+edition"Things that Bite: The Truth about Critters that Scare People Four regional editions available: Great Lakes, Gulf Coast, Southwest and Rocky Mountain)

Tom Anderson and Kathryn Hagen 36387

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Thank you for your consideration. The Boundary Waters and adjacent areas are a precious natural resource benefiting the entire state and should be protected. Kathryn Hagen 4603 Drexel Ave Edina, MN 55424

Tom Beaudry 6420

My name is Thomas H. Beaudry and I reside at 303 East Vermilion Blvd in Cook Minnesota 55723- I support precious metals mining by PolyMet. I have read the EIS and have listened to both sides of the argument. There is no reason to block Polymet from proceeding under the guidelines established by the DNR. Tom Beaudry Recruiter Valor Partners, Inc Roanoke, VA 24016 540-446-5116 Office 218-750-1247 Cell www.valorpartners-com Description: Valor Resize Outlook

Tom Bittinger 21635

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, I am writing to urge the rejection of the sulfide mining projects in northern Minnesota. It is extremely disappointing to me that something as potentially harmful to the natural legacy, health, and economic well being of current and future generations should even be considered by those with the responsibility of looking out for the interests of all citizens. The negative environmental impacts that result from these mines are more than common, they are almost inevitable. Allowing this activity in an area of such natural beauty and environmental uniqueness would be wrong even if only considering the protection of this important natural resource. To take these risks where so much of the area's economic livelihood depends on those unspoiled natural qualities seems unconscionable. The benefits of projects like these are temporary and most of them (corporate profits) go elsewhere. I would also like to express my belief that short public comment period on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), as well as the timing of the limited public meetings, certainly gave the appearance that there wasn't any real interest in what the public thinks about this issue and that a decision has already been made. Having such a short and limited opportunity for public comment on this long, confusing, contradictory and misleading statement was unfair. I am very concerned that this important issue will turn out to be another example of how those making policy decisions that effect everyone often operate in ways that benefit powerful corporate interests over ordinary citizens. Sincerely, Tom Bittinger 133 Sawmill Drive P O Box 186 Lutsen, MN 55612

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Canning 51586

Dec 23, 2013 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thanks for considering my comments. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Tom Canning 511 17th St N Moorhead, MN 56560-2356

Tom Carious 18162

Hi. My name is Jim Leuthner, L-E-U-T-H-N-E-R. And I'm from Carpenters Local 322. And I'm going to yield my time to Tom Carious. TOM CARIOUS: Good evening. My name is Tom Carious. I live here in St. Paul, Minnesota. I want to thank each of the agencies involved for participating in this process, for producing this rigorous and thorough SDEIS, and for taking citizen input in consideration. One of the things that makes this a great place to live is the lively civic engagement, governmental transparency, and democratic participation that we enjoy. We also enjoy high standards of living, clean water, strong unions, a beautiful environment, and well-functioning, corruption-free governmental agencies. These are all things that I value highly. Other people have spoken tonight about the reason that we need copper, nickel, and other precious metals. So I won't go into detail, but I do want to point out that those of us that are concerned with reducing our carbon footprint specifically rely on copper for our wind turbines, for the solar panels in the parking ramp across the street, for the electric car charging stations in the parking ramp, and the power of the light-rail trains that will open this summer in St. Paul. In fact, we in the US are among the world's leading consumers of copper. We consume significantly more than we produce or can recycle. I haven't heard anyone tonight or throughout this debate deny this fact. There's no movement to stop the use of copper or any of these metals. So if it's a given that we're going to continue to use copper and other strategic metals, the only question is: Where should we get it? Right now some of the biggest copper mining countries in the world are Chile, Peru, China, Indonesia, Russia, Zambia, Poland, Kazakhstan, and Iran. I believe that we here in Minnesota and the United States are very privileged to demand that companies looking to open a new mine go through this very thorough process and be subjected to the level of scrutiny that all of us are applying to them right now. I'm concerned that some opponents of this proposal want to enjoy the benefits of copper without considering where it from, what the conditions for workers are in those places, what environmental regulations are in place there, or what the process is for citizen input those countries have. Do we think that public agencies in Russia, China, and Iran hold public comment periods and respond in a meaningful way to citizen input? Is it just or equitable to say that we can't produce the metals safely here in Minnesota while continuing to drive the demand for them. I believe that we here in Minnesota and the United States are in the best position to mine these metals. Better than any of the existing mines in any of the other countries that produce them. We have the strictest environmental regulations to protect our water; the strongest unions to ensure worker safety and good wages; we have public agencies full of technical experts controlled by democratic processes that value citizen input. I trust the DNR and the partner agencies to ensure that PolyMet mines responsibly in this state. I'm sure we can do it better than anywhere else.

Tom Casey 42960

Dear Ms Fay, Attached please find my client's comments. Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail. Thank you. Thomas E. Casey Attorney at Law 2854 Cambridge Lane Mound, MN 55364 telephone: (952) 472-1099 e-mail: tcasey@frontiernet-net

Tom Clarke 57954

We cannot allow massive copper nickel sulfide ore mining in NE MN. The threat to air and water especially the St. Louis River watershed & Lake Superior is too great. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Tom Conrad 42601

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom D 45857

I support the Polymet mining project. Tom Dokulil 3677 73rd Street East, Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota 55076

Tom Diener 44187

Hello, I would like to provide a few comments regarding the proposed Polymet Mine operation in Northern Minnesota. I have attempted to learn as much as is reasonably possible in order to understand the issues involved and the nature of the concerns, objections, and benefits. As an earth science teacher and a seasonal Minnesota DNR parks worker, I attempt to understand, and when required present the issues in an even-handed and balanced manner. I appreciate the care, rigor and science that has gone into the proposal. Broadly speaking, there is much at risk with this project. Taking a historically dirty industry and operating it close to a nearly pristine wilderness area seems absurd. If I could be assured that there is adequate protection in place I could support the plan but as I understand it, the level of funding for protection of the environment will be not be determined until after the plan is approved. It feels like a backward approach. Funding for unforeseen problems needs to be addressed now. Although it could apply to other situations, enforcement of regulations safeguarding the environment including water quality is an important consideration. Who will be the enforcement agency, several hundred years from now, to deal with harmful tailings runoff if they occur. Thanks, Tom Diener 5818 Morning Star Drive Duluth, Minnesota 55804

TOM DIMOND 43109

Tom Dimond 2119 Skyway Drive Saint Paul, MN 55119 March 13, 2014 RE: Comments on PolyMet - NorthMet SDEIS My family came to America in the early 1600's. Their survival was dependent on finding a way to make a living. Thankfully, our founding fathers and mothers did not choose to pollute the land such that we would still be working to clean up their mess nearly 400 years later. Part of my heritage is Mohawk. A strong Native American tradition is we are caretakers of mother earth and we should respect and protect our natural resources for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. My comments are based on the understanding that the quality of our lives are in great part the result of actions of our ancestors and our actions will impact future generations. What we decide to do today will affect generations that are not born yet and have no voice in these decisions. They will however live with the pollution and natural resource degradation they had no say in. We must be their voice. Some have suggested we should create 500 years of pollution for short term jobs and the latest electronic gadget. We all have to ask ourselves if a gadget that is outdated in year or a job that disappears in 20 is worth polluting our State for 500- The negative impacts to our State greatly outlast the short term benefits. The SDEIS does not include the full economic picture. Tourism is a major employer in Minnesota. Attracting and retaining businesses in Minnesota is highly dependent on the quality of life and the natural environment. Degradation of the environment and potential financial liabilities from 500 years of cleanup could cause job losses that greatly exceed any temporary gains. The Cumulative Effect or Cumulative Impact has not been adequately considered. The proposal indirectly impacts 6,498-7,350 acres of wetlands, and directly impacts 912 acres of wetlands. The proposal impacts 1,741 acres of MN high biodiversity significance and 698 acres of imperiled or vulnerable native plant communities. The Federally listed Lynx will be affected by fragmentation. A large black spruce, tamarack, and cedar wetland, a lake, creek and river are impacted. The impacts can be 200 to 500 years or permanent but the jobs only last 20 years. In order to maintain the jobs it requires approving another project every 20 years. This would have a cumulative effect of 10 times the impacts of this project before any of the polluted site is cleaned up. This ever expanding area of pollution can have significant impacts on the attraction and retention of business in the State. These impacts are not adequately considered in the SDEIS. Cumulative effect also applies to the protected publicly owned land in the Superior National Forest Much of the proposed mine site is federally protected land in the Superior National Forest The Weeks Act protects this land. PolyMet proposes swapping privately owned lands in the Superior National Forest for the 6,650 acres of federally protected public land. This proposal is contrary to protection of the wetlands and natural resources within the boundaries designated. The land they want to trade is not currently threatened. If the US Forest Service does not agree to the swap the amount and quality of wetlands will not diminish within the boundaries of the Superior National Forest If the US Forest Service does agree to the swap there will be thousands of acres of wetlands lost or degraded within the boundaries of the National Forest This proposal does not call for the restoration of wetlands that have been lost The US Forest Service should not support a proposal that causes a net loss and degradation of existing wetlands. The Forest Service should consider the cumulative effect. State law calls for mine closure to be stable and minimize hydrologic impacts, release of substances, and maintenance free. The modeling for water flow and assumption that 99% of the flowage and seepage will be treated

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Drill

6337

The Iron Range is my favorite place in the whole world. We have a cabin on Lake Vermilion that has been in my wife's family since 1936- We took that property over in 1991- There are 3 different watersheds in the Duluth complex. Polymet has mitigated the problems in the watershed where they operate. This area is an economic wasteland without this project. This project will transform the area into a vibrant and sustainable economy with jobs and services for over 100 years, possibly 200 years. This area is mining rich with other projects on the horizon. They all depend on the same infrastructure and many of the same resources. As a result of the mining trust that benefits the public schools the MN department of education will become richly funded for a century or two. This deposit is possibly the largest in the world. Developing countries are starving for these raw precious metals. The timing could hardly be better to pursue this. India's electric grid failed 18 months ago leaving half the country dark for a week. They need trillions of copper. China consumes 38% of the world's supply of copper. India is going to consume MORE copper than China to meet their development goals. That will drive the price north. Petroleum and copper are sympathetic to each other in price, meaning one goes up the other goes the same direction. Exporting copper is a perfect hedge against importing oil although indications point to a massive surplus in the near future for the US. A commodity surplus is never a bad thing as long as there is a shortage elsewhere in the world. I believe Washington has recognized this as evidenced by their veiled support in the arrowhead area. Polymet is seeking a 20 year permit to mine. My understanding is they will be upside down at the end of the first 20 year because of the funding for product deal worked out with their primary funding partner. For that reason I am confident Polymet WILL ensure they are a model permittee in that first 20 years so they will receive a second 20 year permit. Don't waste our fantastic resource mining provides the great state of MN. The time to act is NOW. GRANT the permitting process and if Polymet meets those conditions grant them the 20 year permit to mine. HYPERLINK "<http://www.mytelepath-com/>"MyTelepath LogoTom Drill, MyTelepath, Inc. Tel: 952-400-6004 | Fax: 952-400-6005 HYPERLINK "<mailto:tdrill@mytelepath-com>"tdrill@mytelepath-com | HYPERLINK "<http://www.mytelepath-com>"www.mytelepath-com

Tom Ehlinger

21326

I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed PolyMet mine in northern Minnesota. I know the arguments for the mine and I do not minimize the need of people in that area to have good paying jobs. But the idea of putting our fresh water at risk for hundreds, if not thousands of years, for at most several decades of jobs, is utterly astounding. It rises to the level of madness. We're talking not just jobs but the very essential elements of life. Water - fresh water - is what makes life itself possible on this planet. We have a finite amount of water - earth is a closed system and more water will not be created. Recycled from form to form and place to place - yes. But once it is contaminated, it will take generations upon generations to gradually clear up. Hubris has been the downfall of every great civilization. We know that every great culture throughout history has overreached its grasp - all the time thinking that they were capable of controlling the world they lived in. Over the past millenium, humankind has come to think that it can always find a technical solution to every problem. But we can't - especially it we think that we can forecast what will be possible over the next 500 years. The United States has not even been in existence that long. Please, for the sake of my children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, and great-great grandchildren, prevent this mine from being created. Tom Ehlinger 9937 Alabama Road Bloomington, MN 55438 952-897-1749 HYPERLINK "<mailto:tomehlinger@gmail-com>"tomehlinger@gmail-com

Tom Elisekson

57971

Sulfide mining is notoriously environmentally hazardous. The last place to approve a mine like this is near environmentally sensitive areas. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dniinage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Fiero

38703

Dear Sirs, In regard to the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS: Polymet states that the actions it has agreed to take to mitigate water contamination are unprecedented in scope. However, this is not good enough-if mitigation efforts end before the threat to water quality ends. Polymet's modeling for contamination and mitigation stop at year 200 for the mine site, and year 500 for the plant site-ignoring the fact that contamination will continue after these end dates. Will the state of MN and its taxpayers then assume the burden of continuing the necessary mitigation actions. Furthermore, the SDEIS modeling of groundwater movement at the mine site uses a Partridge River estimated baseflow of 0-51 cfs, which is not realistic. Actual measurements east of the mine site establish a baseflow that is several times higher. As a result, SDEIS predictions for the amount of sulfates and other pollutants entering the river are probably low. Significant quantitative errors in the SDEIS need to be corrected, and the corrected document should then be subjected to further review. In addition, Polymet must guarantee adequate permanent funding for pollution mitigation actions, rather than assuming that the problem of water contamination by copper, lead, mercury and sulfates will disappear after some arbitrary end date. 200 or 500 years seems like a long time to you and me, but this is only the span of a few human lives. We need to consider how our actions today will affect future generations. Thank you, Tom Fiero 271 Devil Track Road Grand Marais, MN 55604

Tom Finholt

40417

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Tom Finholt 212 Timber Wind Dr Wildwood, MO 63011 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Finholt

40436

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Tom Finholt 212 Timber Wind Dr Wildwood, MO 63011 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Garneau

14788

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: This may be a form letter but it expresses my concerns perfectly. I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights: •Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines. •Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes. •Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish. •Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected: •The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands. •The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense. •The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts on lyn

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Garneau

51060

Dear Mr Dabney, Mr Bruner and Ms Fay: This may be a form letter but it expresses my concerns perfectly. I'm writing to ask you to reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project and proposed exchange of 6,650 acres of Superior National Forest lands. The PolyMet mine and the exchange of public lands to allow an open-pit sulfide mine and mine wastes on Superior National Forest lands are inconsistent with federal law, public interest and fiduciary responsibilities to tribes. The Land Exchange serves only the private interest of a foreign corporation, not the public interest. The Land Exchange won't unify ownership of federal lands. Nearly all of the lands in the exchange have split mineral rights and no legal barrier to surface mining. The Land Exchange results in an unacceptable net loss of high quality natural resources from federal public lands. This includes a net loss of 6,026 acres of areas with high biodiversity; 2,030 acres of mature forest – replaced by 2,000 acres of immature forest; 1,400 acres of floodplains and losses of 11 endangered or threatened species. The SDEIS does not assess the costs of replacing natural resources values lost when mature forests and pre-settlement wooded wetlands are destroyed. Despite the scandalous history of sweetheart appraisals that favor private interests, taxpayers have seen no appraisal information to show that the PolyMet Land Exchange would meet legal requirements for a fair trade. The PolyMet sulfide mine would reduce lynx habitat by two square miles, kill individual lynx, and impact 2 out of 13 remaining small corridors for wildlife to travel across the Arrowhead region. The PolyMet sulfide mine plan would also destroy 2,775 acres of habitat for moose, a species critical to tribes, the population of which dropped precipitously by 35% from 2012 to 2013- Yet, the SDEIS contains no analysis of impacts on moose from the PolyMet project. The SDEIS' analysis of harm to resources that are important for tribes relies on implausible assumptions. The SDEIS underestimates the hundreds of years of water pollution from the PolyMet sulfide mine and assumes away impacts on the St Louis River and tribal resources. Whether in discussing the PolyMet sulfide mine or the proposed exchange of lands ceded to the federal government by the tribes, the SDEIS disregards the federal government's fiduciary responsibility to protect tribal rights to hunt, fish and gather plants, including wild rice. Please take the following actions to protect clean water, ecological communities, public lands and tribal rights:

- Reject PolyMet's proposed Land Exchange and any other land exchange where lands received by the public have split mineral rights and could be destroyed by future mines.
- Reject the PolyMet Land Exchange as inconsistent with the requirements of federal laws requiring that exchange of public lands be in the public interest and for fair value.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange due to the cumulative and significant adverse impact on endangered plant and animal species and species of concern to tribes.
- Reject the PolyMet project due to the cumulative and significant adverse impacts on clean water, wild rice, healthy aquatic systems and mercury contamination of fish.
- Reject the PolyMet project and Land Exchange as inconsistent with fiduciary obligations owed by the United States government under treaties with Indian tribes. No more studies are needed to know that the PolyMet land exchange and sulfide mine should not be approved. The SDEIS plan is also inadequate and should be rejected:

- The SDEIS fails to assess costs of replacing functions lost due to destruction of mature forests, floodplains and high value wetlands.
- The SDEIS fails to disclose appraisal information for public comment so citizens can scrutinize whether PolyMet would get a sweetheart deal at taxpayer expense.
- The SDEIS fails to analyze alternatives, including underground mining, that could reduce impacts o

Tom Graham

36537

I don't think you should develop The project that you're proposing. I don't think it's in the best interest of the area or for the people living there and then the people using the boundary waters canoe area. This is extremely bad for the wildlife and water creatures. we need to protect our lands and natural areas. Tom Graham Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Howell

19875

Feb 28, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I have traveled by canoe and camped in the Boundary Waters area. It is a special place with rich biological resources and beautiful scenery. The waters were so clean that we could safely drink from any lake or stream. Places like that should be protected and preserved. Too much of our country is being polluted by chemicals produced by industrial processes. Many companies promise not to pollute, or to clean up the pollution they produce, or to "restore" the land to its previous condition. The record for fulfillment of these promises is replete with unsatisfactory results. Some of the companies go out of business before fulfilling their promises, others never live up to the promises - perhaps they never intended to, or didn't realize what the full costs of those promises would be. Too often taxpayers and local residents and local businesses are left to deal with the pollution problems and the costs of cleaning up - if, in fact, it is possible to clean up the damage in any meaningful way. With far too many pollution problems the damage can last for decades. In some cases, where livelihoods, living conditions, business opportunities, water resources, and biological resources are damaged, possibly for one or several generations, there is little that is done, or can be done, to repair the lives of those who have been adversely affected. We do not place enough value on our natural biological resources and on the clean water resources that nature provides. Those resources appear to be free of charge to us. We seldom think about the millions of years it took to produce those water resources or to produce the intricate and complex interdependent webs of plant and animal life that make up our forests and other natural habitats that provide us with many things that make our lives possible - and make our lives worth living. Once they are damaged, or destroyed, the value of those biological and water resources become more apparent. It is much easier, and more cost effective, to preserve biological and water resources before damage is done than to try to repair those resources after they are damaged. Once waterways are polluted with sulfates and heavy metals it will be a very long time before the adverse effects on fish and other aquatic life forms diminish. If fish advisories already exist for waters of the area, there should be vigorous efforts to reduce pollution rather than support for projects that will make things worse. I am very concerned with protecting our clean water. I have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. Wild-rice farming will be endangered. That will affect those who depend on those crops, as well as their customers. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of year

Tom Jahnke

47214

From: Tom Jahnke 3403 56th St NE Buffalo, Mn 55313 I am writing to express my opposition to proposed mining operations in NE Minnesota. I have worked as a professional forester for over 40 years within the state and have never witnessed a successful recovery of natural resources following any kind of mining operation. Statements to protect water have been misleading in all instances. The scar upon the landscape never heals. In my home county of Wright, there are at least 40 old gravel mines that have never been "healed" after the minerals were removed. It is disgusting and a waste of our treasured lands. If the rare minerals of northern Minnesota are truly so valuable, there best be a method by which those who operate the mines can safely protect the environment and afford to pay all expenses to recover the lost resources "up front". If that is not possible, this mining proposal should be stopped in its tracks. Travel to Ladysmith, Wisconsin and Sudbury, Ontario to witness firsthand the devastation created by these types of mining operations. I always lament the use of "BORROW PITS", as mining operations refer to their sites. They never return what has been borrowed. If they must borrow something from us, let them borrow our cats. That way, we might have a chance of a few of them getting back. Thanks for allowing me to express myself. Sincerely, Tom Jahnke

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Jordan

30982

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I don't know, but it seems that \$rules over life especially our precious lakes and rivers..I know land has been mined on land near the Great Lakes for centuries. This effort seems to be an accident ready to happen. Try to live in an area like West Virginia or Ohio that was hill top strip mined for years and is still going on in W.VA. and Kentucky. The water is not safe to drink ..the latest spill in W.Va. had nothing to do with the mining but was directly related to not being able to drink the water in the in the first place as a result. Pollute the Great Lakes and see how much money you can come up with. Are the Koch Brothers in on this. Do they have as much money as PGandE. How many people in Minnesota are aware of this I wonder. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Tom Jordan 601 Lawton Rd Marietta, OH 45750-1123 (740) 516-8188

Tom Kapsner

42632

See attachment

Tom King

16357

To whom it may concern: I am against the polymet project or any other project that starts sulfide mining near the BWCA and lake superior water shed. I don't believe we have the technology to safely do this kind of mining at this time. Also we do not need to tap into these resources and can save them for a later time when the need will be greater and the technology more advanced. We are responsible for keeping our water and lakes safe for our children. Starting the type of mining at this time will jeopardize that. We should not be making some corporations and people rich at the expense of our heritage Regards Tom King 7259 Old No. 7 Rd Virginia, MN 55792

Tom Kolodzinski

18295

Tom Kolodzinski. My concern is that the project has not looked enough at the impact on White Water Lake. In the small bay, by the diversion works, there is a potential drop of up to 12 feet of water in that small bay, when pumping into Colby, in the initial stages. So, as a homeowner in that area, especially if it is during drought time, that ruins our opportunities or that impacts greatly, severely our opportunities in enjoying the water and what we built. And that's my concern, that they haven't paid attention to what the impact is going to be or how they are going to address it. The statement that I wish to make is that it is a simple choice. Nobody wants to see damage to the area. The mine is certainly, with that kind of money, the mining company, 600 million, isn't going to want to see damage. And those that do not support the mine have not shown evidence that this model will cause the damage. So, my suggestion is just proceeding, because we don't know, and have the safe guards to control it.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Koshiol

4734

What I have been reading and hearing about the proposed PolyMet NorthMet open pit heavy metals mine is of great concern. I have either led or participated in over 50 BWCA overnight canoe trips, including two successful moose hunts and two unsuccessful bear hunts, plus have hunted, fished, camped, backpacked, boated, and paddled in the Superior/Quetico region for much of my life, giving me great concerns about the known water quality issues associated with the proposal. Having read and listened to industry representatives and project supports, I find their comments to be shallow, short-sighted, and unsubstantiated. There does not appear to be a concrete water protection/treatment plan in place, but just vague promises that all will be taken care of. There seems to be no dispute of the number of years the mine will operate (20), the number of local full-time jobs (90), and the number of years requiring water protection/treatment (500). This is boom and bust to the max, and it does not add up. It's a ridiculous compromise to the 33,000-plus tourism jobs already in place, and that presently sustain many communities in the area. It is argued that iron mining was and is a vital part of that area of Minnesota for many years, and that the area still has clean air and water that draws many annual tourist to the area (a quarter-million annually to the BWCA alone). But this is different. The dangers associated with acid mining are astronomically larger and longer lasting than the iron and taconite mines, and the industry's track record is dismal at best – terrible in reality. We all want good jobs for everyone. I work in the HVAC industry, and we depend on plentiful work. But, again, this is different. These are very short-term jobs for a very low number of families, with the vast majority of mining profits leaving not just our state, but our country. Tom Koshiol Crow River Trail Guards "Connecting Kids to the Outdoors" Paynesville, MN 56362 [HYPERLINK "http://www.trailguards-org/"](http://www.trailguards-org/) www.trailguards-org 320-250-0464

Tom Kranz

47068

The YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities (YMCA) offers life-changing wilderness experiences through a variety of year-round camp programs, placing thousands of young people and families every year in the public waters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW) and nearby lakes and rivers. This pristine wilderness area has clean water and healthy forests and it is in everyone's interests for the BWCAW to remain unspoiled and unpolluted. The YMCA is aware of proposals to mine sulfide ore in the watershed of the BWCAW. In considering the permitting of any proposed sulfide mining operations, we urge decision makers to be certain that the following clean water and environmental protection principles can be guaranteed: 1- BWCAW waters and nearby lakes and rivers remain safe and clean 2- Strong safeguards are in place in the event anything goes wrong 3- Mining companies must leave the site maintenance free (in accordance with existing MN mining rules) The YMCA is committed to preserving the natural environment in and around our camps and in the BWCAW, for generations to come. We are also concerned that one of our camps, YMCA Camp Warren, operating for 87 years on Half Moon Lake south of Eveleth, is within the downstream catchment zone of the proposed PolyMet Mining NorthMet Project Site. We strongly urge careful scrutiny of proposals that have the potential to disturb or pollute the BWCAW and nearby lakes and rivers. Tom Kranz Vice President of Camp Operations YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities 2125 East Hennepin Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55413 (C) 651-295-5790 [HYPERLINK "mailto:tom.kranz@ymcatwincities-org"](mailto:tom.kranz@ymcatwincities-org) tom.kranz@ymcatwincities-org The Y: We're for Youth Development, Healthy Living and Social Responsibility Comments Comments will be accepted until 4:30 PM CT on Thursday, March 13, 2014- Email: Submit comments to: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us. E-mail submissions should include a full name and legal mailing address. [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us) Email us » Mail: Written comments may also be submitted to: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 _____ Comments will become part of the official record and as such, may be made available for public examination. Comments and submittals will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information; therefore, the Co-lead Agencies suggest that commenters not submit information that may cause the commenter concern if publicly disclosed.

Tom Lenarz

22052

My name is Tom Lenarz. My full address is 1123 Summit Ave Cloquet Mn 55720 I would like to submit a comment in support of the Polymet project. I have been following this process for the last 7 years. While I agree that keeping the environment safe is important, I think the management for this project has gone above and beyond to show that they can do this in a safe manner. I would like to see this comment period come to a conclusion and the permits needed to continue the project approved. Thank you for your time. Tom Lenarz

Alphabetical by sender's first name

tom lewis 57720

Dear Sir/Madam, Please be advised that I wholly support PolyMet Mining and their bid to open the NorthMet mine. Sincerely, tom lewis

Tom Lindquist 42443

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Tom Lindquist 1115 Magnolia Ln N Plymouth, MN 55441-4637

Tom McMullen 57719

I am submitting this e-mail in favor of the PolyMet project and other mining opportunities in the State of MN. I am an environmental engineer by trade and an avid outdoorsman. However, I feel the process to approve the PolyMet Mining project has been dragged out long enough. This is a valuable project for the state of MN, we have already lost enough jobs (tax base..) from our state. All of the so called "environmentalists" who are fighting this will never be convinced these mines are a good idea even though they sure enjoy their i-phones, laptops, etc the devices are all driving up the demand for precious metals. I feel the DNR has done an adequate job of holding the mining companies responsible, they have done their due-diligence, let's move forwaRd Sincerely, Thomas McMullen, PE Industrial Reps 112 Lookout Point Buffalo, MN 55313 Cell: 612-819-3591 e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:tom@industrialreps-com"tom@industrialreps-com

Tom Neiman 43798

I am adamantly opposed to the proposed copper mining site in northern Minnesota. Satisfying short-term business opportunities does not serve the long-term best interests of Minnesota/the upper Midwest or its people/land/animals/agriculture. Reserve Mining is a good lesson to keep in mind. Tom Neiman 3712 France Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55416 Tom Neiman | HYPERLINK "mailto:marsha.lapage@mpls.k12-mn.us"tom.neiman@mpls.k12-mn.us Community Education Coordinator Minneapolis Community Education | Minneapolis Public Schools P: 612-668-3100 | F: 612-668-3085 Description: cid:image003-png@01CCF2FB.E4B93D80

Tom NN 42657

See attachment

Tom Obst 42709

See attachment

tom peacock 23487

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Governor, I have returned to the Northeastern parts of you state every year for a decade or more, and I began visiting the same area in 1946 for a number of years before moving WeSt The importance of clean water, undamaged environment, clean air has only grown in these succeeding years as pressures on them have increased. Requirement for Government protection of these basic resources has grown as well. It is the last public defense resisting habitat and environmental degradation, and the subsequent destruction of life. The value of profits cannot, by any rational measure, begin to compare to their value. Deny the proposed PolyMet Mine. Sincerely, Tom Peacock 43 Durham Rd Sincerely, tom peacock 43 Durham Rd San Anselmo, CA 94960-1604 (415) 453-4640

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Pliska

39744

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Tom Pliska 5341 41st Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-2227

Tom Plocher

46110

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billion in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Glencore should be a responsible party for financial assurance in PolyMet's mine plan To Lisa Fay, MN DNR, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not account for or even mention Glencore, the largest shareholder in PolyMet. Glencore is a global commodities and mining company, with a long record of environmental pollution and anti-labor practices. It's interim chairperson is none other than Tony Hayward, who led BP to the worst safety record among major oil refining companies. The discussion of financial assurance in the SDEIS is inadequate in several ways, but one is the lack of any mention of Glencore - the largest shareholder, largest funder, and owner of the first five years of minerals from the proposed NorthMet mine. Since PolyMet is a junior mining company that has never operated a mine before, and since their assets are limited, the best guarantor of bankruptcy-proof financial assurance is the inclusion of Glencore in any potential liability from pollution at the site. Taxpayers have incurred billions in cleanup costs, at times due to an inability to pursue the parent companies that bankroll junior mining companies. The PolyMet SDEIS should establish that the owner of the mine's proceeds and largest investor is responsible if pollution occurs. Please take the following actions: 1)Require that the PolyMet EIS include mentions of Glencore as the largest shareholder of PolyMet stock, the largest investor in the PolyMet NorthMet project, and as the owner of the first five years of NorthMet's minerals due to an off-take agreement with PolyMet. 2)Include Glencore in the financial assurance section of the document as a potentially responsible party, in case the financial assurance required of PolyMet proves to be inadequate. 3)Require that any permit to mine for PolyMet include Glencore, due to their status as largest investor and owner of the minerals produced by the mine. Sincerely, Tom Plocher 9040 152nd St N Hugo, MN 55038-9117

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Reinke

41553

The model used to calculate the alleged economic benefits of the mine does not take into account the costs to the environment; the displacement of other economic activity, including among other things tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather under the 1854 Treaty; the infrastructure, government, and social service costs resulting from the mining; and the consequences of the unpredictable influx and outflow of mine employees. What would be the costs for public infrastructure, lost opportunities to engage in other economic activities incompatible with mining, depressed real estate values, lost recreational opportunities, social upheaval, and perpetual clean-up that the public would be required to bear. PolyMet admits that water pollution by sulfuric acid and heavy metals will last for at least 500 years. Not all of the polluted water will be captured for treatment. Annually, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater without being treated. Annually, 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater without being treated. The SDEIS fails to adequately assess the long-term impacts of the pollution resulting from the release of this untreated water. The computer model used by PolyMet may understate the actual pollution impact, because it has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality around the mine site. Thanks,

Tom Roth

16609

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Tom Roth 1989 Wellesley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Roth

50003

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Tom Roth 1989 Wellesley Ave Saint Paul, MN 55105

Tom Rukavina

18194

My name is Jeff Huberty. I'm a business agent with St. Paul Plumbers Local 34, and I would like to concede my time to Tom Rukavina. Thank you. I am Tom Rukavina, R-U-K-A-V-I-N-A. I'm a third-generation Iron Ranger, and I've got a fifth-generation granddaughter who lives 10 miles from this mine and I want the same thing for her and all of our grandkids that I had, and that's a good middle-class American life, and on the Range, that means a good union mining job. We've been mining on the Range for 132 years -- I'll correct everyone tonight -- 132 years. We're proud of what we do and who we are. We are miners. And you know, right now, as we're sitting in this room, there's four mines in the Superior National Forest that are churning out all the metals we want. They do such a good job that you people who go up to the Boundary Waters, you drive right by them, and you don't even know they're there. So we're the best miners in the world, and for the next 132 years, we're going to be mining because Minnesota's been blessed with some of the richest mineral deposits in the world. Now, everyone in this room uses all the metals that we're talking -- and minerals we're talking about tonight. So we're all polluters, but we all want to be good environmentalists. Nobody's got a monopoly on the environment. This project, think about it, is the biggest recycling project in the history of the State of Minnesota. We're not talking about pop cans and beer bottles on the curbs here, folks. No, we are talking with a plant that has a coarse crusher – coarse crusher, fines crusher, concentrator, railroads, tailings ponds, pipelines, haul roads. They're already there. We're going to make a new mine on an old mine. What in the heck makes more environmental sense than that? Come on. You know. Here's the fact: In fact, because of it, this mine will pollute and harm Mother Earth less than any other mine that's past or present planned right now. So that alone should be a major factor for our regulators over there, whom I know a few of them, when they make the decision, because this mine makes the most sense environmentally. So let's work together. You know, we've got the brain power. We've got the technology. We even have the environmental regulations to make this mine one of the showcase mines in the world. PolyMet is the perfect fit for this mine. It's already there. You know, and for all you anti-mining folks in the room, I got a paper bag here, and my friends in the back of the room, we brought some for you. We'll collect your car keys and your cell phones and your iPads at the door because all of these projects, or all of these little gadgets that you have are made from minerals so, you know, you can export your pollution to China, or you can have slave labor in Africa, but right here, you can have good union mining jobs in the United States of America.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Rukavina

44812

Attention: Lisa Fay I have followed the progress of the Polymet/Northmet proposal for almost 10 years, both as a citizen and former State Representative representing the area where the proposed mine would be located. I strongly support the project I grew up on the edge of a mine on the Northside of Virginia. At the time, Virginia had a population of 14,000 people. Almost everyone on our block had a father or grandfather who worked in the mines. Mining is what we have done on the Range for 132 years. And I proudly point out that while we have altered the landscape with our mining culture, we have not damaged the environment. In fact, people come to visit or live here because of our pristine atmosphere. A mine can only exist and operate if the metals are there to mine. Minnesota has been blessed with not only one of the largest iron deposits in the world, but also one of the largest deposits of copper, nickel and precious metals. It makes economic and environmental sense to locate this Northmet mine in the Hoyt Lakes/ Babbitt area. The towns that will house the workers are already there and are capable of accommodating the influx of workers needed to build and operate the mine. As a State Representative, I passed the law that preserved the infrastructure at the old LTV taconite mine for the day when a new mine would locate there. That new mine should be Polymet. When LTV (Erie Mining Company) was built, it was a 350 million dollar investment in 1952 dollars. Today that would equal around 2 billion dollars of investment. By using all the old course and fine crushers, concentrator, power lines and sub-stations, railroads, haul roads etc, the NorthMet project will save the environment by not having to mine for the metals that built this minesite the first time around. This should be a major consideration for all the agencies charges with approving this project. The human race and the citizens of the USA need the resources that will be mined at the Northmet site. In order for the human race to move away from the fossil fuels that cause global warming, we need the copper and nickel and platinum, palladium etc that will be mined at this site. We know how to mine on the Iron Range of Mn and we know how to do it correctly. Modern technology and modern regulations will insure that this mine will be one of the most environmentally sensitive mines in the world. We can not bury our heads in the sand and pretend that the mines that are currently supplying all the metals we use in our daily lives are doing it properly. We know that here in the USA, you regulators will make sure that we put all the safeguards in place to make this mine the safest in the world. The experts at the Natural Resources and Research Institute at the University of Minn/Duluth, have indicated to me that we can mine the Copper Nickel etc ores safely and properly. They have indicated that the reverse osmosis process proposed by Polymet to treat their waste water will work and not pose a threat to our area. In fact, many of the communities on the Range get their drinking water from the old natural iron ore pits. The sulfides in those pits has not turned to sulfates. People drink this water and don't get harmed. People in the Eveleth/Virginia/Gilbert/Mt.Iron area live under the shadows of three different mines operating near their communities and they live healthy long lives. The U of Mn has completed a 5 year/ 5 million dollar study on mesothelioma and found our air is cleaner than the air in downtown Minneapolis. We have not polluted our environment. Please approve the NorthMet project. America needs to make and manufacture things in this country. We need to mine the resources we all use in this country, not export our desires for these metals to another place where the environment will be abused. Iron Rangers are hard rock miners. Don't destroy or try to change who we are and what we do. We have mined correctly for 132 years. We have the resources to mine for hundred

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Sharkey

40321

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Tom Sharkey 2 Arrowwood CT Granby, CT 06035 US

Tom Steigauf

4874

To who it may concern, Thank you for the great work the MN DNR has done in the past and continues to do today. I am proud to say that I'm from MN "The land of 10,000 Lakes". I believe our DNR has done an incredible job of conserving and maintaining our natural resources. After all, these resources don't belong to us we are leasing from our children and grandchildren. I wish to voice my concern about the PolyMet mining proposal. This type of mining; often called sulfide or acid mining has never been conducted in a way that preserved the natural landscape, habitat, or wildlife in the adjacent areas. That track record speaks for itself. People travel from all over the United States and even the world to visit MN for our lakes; the BWCA being a prime example. They don't travel here to see our mines. My in-laws have a lake home in Ely. We regularly host friends and family up there from all over the USA and Germany. The PolyMet mine will create jobs but how many and for how long. PolyMet will run the mine for 10 years or so then leave. The jobs will be lost and MN will be left with the environmental mess. The fact is a relatively small number of jobs will be created and most of the money will leave the state. Companies will promise anything and everything to get their way. Remember the repair hub and call center Delta promised to build in the Range. It would be far better to develop tourism and create jobs around tourism. These would be long-term jobs that would continue on for generations. I realize this makes it seem I don't care about the people living on the Range. The truth is I do care. I care a great deal about them. That is why I have the courage to challenge them and you to reject this easy way out. The PolyMet mining operation will damage our beautiful natural resources. It is that simple. People deserve to have jobs but not at this awful price. The mine will create very few jobs in the grand scheme and damage the number one major resource we have; our beautiful lakes and forests. Thank you for your time and consideration. Best regards, Tom Steigauf 6944 Stevens Ave So Richfield, MN 55423-2410 763-526-6362 HYPERLINK "mailto:tom.steigauf@gmail-com"tom.steigauf@gmail-com

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tom Thompson

18939

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: Please extend the comment period for the Polymet Northmet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement from 90 days to 180- The Statement is not something that most people can just read overnight or even several days and understand. The time allotted included one of the busiest holidays of the year for people and some of the most frigid and snowy weather seen in many years. Many, including myself, live out in the areas being impacted where life has slowed because of the weather. Getting chores and going to town to do errands has been more time consuming. I have a Duluth address but live 30 miles north of it and must drive there to do business and shop. The Polymet Northmet project will have extensive impact on lives. Having quality time to investigate this document is important. Please extend the time period to give adequate time to go over this huge document. Thank you for your consideration. Tom Thompson 1370 White Lake Drive Duluth, MN 55803

Tom Uphaus

40617

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Mr Tom Uphaus 2650 N Pine Creek Rd La Crescent, MN 55947-9619 (507) 895-2152

Tom Welch

42565

See attachment

Tom Witt

7037

To whom it may concern: Greetings. I'm a long-time resident of Minneapolis, but a frequent visitor to northern Minnesota. I'm writing to add my voice to those opposing the PoyMet Sulfide Mine. For a time I lived on site at an abandoned copper mine in Washington State, which now more than 50 years after its closing is still a Superfund site with toxic danger surrounding it. That experience has caused me to err on the side of caution when considering permit requests for future large mines. As the SDEIS analysis point out, strip mining brings with it a host of environmental damages that are not worth the number of jobs that PolyMet promises: Danger to water quality Discharge of sulfates Harm to wildlife Destruction of wetlands We have been given an incredible gift of amazing natural resources in Minnesota's Arrowhead Region. Let's not pollute it for the sake of some jobs, but rather let's do the harder work of finding more jobs that don't have such a harmful effect on our environment. Thanks for listening. Thomas W. Witt 2416 E. 22nd Street Minneapolis, MN 55406 [HYPERLINK "mailto:tw Witt@gmail-com"tw Witt@gmail-com](mailto:tw Witt@gmail-com)

Tom Wright

42567

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Toni Malanaphy-Sorg

9466

We cannot continue to make short term decisions that have long-impacting and negative repercussions for our future. I understand that people need work in the Range. Let us put our efforts toward finding work that does not ruin the water we drink and the soil from which our food comes instead of spending millions of dollars on lawyers and studies to try and make something that is clearly bad look not so bad so a ruthless corporation can make more money for their shareholders. We the people are becoming educated and we are tired of politicians who are in the pockets of these businesses on the one hand and wanting to quickly assuage the need for gainful employment for their constituents on the other hand coming up with “fixes” that fix nothing. Put this project up for a vote by the people – all the people who will be affected by the project, during the next election. That would be democracy. I guess you know how I would be voting. Thank you, Marie Malanaphy-Sorg 165 Western Avenue N. #205 Saint Paul, MN 55102

Toni McCray

41635

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Toni McCray 6329 Brightlea Dr Lanham, MD 20706-2865

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Toni Pangborn

16284

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Toni Watt

18238

My name is Toni Watt, T-O-N-I, W-A-T-T. And I am a proponent of no mining allowed in the Boundary Waters. I really don't think it's safe, and I don't think they can guarantee that the water there will not be polluted. I don't think it's a good investment to look for 20 years worth of jobs, maybe, and 500 years worth of pollution, you know, and there's -- and the mining companies do not have a good track record, and we raised our children in the Boundary Waters for summer trips and it's a very beautiful, pristine wilderness, and I really -- and if Minnesota doesn't keep its Boundary Water Canoe Area, it's going to lose big time, financially, and the country will lose that beautiful asset that we have here. We need to be very, very cautious about preserving the waters of Minnesota. We are at the beginning point of three different river shed areas here, and we can't afford to pollute our water. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tony Baldwin

17342

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

tony colarich

7766

There needs to be a balance in regard to the ecology and the economy. The SDEIS for the Polymet mine project does exactly that. Ten years of DNR work has gone into this document. After ten years it is time for this project to move forward. The Range, the state of Minn., and the United States need the excellent paying jobs that this Mine will provide. Minn. has the strongest Mining environment laws in the United States. It will be done safely. Everyone in the state will take nothing less. Thank you Anthony M. Colarich 1011 East White St Ely,Mn. 55731

Tony Jordan

9845

My Name is Tony Jordan, and I live at 3754 Rustic Place, Shoreview, MN 55126- Although it has been 8 years since I've been to the BWCA, I know it to be a true "water world". The flow of the visible water through passages connecting lakes for 100 miles or more is a sensitive provider of all forms of life in the area. The flow of the water that we can't see underground is even more intricate and sensitive. The minerals are not going anywhere and their value will only increase. We should wait for technology to be developed to offer the possibility of mining them without the accompanying destruction that future generations will pay for. I am against the mining proposal because of the irreversible damage that will be done to the area. I am in favor of an additional user fee for the BWCA that would be shared with the residents of the area to compensate for their not getting the 300 some jobs that come with the destruction of the area. Thank you, Tony Jordan (651) 482-9608

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tony Kwilas 18360

(Inaudible) environmental policy of Minnesota Chamber of Commerce. I want to thank the DNR for their hard work on this. And we think the document is complete. I would like to cede my time Senator David Tomassoni.

54895

See attachment

Tony Nelson 10266

As the Chair of the Dakota County Planning Commission, I understand the push for more jobs. Especially in an area that needs them. But, I am also the Habitat Chair for the Twin City chapter of Trout Unlimited and I understand the community's desire for clean air and water. The technology is there to extract the minerals but there are no known examples of a case where the waste is handled in a safe way. This type of mineral extraction will leech sulfuric acid from the tailing sites. There are no examples of an existing mine that does not have this problem and the timeline to control this is for hundreds of years. Are the mine owners willing to put the money up front to cover the entire cost for this cleanup. We must not get caught in a situation where the owners file bankruptcy after the mine is played out and the citizens are stuck with the bill. I know there will be extreme pressure placed on all the agencies to push this through, but the people of Minnesota are relying on your agencies to look at the science and the limitations of the existing technologies to make a decision that protects the land, the water and our children. You are caught between a jobs and profits over-rule all and a "NIMBY" mindset but you must rule on the facts that you have. Can you permit a mine and preserve the water quality that currently exists. The decision is yours. Both sides want you to do your jobs, so do them. What does current science tell you. Tony Nelson, 890 Redwood Drive, Apple Valley, MN 55124; 952-486-2282

Tony Terwey 41891

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tony Terwey Richmond, Minnesota

Tony Vavricka 9

From: TONY VAVRICKA [mailto:tonyvavricka@gmail-com] Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:03 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: 500 years Hi Lisa, The press release put out by the DNR forgets to mention the 500 years of clean up. from star trib The DNR says in the environmental review that PolyMet would be required to operate the reverse osmosis water treatment systems for as long as necessary. Computer projections in the environmental impact statement say that either active or passive water treatment will be needed for 200 years for the mine site, and up to 500 years for the metallurgical site. The document says water treatment would cost between \$3-5 and \$6 million per year after the mine closes. <http://www.startribune-com/local/226548091-html> who gets to pay for this Tony Vavricka

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tonya Draughn

40184

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Tonya Kjerland

18269

My name is Tonya Kjerland and I am from Northfield, Minnesota. I am a graduate student at the University of Minnesota. I have done extensive studies with wild rice in the field. And I would like to state that in order to determine what a rice water is, the state should consider simply the presence of wild rice. Looking at historic data, such as it is, is very difficult at this time since we have not yet collected enough density data to determine how wild rice populations change over time. I know from experience of looking at the data that does exist from the 1854 Treaty Authority, it is clear that rice can fluctuate extensively in density as well as spacial presence. I would also like to say as a native person that the wild rice is more than just a plant. It is a sacred medicine. And that this is not just for the native people, it is for everyone. Ahaa Miiigweh, A-H-A-O, and then M-I-I-G-W-E-H.

Town of Fayal

54716

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tracey Smallwood

40293

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Tracey Smallwood 1322 harwich dr Waldorf, MD 20601 US

Tracy Alfson

16995

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Tracy Alfson 6037 Country Club Road Houston, MN 55943

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tracy Alfson

50280

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Tracy Alfson 6037 Country Club Road Houston, MN 55943

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tracy Bauman

16590

Feb 19, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Tracy Fredin

42464

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness and Lake Superior Ecosystem. It does not provide enough economic benefit for the cost to our quality of life. There are other, more economically effective paths to follow. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Tracy Fredin 4506 Nawadaha Blvd Minneapolis, MN 55406-4036 (612) 729-3802

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tracy Kraemer

41982

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tracy Kraemer Blaine, Minnesota

Tracy Mallon

40360

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Tracy Mallon 4136 Freeland Ave Philadelphia, PA 19127 US

Travis Barnes

54172

The mine is a bad idea. It will cause a lot of pollution and kill a lot of wildlife. You could mine somewhere not important like Canada.

Travis Durkin

20017

I am against the new mine. I live in Ely and I am very concerned about our watersheds. I do not feel that there is sufficient evidence to keep our waters safe from pollution. Please do not approve this operation. Thank you. Travis Durkin 16 N 8th Ave E Ely, MN 55731 - Travis ;-)

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Travis Mazerall

40820

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Mr Travis Mazerall 19 South St Brighton, MA 02135-5167 (857) 383-8062

Trevon Clay

54177

I don't think they should build the mine because there is many places to mine besides doing it right next to a wildlife area. The mining will destroy fishing, the water, the sulfuric acid will destroy all most everything in the water that would be another wildlife destroy. Just because they want to get copper and nickel. The wild habitat will be destroyed we need animals to survive like fish and other animals. The acid will make the [ILLEGIBLE] the go down.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Trevor Russell

38788

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tricia Smith

17010

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Trilby Busch

42439

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, When I first moved to Minnesota in 1968, a controversy arose about the dumping of taconite tailings containing asbestos into Lake Superior. The practice was finally stopped, but only after tons of carcinogens were put into the water. I beg you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Dr Trilby Busch 2648 Emerson Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55408-1222

Trish

49559

Congratulations on your retirement .BUT before you leave, please and forward these notices to Supervisor Periman It's possible.. PolyMet may have some good points, but it will also destroy the wetlands.. And leave us with a mess when they pull out. Trish In a message dated 2/28/2014 8:14:10 P.M. Central Standard Time, tdabney@fs.fed.us writes: On Tuesday, March 4, I begin my retirement. Contact Deputy Forest Supervisor Richard Periman at rperiman@fs.fed.us or 218-626-4303 for assistance. This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Trish Gardiner

41753

Mar 8, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsib

Tristan McCormick

41253

As someone who has studied natural resource economics, environmental policy and biogeochemistry a fair amount I know that these issues can involve many important stakeholders with conflicting but valuable objective functions where policy makers face difficult tradeoffs and non-pareto improving solutions. This is not one of those times. As I'm sure you know, unlike iron ore mines, the impact of which is huge but containable, sulfide mining tailings produce highly acidic runoff. The upper Minnesotan hydrological system is so interconnected that this would mean centuries of catastrophic and un-manageable ecological costs in what might be the combined most beautiful, ecologically valuable, and visited lake ecosystem in the Union. Which is to say nothing of the negative externalities imposed on anyone who has ever gone or will ever go to the BWCA in this or any coming generations. But they'll clean it up, right. Even if they DID commit the appropriate amount of fund (which is probably, you know, hundreds of billions of dollars since the runoff would need essentially indefinite treatment), there is a nearly flawless record of companies like this almost immediately raiding those funds/hiding behind bankruptcy protection. Then who pays for it. No one. But what about the jobs. The few thousand jobs created over the next decade will be nothing compared to the job and revenue losses in the tourism industry that will almost certainly result as people are less inclined to visit a lake system with a pH of 5. Obviously I exaggerate. The pH wouldn't be that high. But it would be too high for fish. Like walleye. I love walleye. These companies aren't even American. Which might be the WORST possible reason to reject this mine but the money isn't even staying in the state. It's going to some international mining conglomerate acting through shell corporations.. I didn't even know that was actually a thing. What is this a Jean le Carre novel.. Anyway. Please. For once, can the good guys win. Please call me if in any way I can help convince you to take the high road. Seriously though, I'm 23 and I'm gonna have to explain this shit to my kids. Cheers, Tristan

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Trout Unlimited Chapter 642 47838

attached is a letter that was sent 3/12/14 but was returned so sending again

Trout Unlimited Minnesota 54909

See attachment

Troy Rogers 43203

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years and beyond. I was born and grew up on the Iron Range. After living away from the area for a number of years, I recently made the decision to return to MN and have since moved to Duluth. As a young professional with specialized skills, my career aspirations have long implied that I should seek out opportunities in a larger urban center on the East or West CoaSt However, return trips to visit family and friends over the years have convinced me that the place I want to be is in Northeastern MN. Foremost among my reasons for wanting to return to the area to live, work, and grow my small start-up company are the pristine lakes and waterways of the Arrowhead region. I know many peers of my generation with similar stories. Motivated, energized young people who have stayed or returned to the area, inspired by the unique and treasured natural recreation opportunities afforded by the area's forests and lakes. I am a firm believer in the potential for this region's innate cultural and recreational resources to usher in an era of economic revitalization for the Arrowhead. I also believe that short-sighted decision making based on short term profits for the few can undermine and negate this potential. As such, I view the PolyMet project as currently proposed, planned, and outlined in their SDEIS to be a major threat to Northeastern MN's long term economic vitality, rather than as an opportunity. Specifically, I agree with WaterLegacy's findings and assertions, as outlined below: The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant f

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Troy Rogers

47783

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years and beyond. I was born and grew up on the Iron Range. After living away from the area for a number of years, I recently made the decision to return to MN and have since moved to Duluth. As a young professional with specialized skills, my career aspirations have long implied that I should seek out opportunities in a larger urban center on the East or West CoaSt However, return trips to visit family and friends over the years have convinced me that the place I want to be is in Northeastern MN. Foremost among my reasons for wanting to return to the area to live, work, and grow my small start-up company are the pristine lakes and waterways of the Arrowhead region. I know many peers of my generation with similar stories. Motivated, energized young people who have stayed or returned to the area, inspired by the unique and treasured natural recreation opportunities afforded by the area's forests and lakes. I am a firm believer in the potential for this region's innate cultural and recreational resources to usher in an era of economic revitalization for the Arrowhead. I also believe that short-sighted decision making based on short term profits for the few can undermine and negate this potential. As such, I view the PolyMet project as currently proposed, planned, and outlined in their SDEIS to be a major threat to Northeastern MN's long term economic vitality, rather than as an opportunity. Specifically, I agree with WaterLegacy's findings and assertions, as outlined below: The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS
- The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fract

Twin Metals Minnesota

42923

Ms Lisa Fay: On behalf of Twin Metals Minnesota, LLC ("Twin Metals Minnesota"), please find attached an electronic copy of Twin Metals Minnesota's comments to the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A hard copy of these comments and a CD of attachments were delivered by messenger earlier today. The hard copy of the comments inadvertently excluded page numbers, which has been corrected in the attached electronic copy of the comments. Please substitute in the record the attached electronic copy of the comments for those that were delivered by messenger. Note that the CD included with the hard copy comments contains attachments that are too large to include via email. This CD of attachments should be included with the electronic copy of the comments, such that the CD and the attached electronic copy of the comments make up Twin Metals Minnesota's comments on the recoRd Please let me know if you would prefer that we submit another hard copy of the comments, and we will deliver one as soon as possible. Thank you, Andrew J. Gibbons Andrew J. Gibbons | Attorney | Stinson Leonard Street LLP 150 South Fifth Street, Suite 2300 | Minneapolis, MN 55402 T: 612-335-1438 | M: 612-432-7252 | F: 612-335-1657 andrew.gibbons@stinsonleonard-com | HYPERLINK "<http://www.stinsonleonard-com>"www.stinsonleonard-com Stinson Leonard Street LLP is officially open for business. Please update your records to reflect the new email address and firm name. This communication (including any attachments) is from a law firm and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please contact the sender for instructions concerning return or destruction, and do not use or disclose the contents to others.

Twin West Chamber of Commerce

42878

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

tye block 42423

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms tye block PO Box 19 Cordova, SC 29039-0019

Tyler Lies 47423

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. I have camped in the Boundary Waters multiple times with friends and family and every time I visit I discover something new in the area and within myself. This is only possible due to the pristine condition this natural area has been preserved in. I'm also an Environmental Geoscience major at UND though I live in MN, and I understand the type of effects that this could have on the environment, though not to the degree as the people doing the testing. I would love to have the ability to continue visiting this area in the condition that it's in for years to come, and this won't be possible if it becomes polluted and disrupts the ecosystem that is currently in place. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Tyler Lies 716 169th Ln NE Ham Lake, MN 55304-4891 (612) 423-1282

Tyler Nord 18334

My name is Tyler Nord. I live here in Duluth. I am also a taxpayer and also study political science and economics at UMD. There is a lot to be said about this in regards to the economic situation, the amount of waste copper, scrap copper that we are exporting that is highlighted by the Bloomberg Business Group, the same people that audited the Federal Reserve Bank. They have shown that we are sending (inaudible) scrap copper to China to fuel their growth. Since 2007 they fueled the majority of their growth from our scrap copper. The economics aside, I would like to address the SDEIS. I would like to request that it is rejected and reanalyzed. I would ask that Section 404 is rejected and reanalyzed. And I would like to ask cumulatively that at that point there is no reason for the Land Exchange until these other things are stopped. When you take a wetland out from one area, you can't just have another one happen somewhere else. Any technologist can tell you that. Any geographer can tell you that. It might be a similar size of wetland, but the service it provides to your economy isn't the same, if in a specific location, you filter more water than in another location. So, just adding more wetlands somewhere else while destroying the wetlands on the other line won't work. Now, in the SDEIS -- in the EIS they demonstrate that they will be using the LTV site. (Inaudible) it drains from the bottom into three separate streams. It was designed that way. They are just going to pile a different type of waste on top. I will remind you that this type of mining has never been done safely and we live in a high-water content area, however you want to say that. Now, what we are looking at here is when we had that flood a couple of years ago, whatever year it was, it doesn't matter, it was a 500-year flood, it was a 200-year flood; well, I'm from Fargo, North Dakota. They are putting in a diversion. Lots of stuff going on with the water management there. Now, they said it was a 100-year flood in '97. Oh, then it was a 200-year flood in 1999. Oh, now it's a 500-year flood. Now, PolyMet doesn't acknowledge 500-year floods or 1,000-year floods, 2,000-year floods at the site. It doesn't matter. The main flaw in the EIS, the acronym that applies here, it is that it doesn't show what happens if the pumps at the edge of that tailing pond fail. It doesn't show the alternative scenarios. It doesn't show that 21 gallons per minute that leaks from the LTV site, that they admit will be leaking 21 gallons per minute, that is -- first of all, that's never been demonstrated before. They acknowledge that untreated water will be leaving the waste site. Thank you.

42659

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Tyler Reid 42009

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Sincerely, Tyler Reid 34232 N Bluestem Rd Round Lake, IL 60073-5245

Tyson Nguyen 41919

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change.org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Tyson Nguyen Brooklyn Park, Minnesota

UM Natural Resources Research Institut 42893

On Behalf of Lucinda Johnson, NRRI Director. Please find attached NRRI's comments regarding the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed NorthMet mine project and land exchange. Thank you, Trish Trish Sodahl Assistant to the Director Natural Resources Research Institute University of Minnesota Duluth 5013 Miller Trunk Hwy, Duluth, MN 55811 218-720-4207, fax 218-720-4219

United Transportation Union 54880

See attachment

USDOJ 42983

To Whom it May Concern, The US Department of the Interior's comments on the subject project are attached. If there are questions, please contact this office at (215) 597-5378- Regards, Valincia Darby - Valincia Darby Regional Environmental Protection Assistant Department of the Interior, OEPC 200 Chestnut Street, Rm. 244 Philadelphia, PA 19106 Phone: (215) 597-5378 Fax: (215) 597-9845 HYPERLINK "mailto:Valincia_Darby@ios.doi.gov"Valincia_Darby@ios.doi.gov

USEPA 47834

See attachment

47835

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

USW Local6115 42924

Attached is an Amended Resolution from USW Local 6115- _____ HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/" This email is free from viruses and malware because HYPERLINK "http://www.avast-com/"avast. Antivirus protection is active.

UTU Minnesota: 42987

Dear Sir or Madam, Please see the attached letter from the United Transportation Union, Rail Division of the Sheet metal, Air Rail and Transportation Union, (UTU-SMART-TD). This letter has also been hand delivered to the DNR Offices in St Paul. On behalf of our 1200 active and many retired railroad workers in Minnesota, we support the acceptance of the proposed Polymet Mining Environmental Impact Statement without any further delay. Please add our UTU-SMART-TD letter dated March 8th, 2014, to the DNR, to the public comment docket. Thank you. Phillip Qualy UTU-SMART-TD SLD Minnesota 651-222-7500

V Brandt 40336

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, V Brandt 28 W.10th New York, NY 10011 US

V johnson 39734

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms V johnson 1027 16th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-2409

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vaillancourt Michele

39017

Thank you for your response. However, as I informed the North Star Chapter of the Sierra Club, if I did submit comments, I didn't intend to do so. Please withdraw them. Regards, -Michele Vaillancourt Michele D. Vaillancourt (612) 604-6681 [HYPERLINK "mailto:mvaillancourt@winthrop-com"](mailto:mvaillancourt@winthrop-com)mvaillancourt@winthrop-com Notice: Important disclaimers and limitations apply to this email. [HYPERLINK "http://www.winthrop-com/our_firm/email_disclaimer.aspx"](http://www.winthrop-com/our_firm/email_disclaimer.aspx)Please click here for our disclaimers and limitations. From: *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) [<mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us>] Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:16 AM To: Vaillancourt Michele Subject: RE: Comment on PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft EIS Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

Valerie Lovejoy

40280

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Valerie Lovejoy 3650 cedar flat rd williams, OR 97544 US

Valerie Mellerop

33877

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Wisconsinites consider canoeing in the Boundary Waters area to be the pinnacle of recreation. This pristine wilderness is the last frontier for midwesterners to explore. It should be protected at all costs, as there will never be another. In addition, fishing/canoeing opportunities are being squeezed by development in other parts of the midwest Our great lakes fishery is also being threatened on multiple fronts, including Chicago carp. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands (flooding.), harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Valerie Mellerop 1052 E Gorham St Madison, WI 53703-1608

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Valerie Murphy

21181

Dear DNR, I am writing to let you know I am completely against the proposed Polymet mine in northern MN. Mining destroys the land and water that we rely on for survival and recreation. Even if it could be cleaned up, the clean would be required for hundreds of years, at enormous expense, an expense that may or may not be paid for my the mining company. And there will surely be irreparable damage. The area if miner, would never ever be the same. I believe no potential number of jobs is worth destroying this priceless, beautiful area located near the pristine BWCA. Once it's gone, it's gone. It is not worth it. Thank you for considering my comments. Valerie Murphy White Bear Lake, MN

Valerie Stoehr

45005

Dear Ms Fay, Federal and State Agency Leaders: I am writing to urge you to reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits. I am concerned about the lack of return on investment given that the cost of environmental safety hazards may dwarf the economic benefits. In particular: 1- Copper and nickel mining is better suited to an environment different from the projected northern MN site. 2- Polymet's revised draft (SDEIS) is inadequate. There is no consideration of alternate methods (like underground mine, putting liners under the waste dumps), no guarantees of who pays for routine monitoring/treatment after mine closes—and no consideration of spills, etc 3- The computer model for treating wastes and handling pollution is based on poor data and requires revision. I am working with our elected representatives to urge consideration and adoption of other methods to bring economic opportunities to the Range. PolyMet is not in our best interests. Please deny the permit. Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, Valerie Stoehr Afton, MN Valerie Stoehr PO Box 395 Afton, MN 55001

Valkyrie PenDragon

17068

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Valkyrie PenDragon 3802 Polk Ave Bemidji, MN 56601

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Valkyrie PenDragon

50338

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Valkyrie PenDragon 3802 Polk Ave Bemidji, MN 56601

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vance Anderson

57336

Vance Anderson, from Cromwell, Minnesota. I am a business representative for Roofers Local 96. I support the PolyMet mining and believe them that they will build and operate a mine that complies with all regulations and protects the environment. I trust the multiple state and federal agencies involved in preparing the document. Okay. Based on the extensive documentation as outlined in the SDEIS, I am confident that impacts to the air, water and land will be minimal, if any, and that the land post-closure will be reclaimed to protect natural resources over the long-term in compliance with the law. The SDEIS demonstrates that PolyMet can develop this resource in a sustainable manner and there will be logical engineered solutions proposed for potential impacts. I am impressed by the extraordinary precautions proposed by PolyMet, such as a reverse osmosis, and look forward to having them as a new neighbor. The SDEIS shows that mining, recreation, tourism, and other land and natural resources can be -- can co-exist. The PolyMet project has been designed to minimize environmental impacts, reusing the Brownfield site, reusing existing infrastructure, minimizing disturbance of wetlands, and utilizing multiple safeguards to protect the environment. PolyMet will control and manage stockpiled water and use proven technologies found in liners, water collection systems and cover systems. PolyMet will not discharge water to the environment that has not been treated with reverse osmosis. PolyMet will provide financial assurance to cover all closure costs. PolyMet will utilize the best available emissions control devices on mobile mining equipment. Some foreign suppliers of metals PolyMet will provide don't necessarily follow the sound environmental practices, creating a greater global environmental impact. That's a mouthful there. PolyMet has demonstrated they can produce these critical metals while following Minnesota's strict environmental requirements to protect air, water and land. PolyMet will be a domestic supply of critical metals needed in medical applications, electricity, catalytic converters, cell phones, computers, and other essential products. I use these metals every day. If we are to maintain our modern way of living, we need to continue to find and extract these metals. And just as well we do it in Minnesota, where we find them in abundance, where there are sound regulations in place and where we have a ready and available workforce. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity expanding and diversifying our mining economy. PolyMet can produce these metals in an environmentally sound manner and create hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. I trust the multiple federal, state and federal agencies in preparing the document. The Minnesotans trust the DNR to do the copper-nickel mining and to keep our communities safe. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way that generates significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. Copper-nickel mining will provide millions of dollars in local and state taxes to support our communities and our educational system. It is irresponsible to import these metals from countries that do not have strict environmental standards, when Minnesota has an opportunity to mine responsibly. The environmental review process has been lengthy and thorough. The Supplemental EIS addresses potential environmental impacts and how to mitigate them. It is irresponsible to import these metals and export jobs, when we can mine safely here in Minnesota.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vanessa Hooper

40326

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Vanessa Hooper 2358 Cedar Crest Blvd Dallas, TX 75203 US

Vanessa Silva Cruz

40480

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Vanessa Silva Cruz Boas noites São Paulo, ot 08225-180 BR

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Venessa Fuentes

43505

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish, and human health. The SDEIS must be redone because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze, environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts; and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures, or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Respectfully, Venessa Fuentes Venessa Fuentes 2624 15th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55407

43506

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. The PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish, and human health. The SDEIS must be redone because its predictions are unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze, environmental impacts. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts; and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures, or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Respectfully, Venessa Fuentes Venessa Fuentes 2624 15th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55407

Vern Schueller

58056

No BP in BWCA! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Altemative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vern Simula

16354

First, in a macro sense, the observation (and evidence) that no sulfide ore mine, anywhere, has been operated without serious or extensive water pollution problems, demands that regulatory agencies invoke the "Precautionary Principle," that is, that it is incumbent upon the mining company to prove unequivocally PRIOR to mining operations that that pollution standards will not be violated. The Northmet SDEIS, with its probabilistic/statistical modeling, does not satisfy this common sense standard. The stakes are simply too high — especially within this water rich environment — to allow a "trial and error" approach for demonstrating that pollution incidents will not occur. An additional factor exacerbates this concern: The SDEIS is replete with statements (indications, admissions.) that water quality problems (violations) are, indeed, likely to occur, or could occur. What follows those statements is what is really egregious, and that is the repeated, summary if not "dismissive" comment: "if detected, adaptive water management measures would be implemented." Another variation of this statement which is "arrogant" in tone within the context of this critical question of protecting water quality within a precious environment, is the phrase, "If actual NorthMet Project Proposed Action effects were found to be higher than predictions, then steps could be taken to reduce those effects." "Steps COULD be taken." As a citizen, I am insulted. I demand that the company declare their commitment that "steps WILL be taken" to not only reduce (another weasel term) but to mitigate the problem such that water quality criteria are, indeed, met. Examples of these statements occur on Page 5-98, Page 5-144, and Table 8-0, Sections 1, 2, 9, and 13 (Page 8-4 to Page 16) to cite only a few. The SDEIS contains no detailing of what these "adaptive water management measures" or "steps" would consist of. Additionally, and more importantly, there is no assessment as to the efficacy of such adaptive measures. Thus, the Polymet SDEIS is grossly incomplete (inadequate). This is tantamount to giving the mining company a "back door" to escape designing and validating not just the preventive but the remedial measures in the event a water quality standard is violated. To repeat, the SDEIS narrative conveys the general sense that there is a significant likelihood that water quality violations will occur. This is all the more reason to invoke the Precautionary Principle. ie, "prove it first." Vern Simula 5491 Bluebell Avenue Mt. Iron, Minnesota

18324

My name is Vern Simula, S-I-M-U-L-A. I live in (inaudible) US Steel and Minntac Plant. Many of my neighbors work there and the various mines in the area or mining business. Many of my neighbors, especially young working, are desperate for jobs in our Iron Range communities. Our downtown businesses also depend upon a strong local mining base. We need those jobs desperately and deservedly. That's why so many mine workers are here tonight. But the need for such short-term jobs, or more precisely the asserted economic contributions they propose will be provided, the 20 years, must be considered irrelevant for the purpose of this hearing. That issue is out of bounds. Not germane. Because the fundamental issue here is what is at the proposed mining project can be done safely without harm to the natural environments or to human health. Again, the fundamental issue is the safety of the mining -- the proposed mining operation. And to look at that question, that's a highly technical question. And I for one -- many of us as citizens we really don't have -- you know, miners and folks that have come here tonight we really don't have the expertise to look at the very complex issue of the various scientific questions surrounding will this mine pollute or not. Additionally, a number of citizen organizations have retained professional scientists in various areas and expertise to address the many aspects. And the resulting reports distributed by these organizations gave enormous doubt whether this mining project can be done safely. And also, even the EIS itself is not conclusive. In chapter 8 it contains a litany of major differences of opinion. If indeed there are doubts or disagreements, unanswered questions, or probability that if one of the criteria of the safeguards cannot be met then the only reasonable, prudent decision for our regulatory agencies is to invoke what I call a precautionary principle. According to my handy-dandy Wikipedia, a precautionary principle states that if an action or a policy has a suspected of risk of causing harm to the public or the environment, in the absence of scientific consensus that the action or policy is harmful, that the most prudent type of thing is to invoke (inaudible).

42679

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vern Simula

47347

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Two thoughts: 1- There has been tremendous political pressure urging approval of the SDEIS, because the Northmet Project will create "jobs" for the Iron Range. The pressure is so clamorous that leads one to think that the "Range" is solely dependent upon this project for additional jobs. Not so. The Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board (IRRRB) just in the last three years has, according to their report, created 1,894 permanent jobs, supplemented by 2,800 construction jobs, jobs that do not contribute to potential serious environmental hazards. 2- Numerous statements in Chapters 5 and 8 of the SDEIS "admit" that water quality violations will likely occur. These statements are followed with the rather "flippant" comment that in the event of such occurrences, measures will be taken to remediate the violation. There is no description or evaluation of the efficacy of such remedial measures. This is unacceptable. It gives a potential polluter a free pass. Please reject the SDEIS on a "No Action" basis. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Vern Simula 5491 Bluebell Ave Virginia, MN 55792-4009 (218) 591-5722

48577

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Two thoughts: 1- There has been tremendous political pressure urging approval of the SDEIS, because the Northmet Project will create "jobs" for the Iron Range. The pressure is so clamorous that leads one to think that the "Range" is solely dependent upon this project for additional jobs. Not so. The Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board (IRRRB) just in the last three years has, according to their report, created 1,894 permanent jobs, supplemented by 2,800 construction jobs, jobs that do not contribute to potential serious environmental hazards. 2- Numerous statements in Chapters 5 and 8 of the SDEIS "admit" that water quality violations will likely occur. These statements are followed with the rather "flippant" comment that in the event of such occurrences, measures will be taken to remediate the violation. There is no description or evaluation of the efficacy of such remedial measures. This is unacceptable. It gives a potential polluter a free pass. Please reject the SDEIS on a "No Action" basis. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Vern Simula 5491 Bluebell Ave Virginia, MN 55792-4009 (218) 591-5722

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Verna Alt

18477

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to calculate whether PolyMet's seepage would violate water quality standards using the closest location where groundwater seeps would reach wetlands. Both the mine site and tailings site have high pollution levels in surficial groundwater seeps and have wetlands far closer to pollution sources than the "evaluation locations" used in the SDEIS. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Verna Alt 5115 42 AVE S Minneapolis, MN 55417

Vernon Baker

46988

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Lisa, I'm writing to submit a comment on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project. First, I want to express my confidence in your agency to thoroughly evaluate the project, and its ability to design the mitigation for potential environmental impacts. I believe the environmental review process has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its controls and measures will address potential environmental impacts and will meet all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, I'd like to address some misinformation that has been reported in the media about the 200 and 500 years referenced in the SDEIS. In the groundwater flow model in the SDEIS, water percolates through the bedrock at an extremely slow rate of travel. For this reason, the model was run for 200 to 500 years, allowing enough time for water to move through the aquifer and reach the compliance point at the boundary included in the SDEIS. It is commendable that the modeling completed in the SDEIS is so thorough that it addresses the slow, minimal flow of water for such a period of time. It also shows the project will still meet water quality standards even that far out – all the more reason to support it. This does NOT mean that the mine or processing facility will need treatment for that long. This model demonstrates that PolyMet's plans comply with Minnesota's laws – some of the strictest environmental regulations in the country. Minnesota is home to a world-class deposit of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium and gold. This is an economic opportunity right below our feet that will benefit the state's economy for future generations. PolyMet will produce these metals in an environmentally sound way and generate significant economic activity, expanding and diversifying our economy and creating hundreds of jobs that can support families and sustain communities. We cannot afford to miss this job opportunity. This project would mean 2 million construction hours, 360 full-time mining jobs and more than 600 related jobs – jobs that our state needs. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. Based on my review and the level of detail included in the draft EIS it appears that a thorough evaluation of the project and potential impacts has been completed. Sincerely, Vern Baker Chaska, MN 55318

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Veronica Erickson

54179

I don't think you should mine in the area of the boundary waters. The sulfur in the rock mixed with air creates sulfuric acid. Acid kills most aquatic life. This means no more fishing. Many people go to the boundary waters for peace and quiet, but the drill noise along is hard on the ears. This area has been protected since 1989, and if you plan to mine for 20 years, it will do damage to our water for much longer than that. The contamination from this mine will threaten all water bodies connected to it. The PH of the water will be 4, 3, 2 even 1. Aquatic life dies below a PH of 4. These are just a few reasons you shouldn't mine near the boundary waters.

Veronica Smith

57344

My name is Veronica Smith. I am from the Fond Du Lac Reservation. I am a band member. And my concern is, of course, is the waters and the streams and the lakes that come down from where the mines are going to be. What I have the most concern about is the wild rice. Our Manoomin -- the creator has given us manoomin. Do you need to know how to spell that? M-A-N-O-O-M-I-N. And that's what is my concern. It is the waterfowl and the plants, and of course my concern is the state grains in Minnesota, protecting that to the fullest. And that's what my concern is. Alright? Thanks.

Vicki Andrews

17164

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Andrews 31135 Sunny Beach Road Grand Rapids, MN 55744

45098

I am writing to urge you to reject the PolyMet proposal to build a copper-sulfide mining operation in Minnesota's Lake Superior Basin. This plan is bad for the environment, a potential disaster to Minnesota communities, residents, land and water. PolyMet's proposed location increases risks of pollution and harm to public health - 99% of what is dug out of the ground will be waste. It would impact irreplaceable high value wetlands in the St Louis River watershed- destroying 913 acres and indirectly affecting another 7,228 acres. Tailings will be dumped in an unlined tailing basin. It is almost certain to result in contamination of surface and/or ground water with sulfates and toxic metals. The risk to the environment is simply not worth it. We need to protect Minnesota's land, water, and communities. Please reject this proposal. Protect Minnesota. Thank you, Vicki Andrews 31135 Sunny Beach Road Grand Rapids MN 55744 218-259-4254

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vicki Andrews

50432

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Andrews 31135 Sunny Beach Road Grand Rapids, MN 55744

vicki Bonk

10002

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Bonk 5629 45th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Alphabetical by sender's first name

vicki Bonk

18747

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Bonk 5629 45th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55417

42015

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms vicki Bonk 5629 45th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55417-3018

Alphabetical by sender's first name

vicki Bonk

50822

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream.
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Bonk 5629 45th Ave S. Minneapolis, MN 55417

Vicki Cebulla

15346

HYPERLINK "https://docs.google-com/document/d/1ivta5wqacofQAv9cLy6IykqjeIQu9WQ5Iko_jcfqvw/edit.usp=drive_web" Untitled document

Vicki Culver

39899

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Vicki Culver 8200 38th Ave N New Hope, MN 55427-1113

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vicki Effertz

10216

Sulfide ore mines providing employment is a RELATIVELY SHORT TERM FIX of a problem. Sulfide ore mines polluting water and wilderness is LONG TERM DESTRUCTION of a precious MN resource. Clearly, this kind of mining is not the same as taconite mining. It has more long-lasting and serious consequences to the land and water. It is not possible to guarantee safe mining practices. Once the damage is done, we can not back up on this decision. MN needs to provide incentives for non-destructive industries to move north to provide jobs. Vicki Effertz 8086 Curtis Lane Eden Prairie, MN 55347

Vicki Ericson

57972

I have concerns about the runoff from the holding ponds to the Embarrass River watershed & the 100 mile swamp. Those regions articulate with the Boundary Waters. Please protect them! Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine dnniange has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federalland within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Aletemative.

Vicki Everett

9502

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Everett 11 Elizabeth St #26 Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vicki Everett

18437

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Everett 11 Elizabeth St #26 Duluth, MN 55803

50556

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Vicki Everett 11 Elizabeth St #26 Duluth, MN 55803

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vicki M Gustafson

57212

Dear Sirs:Minnesota is one of the most beautiful states in USA. I have focused on keeping it that way my whole life. I do dispose of dangerous chemicals properly, recycled everything I should. I never litter, etc etc. I know we need to keep our water, air, etc clean of any dangers. It is all we have. Our children, grandchildren deserves better. They are our future. We need to focus on ways to stop toxic pollution and anything that will threaten our water supply, air or land. Sulfide mining in northeastern Minnesota will be a very big mistake. Please protect our children. This mine could create more illnesses that could lead to death. Anything toxic will destroy life. MN will not benefit from sulfide mining. Thank you and I apologize for my messy letter. Vicki M. Gustafson 121 Carlisle Ave Duluth, MN 55803

Vicki Sanville

43999

I submitted my comments to the SDEIS this morning. I would like to be included in the mailings or electronic distribution of the record I included my name, Vicki Sanville, and would now like to submit my address and e-mail contact which is as following: Vicki Sanville 1501 Vermilion Road Duluth, MN 55812 email address: vickisanville@yahoo.-com Thank you. Vicki Sanville On Thursday, March 13, 2014 11:32 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official record If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the record

44237

Why do we need to move ahead with the permitting of the proposed copper mine. We do not have to do so We should understand by now that the resulting damage to our environment does not let us even consider such an effort. What can possibly keep the mercury contamination from eventually moving into the groundwater and causing major changes in the quality of the groundwater involving a huge part of our natural world. We need to look far ahead and try to understand what will be critical for our quality of life in the future. We may be forced to live a much more basic existence where technology will not be as much a part of our lives. The quality of natural resources such as our water will take on new meaning for our existence. We should begin to put more consideration into living with and carefully maintaining much of what already exists, particularly in our corner of the world. Vicki Sanville Duluth, MN

Vicki Stute

42758

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vickie Vogt

39761

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

vicky kent

39404

Dear Reader, I am NO expert, but common sense tells me the risk is too high. I vote against allowing this project to go ahead. Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion. Victoria P. Kent 5555 Dewey Hill Road Edina, MN 55439

Vicky Shields Craig Mevissen

52237

I do not support polymet mining in northern minnesota. Victoria Shields 6641 Lochanburn Rd Eden Prairie, MN 55346 - Craig Mevissen, Vicky Shields [HYPERLINK "mailto:mev.shields@gmail-com"mev.shields@gmail-com](mailto:mev.shields@gmail-com)

Vicky Wicks

5978

20 years of jobs for 500 years of pollution. How short sighted are we to even consider this. I want my children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, . to be able to experience the incredible natural beauty of NE Minnesota. The area really is the jewel of Minnesota. Don't tarnish it with this Canadian company's aspirations. Sent from my iPhone

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Victor Hemmy III

40266

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Victor Hemmy III 771 Kealahou Street Honolulu, HI 96825 US

40358

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Victor Hemmy III 771 Kealahou Street Honolulu, HI 96825 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Victor Walter

40812

Hi, my name is Victor Alan Walter. I live at 18975 Valley View Road in Eden Prairie Minnesota, 55346- I have lived in the Twin Cities area most of my life. I was born in Virginia Minnesota in 1956- I live in the Cities but my heart lives in Northern Minnesota. I can't afford to live up there. I have a family down here. I know most people that live on the range have one or two jobs to support their family. Travel is horrible in the winter. All stores are far away and the produce sucks. But there is a reason people live up there. The beauty of the land. Easy access to forests, swamps, open fields, rivers, lakes and swimming. People live up there for a reason. Because they love living there. The water moves as freely as the air. Life is not easy, financial security is not easy. We don't need more mining jobs in northern Minnesota. Our tourism will be worth much more in the long run for our states financial security. Any degradation of our water will be a slow death for our state. Please do not mine for copper in Northern Minnesota. I love our state. I want to stay here. I want to live here. I want to visit my homeland. Please.

Victoria Bloch

42454

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents completely unacceptable environmental risks it should not be allowed under any circumstances. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota's water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years (or so, give or take a decade or three), and endangers both clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. Lake Superior is a precious national resource, as is every significant body of fresh water in our country. With fresh water at a growing premium, any threat to water represents a threat to our economy, our citizens' health, and our nation. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mrs Victoria Bloch 2556 Granville Ave Los Angeles, CA 90064-2804

Victoria Morrison

39763

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Victoria Morrison 74 Noland Dr Clyde, NC 28721-9299 (218) 341-8294

Victoria Oakey

14370

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting their clean water. I and they have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This irresponsible trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Miss Victoria Oakey 18 Cogges Hill Road Witney Oxfordshire, None OX28 3FP 4401993708832

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Victoria Singer

40878

Mar 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, I'm not a Minnesotan. I live in Washington State. But I am a part of the planetary ecology, and this proposed mining project is of some concern to me. If our landfills were mined for precious metals, and manufacturers pressed to create more from recycled products, there would be no need to open new mines. There would be no need to risk the health and home of all living things. Open pit mining is (or should rightly be) obsolete. Hold the line. Say no to PolyMet. Sincerely, Ms Victoria Singer 705 Lyle Ave # 1 Lyle, WA 98635-9061 (509) 557-5456

Victoria Turke

18254

My name is Victoria Turke, V-I-C-T-O-R-I-A, T-U-R-K-E. The supplemental draft environmental impact statement is inadequate in several areas and should be gone through to thoroughly answer questions in detail. We cannot let this report define the future of our clean water. The SDEIS uses a small bit of data from 1984 to address the water flowage and its impact concerning the issue of how much and how fast our groundwater, streams and lakes will be polluted. The report is using data that does not reflect what the conditions actually are at the proposed site. The report does not reflect the impact that this project will have on our clean water. This report does not adequately answer the question of how this perpetual need for taking care of the polluted waters is to be paid for, and when questioned, they say those details will be addressed during the permitting process. This just is not sufficient. This is our time to voice our concerns about the PolyMet mine that is proposed. We deserve to have all of the details now, not when it's too late. These questions are far too important to put off. The SDEIS does not answer these questions and should be sent back. Thank you.

19527

My name is Victoria, V-I-C-T-O-R-I-A, Turke, T-U-R-K-E. I live at 1004 Trenton Circle North in Plymouth, Minnesota, Zip Code 55441. I'm concerned about the PolyMet sulfide ore mine that is being proposed for the Hoyt Lakes area. Computer models show that the water from the mine and processing plant will be contaminated with toxic metals and sulfate. I spend most of my time in Northeastern Minnesota and own property on a beautiful lake. I am concerned that PolyMet will not be able to capture and treat all of the contaminated water before it reaches the St. Louis River and Lake Superior. A great majority of us are downstream from this project. We need to ask more questions about how PolyMet can possibly keep its word about protecting our waters. PolyMet's own plan admits that millions of gallons of polluted water will seep offsite. The SDEIS does not completely address this subject. How will PolyMet be able to treat the polluted water for 500 years? How will they pay for it? We need more answers. Thank you.

Vincent Graziano

48718

Mar 11, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I would like for once the State and DNR actually protect the natural resources that they are supposed to protect and not just hand over our future to corporations and especially foreign corporations. Examples are the Minnesota River, one of the most polluted in the country, moose hunting when moose are going extinct, wolf trophy hunting, not protecting wetlands, on and on and on. Their own simulations say pollution for 500-years, in other words FOREVER. If this kind of mining does ever become safe (which I doubt), then it will be worth even more in the future. To the unions who I usually defend: not every job is worth doing if it destroys your future. Northern Minnesota has the golden goose. Defend it, don't blindly pander to the "jobs" message. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Vincent Graziano 121 Otis Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-5635 (651) 644-4388

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vincent Trovato

39619

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

39620

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Vincent Trovato 7501 Ontario Blvd Eden Prairie, MN 55344-1889

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Vincent W. King

45163

I am a native of north-central Minnesota and have been camping, hiking, skiing and working in the area near the Polymet site for 44 years. I worked as a wilderness guide in the BWCA. During my time in the northland, I have become familiar with its fractured geology, clean waters, and extremely fragile biomes. Essentially every body of water there is connected to every other body of water, both on the surface and in the subsurface. It is simply ludicrous to suggest that any amount of human engineering, or any amount of money, can prevent a disaster from occurring, resulting in the acid mine drainage entering the surface and underground waters in the area. Apparently the duration of necessary treatment is subject to some debate, but from what I have read treatment will be necessary for many decades, if not several centuries. No human-devised system can stand up for the period of time needed to treat this water. Northern Minnesota's lakes, streams, marshes and bogs are an irreplaceable resource. The short-term economic gains from sulfide mining are far outweighed by the long-term risk. I urge you to reject any permit for sulfide mining in northern Minnesota. Thank you. Vincent W. King 1941 Ashland Ave St Paul, MN 55104 Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail. NOTE: This e-mail message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail Message in error, we apologize. Please notify us immediately by telephone and delete the e-mail message from your computer. Thank you. VINCENT W. KING, P.A. VINCENT W. KING, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW / 310 FOURTH AVENUE SOUTH / SUITE 900 / MINNEAPOLIS / MINNESOTA 55415 USA HYPERLINK "<http://www.vklaw-net/>"<http://www.vklaw-net/> / E-MAIL HYPERLINK "<mailto:vinceking@vklaw-net>"vinceking@vklaw-net / TEL 612-288-9225 / FAX 612-344-1255

virgene haas

38799

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms virgene haas 1057 26th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414-2643 (612) 331-2877

Virgil Boelland

42591

See attachment

Virgil Sohm

17825

I am an enrolled member of the Lake Superior Band of Ojibwe at Nett Lake Reservation in the State of Minnesota. I express grave concern for our water, wildlife and fauna of the northern region of the Arrowhead landbase. Culturally this is our medicinal, hunting and wild rice harvesting territory. The Federal Government and State government has a fiduciary responsibility to honor the rights our grandfathers were promised in the Treaty of 1854- Sulfide mining profits will benefit only the Glencore XStrata Corporation and the Polymet Mining subsidiary company. We do not have to trust their words on keeping our environment safe. Toxic waste labelled as reject concentrate is approximately 99% of the earth they will dig up to extract less than 1% of copper and other precious metals. Keep in mind that the released toxins will disseminate in the water and the air in every direction. The Polymet Environmental impact statement is submitted for public comment prior to March 13, 2014- I'm not a scientist but treating the poison water for 500 years is not financially or ecologically sound advice for Native Americans, Iron Rangers, tourists, wildlife or wild rice. Clean water is paramount to all life. Our brother the wolf has been hunted and trapped for two winters now, our moose population has declined to the point of decision where the Grand Portage, Bois Forte and Fon du Lac tribes are not allowed a ceremonial use permit for a moose. Our lakes are the source of the fish populations. Our wetlands were left here by the receding glacier of the Ice age. We can not reduplicate this process. We as Anishinabeg stand together as stewards of Mother Earth. In review of the SDEIS, the fact that there are inaccurate data and the need to keep our National forests sustainable; I urge you to reject any and all plans for sulfide mining. Miigwech, Virgil D Sohm PO Box 662 Tower, MN 55790

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Virginia Dale

39075

---Original Message--- From: dalev1@earthlink-net [mailto:dalev1@earthlink-net] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:45 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, Virginia Dale 2430 Irving Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55405

Virginia Danfelt

36340

For Lis Fay, EIS Project Manager:

Virginia Groos

57990

I totally agree with the information below & feel we are going in the wrong direction - need more wind & solar power. Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid mine drainage has polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife, exchange of federal land within Superior National Forest, and cumulative impacts, and support the No Action Alternative.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Virginia Mattson

40264

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, Virginia Mattson 4917 Andrew St St Bernard, OH 45217 US

Virginia Nichols

57444

I will be brief - this plan is short sighted, and will irrefutably negatively affect the waters that Minnesota is famous for. It is astounding to me this mine is even under serious consideration, given the obvious risks. Virginia Nichols 330 S. 4th St Ames, IA 50010

Virginia Rosenbaum

35315

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. Lake Superior is connected to the other 4 Great Lakes; together they hold one-fifth of the world's fresh water supply. It would be CRIMINAL to allow a corporation to risk polluting this vital resource, only for a business to make a short-term profit. Millions of people rely on the Great Lakes for their drinking water, and there is also a large (billions of dollars) fishing industry that requires clean water. Would we acquiesce to the risk if such open-pit mines were to be opened on Canadian shores. NO, we would not. We cannot permit these open-pit mines to operate on the shores of the Great Lakes. Thank you. Sincerely, Virginia Rosenbaum 1133 Judson Ave Evanston, IL 60202-1314 (847) 864-5514

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Virginia Schwertfeger

16081

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Virginia Sullivan

16050

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Voyageurs National Park Association

54910

See attachment

Vu Thanh Phan

54200

I don't think having a mining project by the boundary water is a good idea in the long run. I personally enjoy sightseeing in the boundary water and canoeing in that region. Having a mine up there can potentially damage the aquatic ecology and the natural habitat of many species. Also, I would like you to review and take a look at the mining project extra cautiously. Thank you in advance!

W Clinton Jurgens

16935

Ladies and Gentlemen: Please accept the attached comments on the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). If you would prefer a Word document, I can forward that as well. Thank You. Respectfully, Clint Jurgens [HYPERLINK "mailto:clintjurgens@mac-com"](mailto:clintjurgens@mac-com)clintjurgens@mac-com 3770 Talero Curve Chaska, MN 55318 The information contained in this message and any attachment may be proprietary, confidential, and privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by replying to this message and deleting it and all copies and backups thereof. Thank you.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

W. Charles Huskins

42980

This message is addressed to: Ms Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Mr Douglas Bruner United States Army Corps of Engineers Mr Tim Dabney United States Forest Service I have attached my comments on the SDEIS for the NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange. Please provide a confirmation of receipt. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS. Please include me on all mailing lists/groups regarding the NorthMet/Polymet proposal. Sincerely, W. Charles Huskins, MD, MSc 1323 Lone Pine Drive SW Rochester, MN 55902

W. Knox

47037

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream. •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, W. Knox 3156 23rd Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407

Alphabetical by sender's first name

W. Knox

47039

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, W. Knox 3156 23rd Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407

Wade Christensen

18095

My name is Wade Christensen. I am a long-time member here, in Northern Minnesota. I believe to GPM, Incorporated. We have a number of our guys here supporting this project. I want to thank the Army Corp of Engineering, the Department of Natural Resources, and the -- there's another one in there, I know. I can't remember which one it is. I want to thank you for your due diligence in this project because this is very important to us. I was going to come up here and talk about financial assurance as it relates to what PolyMet has to do to get this project off the ground. I'm going to do that in a little different way and I'm going to ask a couple guys to stand up. One of them is Bill Moraski. Bill, can you stand up? Adam Christianson. And David Hughes. Stand up. This is my vision -- Bill, please, no, stay standing. This is my vision of financial assurance. Number one, I do have to point out, it's amazing how Bill, at 75, looks younger than Dave. I wanted to point that. Here's what financial assurance looks like to me. I called on Bill 25 years ago and I probably haven't seen Bill in 20 years. Adam, my son up here, will be calling on Dave, and you could replace any one of us with 20, 30, 40 other vendors that are here tonight, and it's the same process. It's the process that financial assurance is that the Iron Range is evolving. Taconite is always going to be here, but we have the opportunity, with PolyMet, to do something completely different, and to take that next step in the evolution of mining. We support PolyMet 100 percent. We thank you for the commitment that you've done in good science and preparing them for this project. So thank you, and thank PolyMet for being a part of this. BECKY SAHR I'm Becky Sahr and I defer my time to Bud Stone.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wade Johnson

40443

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired

42196

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. There is enough destruction taking place on this planet already for the sake of easy money. When it gets to the point of sacrificing our environment as the Polymet proposal does, it must end. I have enjoyed lots of time spent in northern Minnesota and hope to continue to do so. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr Wade Johnson 4720 13th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55407-3558

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wallace Elton

12672

Feb 13, 2014 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Dear Department of Natural Resources, Northern Minnesota is a special place because of its clean water and valuable wildlife habitat. I am fortunate to have visited several times, and I hope to do so again. Therefore, I have major concerns about PolyMet's plan to mine sulfide ore in the region as described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I believe the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it proposes no mitigation for indirect damage to wetlands and is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment needs and how they will be paid for. This information is necessary to fully assess the environmental impacts of this proposal. PolyMet seeks to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal (that is, public) ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest. The mine, if built, will destroy more than 900 acres of wetlands, with an additional ten square miles of wetlands projected to be indirectly impacted by toxic dust and dewatering. The SDEIS proposes no mitigation for the indirect wetland impacts. In addition to this destruction of wetland habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper, and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream and into Lake Superior, an important resource in itself. Beyond the inadequacy of the SDEIS cited above, the damage to wetlands and forest habitat will affect many kinds of wildlife directly, including four bird species identified as of greatest conservation need: spruce grouse, black-backed woodpecker, northern goshawk, and boreal owl. In addition, birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food, including belted kingfishers, hooded mergansers, common terns, and common loons, will be harmed by the decline in water quality both locally and downstream. For these reasons, I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers to deny the Section 404 wetlands permit, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to reject this dangerous proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mr Wallace Elton 36 Curt Blvd Saratoga Springs, NY 12866-8913

walmoe

19941

We just received this from Lloyd Ollila, Birch Point Road, Tower, MN 55790- Please include as comment. Walt Moe >>> The Canadian government just rejected and Gold and Copper mine. >> VanCOUVER - The federal government has again rejected a proposed > \$1-5-billion, open-pit, gold-copper mine in British Columbia's > Interior over environmental concerns, a decision critics are > celebrating but one the company vows to fight. >> Environment Minister Leona Aglukkaq said Wednesday evening that her > ministry has rejected the New Prosperity Gold Copper Mine for a second > time because it will cause significant adverse environmental effects > that can't be mitigated. >> Just four years ago, the ministry rejected the project because Taseko > Mines Ltd. (TSX:TKO) plan to drain a lake to use as a tailings pond. >> "The Government of Canada will make decisions based on the best > available scientific evidence while balancing economic and > environmental considerations," said Aglukkaq in a news release. >> "The government will continue to make responsible resource development > a priority and invites the submission of another proposal that > addresses the government's concerns." >> Aglukkaq said in making the decision, the federal government > considered and agreed with the conclusions of a report released by > the Independent Review Panel on Oct. 31, 2013->> That report found the project would cause "significant adverse > effects" on water quality, fish and fish habitat in a lake of > significance to area First Nations. >> The site is 125 kilometres southwest of Williams Lake, B.C., and is > the tenth largest undeveloped gold-copper deposit in the world. >> Following the report's release, Taseko applied to the Federal Court > for a judicial review of the assessment, arguing the panel used the > wrong information in drawing its conclusions. >> Brian Battison, vice-president of corporate affairs at Taseko, said > the company is "terribly disappointed," but added Wednesday's > announcement is not the end of the project because it's too important > for British Columbians and residents of a region known as the Cariboo. >> "We're going to continue with our existing judicial review, which is > currently before the courts," he said. "That will continue to run its > course, and consideration will be given to what other course of action > may be available to us." >> Asked if the company would submit another proposal, Battison replied, > "I'm not saying we won't, but we've been down that road before." He > said the process has cost the company millions of dollars. >> Battison said the decision will be "tough news" and a "shock of > disappointment" for the thousands of Cariboo residents who have > supported the mine. >> "It's a significant event in the life of mining in British Columbia, > and it will have a profound effect on the attitude investors have > towards the province," he added. >> But Tsilhqot'in Tribal Chairman Joe Alphonse said members are excited > about the announcement, which was big news to the community, and it's > time to celebrate. He said he's no longer worried about the project > moving forward >> "I think if you've had two scathing reports like this come out, you > know, I think that speaks volumes about any possibility of moving > forward on this project by anyone," he said. "So we have comfort in that." >> Alphonse said certain areas should remain untouched, like Fish Lake, > but the Tsilhqot'in have been developing their own mining policy. >> "We would be open to mining proposals if companies come to our door, > work with us, treat us with respect and allow us to develop proposals > together," he said. "In today's day and age, projects like this aren't > going to go through unless all parties are working together." >> The Sierra Club BC also welcomed the announcement, saying the decision > was the only one the federal government could make. >> "Even as we are celebrating this important moment, we are m

Alphabetical by sender's first name

walmoe

20184

COMMENTS ON POLYMET SDEIS JAN 22, 2014 Revised 2/26/2014: Only 10% of the water in the world is fresh water. The second largest fresh water lake in the world is Lake Superior. Fresh water is essential to all forms of life. We cannot survive without fresh water but we can survive without precious metals until they have proven technology available to insure non-pollution. New high temperature and acid leach extraction techniques make precious metals mining doable and profitable, but also polluting. The POLYMET representative stated that the acid is absorbed by the metal – is this true. The MPCA should halt mining production immediately once the pollution hits a minimum level if Polymet is allowed to mine. Lake Vermilion is already considered an impaired lake with fish consumption advisories regarding mercury. Also the Vermilion River. The pollution levels are already above minimums due to the Minntac mine. I would like to know if and how many mines the MPCA has stopped from production when the pollution minimums allowed are reached. Stopped until the problem was solved. How many precious metal mines are there in the world that have pollution problems The one in Finland is one for example of sulfide mining having problems If Polymet is interested in the environment, instead of all their advertising, they could have spent the money cleaning up the two polluted ponds at the mine site. This would have been a much better advertisement to show their interest in the environment. It would please me more to see greater effort to develop non-polluting technology before beginning mining. Thank you, Marcie Moe 3331 Nisen Dr Tower, MN 55790 P.S. I really would like for the St Louis River be tested for pollutants to establish a baseline. Plus, it makes no sense to use all the taxes Polymet will be paying to pay for the cleanup of the pollution left behind. The effect of mines in Finland at the present time: Talvivaara Mining Company plc ([HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finnish_language"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finnish_language)Finnish: Talvivaaran Kaivososakeyhtiö Oyj) is a [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finland"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finland)Finnish-based [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Nickel"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Nickel)nickel mining business operating in [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finland"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Finland)Finland. Listed on the [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/London_Stock_Exchange"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/London_Stock_Exchange)London and [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Helsinki_Stock_Exchange"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/Helsinki_Stock_Exchange)Helsinki Stock Exchanges, the company is a constituent of the [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/OMXH25"](http://en.wikipedia-org/wiki/OMXH25)OMXH25 index. Sulphate emissions vastly exceed limits. Neighbours complain about dust and odours from Talvivaara mine print this "Are we supposed to sit quietly and suffer from the dust and odours. Our houses, land, and shoreline are worthless", says Salme Kananen, 67, as she bakes bread in her house in the village of Taattola in Sotkamo in the east of Finland. Nearby is Lake Hakonen, whose surface has started to bubble in a strange manner. The Talvivaara nickel mine is five kilometres away. "There are three large anthills on the shore of the lake. Last summer all of the ants disappeared. I have walked along the lakeshore since I was a child, and I have never seen anything like this", Kananen says. Salme's husband Juhani Kananen, 68, shows the rainwater collectors in the back yard Kananen says says that samples are taken from the collectors once a month. "Not much has been found. In the winter the snow is like a layer cake with layers of black graffiti dust The prevailing winds are from the southwest where the mine is located." When the smell is strongest he will not even venture out to the mailbox. He says that the hydrogen sulphide aggravates his asthma. "We were hoodwinked when they set up the mine. They promised that the extraction of metals involves a closed cycle, and that nothing would spread beyond the mine area", complains neighbour Alpo Partanen. Partanen is a member of the Sotkamo municipal council. The council visited the mine on Tuesday bec

Walt Handschin

42782

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Walt Moe

18076

I am Walt Moe. First, I want to thank everybody for the efforts they put out the SDEIS. I downloaded that into my computer. It was quite lengthy, all 2,169 pages of it. But searching the SDEIS, I have found no concrete actions being proposed to be taken in case of things going wrong at the PolyMet mine causing irreparable harm to the waters of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers, river watersheds and surrounding thousands of acres around these watersheds. The mining operation is predicted to last 20 years, and the remediation efforts to last at least 200 years, more likely 500 years, or even into perpetuity. To me, this is a poor tradeoff for the people of Minnesota. Murphy's Law states that if anything can go wrong, it will. Having spent my working life as an electrical engineer, dealing with making sure that if Murphy's Laws comes true, which it will, in whatever we do, we must have fail-safe triple-redundancy backups to avoid catastrophic disasters. My questions are how much monitoring is going to be required? For how long? How will it be handled? How quickly is a response going to occur? Who's going to make the decisions to curtail operations, and who's going to decide if it operations are allowed to presume -- or resume? As I understand the procedure, the above is to be spelled out in the actual permitting process, which I'm not sure will be subjected to the same scrutiny as the EIS. If it isn't, I would certainly like it to be. Again, I think that the approximately 300 jobs for 20 years versus 200 to 500 or more years of remediation is an extremely poor choice unless other alternatives can be explored. I don't think we're in a do-or-die situation yet where we can't exist without mining these precious metals. Thank you.

Walt Niemiec

38933

This is an amazing story and I'm bewildered at the potential of this becoming reality. The DNR gets into such a tizzy about slot limits on walleyes to the point of total buffoonery yet something as deliterious as this mining operation seems to be a definite possibility. I'm for economic development, people need jobs, but this cost is far too high. I believe it should wait unless and until a less obtrusive mining procedure can be developed. Walt Niemiec 16740 Upper 1st st so Lakeland Shores, MN 55043 651 436 5650

Walt Seibert

18240

It's Walt, W-A-L-T, Seibert, S-E-I-B-E-R-T, 345 Edgewood Avenue South, St. Louis Park, Minnesota, 55426. My comment is that I don't want us to stand in the way of progress, but I also want to be very sure that we know that the standards that have been created are correct and will prevent damage to the either land, rice, water, air, and I guess also I'm concerned about the sound pollution, as well. And that's it. I just want to make sure that the standards that have been created have been created in a thoughtful process, and have been signed off on by all of the appropriate agencies with the needed knowledge. And of course, I am out of the '60s and I'm skeptical. Thank you.

Walter Prentice

39203

Mar 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay MN Dear Ms Fay, Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Walter Prentice 1850 Vermilion Rd Duluth, MN 55803-2509 (218) 730-9973

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Walter Velishek

41931

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Walter Velishek Belle Plaine, Minnesota

Waltraud Usahanun

29299

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. People need to vote unacting authorities acting irresponsibly to future generations and living creatures out of occupations once and for all. **ENDLESS GREED FROM ECONOMY and HELPING AUTHORITIES HAS TO STOP ALL KINDS OF DESTRUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT and LIVING CREATURES BY APPLY STRONGEST JUSTICE TO THE RESPONSIBLES. DEMAND ALL INITIATORS ACTING IRRESPONSIBLY TO PAY REDEMPTION TO FUTURE GENERATIONS.** "It is horrifying that we have to fight our own governments to save the environment." Sincerely, Waltraud Usahanun Treustr. 63 / 6 / 12 0 Vienna, None 1200 4316503612290

29311

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. People need to vote unacting authorities acting irresponsibly to future generations and living creatures out of occupations once and for all. **ENDLESS GREED FROM ECONOMY and HELPING AUTHORITIES HAS TO STOP ALL KINDS OF DESTRUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT and LIVING CREATURES BY APPLY STRONGEST JUSTICE TO THE RESPONSIBLES. DEMAND ALL INITIATORS ACTING IRRESPONSIBLY TO PAY REDEMPTION TO FUTURE GENERATIONS.** "It is horrifying that we have to fight our own governments to save the environment." Sincerely, Waltraud Usahanun Treustr. 63 / 6 / 12 0 Vienna, None 12007 4316503612290

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wanda

8741

Thank you so very much for informing me about the mine. I appreciate it very much. Wanda K. Sonnentag From: HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"*NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 3:32 PM To: HYPERLINK "mailto:jimwansonn@charter-net"Wanda Sonnentag Subject: RE: Reject PolyMet's NorthMet Mining Proposal Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Wanda Ballentine

9665

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Wanda Ballentine 1181 Edgcumbe Rd 314 St Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wanda Ballentine

18534

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Wanda Ballentine 1181 Edgumbe Rd 314 St Paul, MN 55105

43995

Mar 13, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Minnesota has never permitted a project that would destroy this many acres of wetlands. Wetlands are of enormous value and so many have been destroyed throughout the US. They are PARTICULARLY necessary as we are getting both more floods and drought. Wetlands can hold water during floods and maintain water during droughts. Further, they filter the water and increase it's purity. And then, the idea that following the close of the mine would require hundreds of years of treating polluted water.. Always there is the statement that jobs are the necessity for any proposed business. How long will the jobs last - a lot at first, but much fewer later - relative to the years of treating the polluted water. Will PolyMet PAY for treatment. Or - as so often happens - will they go bankrupt and leave it up to the taxpayers . The decisions about PolyMet will have ramifications right up to the edge of the Boundary Waters Wilderness. There is sulfide mine exploration and development happening along the South Kawishiwi River and on the shore of Birch Lake right now. If Minnesota allows this industry with an unbroken record of water pollution into this area, the pure water that is the lifeblood of the Boundary Waters would be severely threatened. According to what I read, PolyMet's studies contain inaccurate water data that must be corrected - this lack is true of I don't know how many extraction proposals made in this country. They always come through saying there are minor risks - but major risks are found after the fact when it's too late. I keep thinking of Fukushima, Duke Energy, Freedom Works in West Virginia, etc Likewise, the mine plan lacks analysis of human health impacts from mercury and asbestos-like fibers - then I think of Deepwater Horizon and the health disasters caused the people there - though they were told everything was safe, or the fish from waters near Fukushima - but also to California, of the tremendous problems caused by "fracking"with water and air pollution. Governments and corporations will always swear things are just fine, but observing all the health and environmental disasters that occur regularly, there is no reason to believe them. Sincerely, Ms Wanda Ballentine 1181 Edgumbe Rd St Paul, MN 55105 (651) 200-3093

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wanda Ballentine 50610

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Wanda Ballentine 1181 Edgcumbe Rd 314 St Paul, MN 55105

warren 41249

Lisa Fay MN DNR Lisa, My findings are that the Draft EIS(SDEIS) does in fact cover all areas of environmental concerns and the PolyMet Mining Project should be allowed to proceed. Thank you, Warren Johnson 1003 South 2nd Ave East Ely, MN 55731 218-365-6360

Warren Anderson 42873

See attachment

Warren Banks 42238

Is there a verified history of the effects of copper-nickel mining on the adjacent environment. Warren Banks 13776 Fordham Ave Apple Valley, MN 55124

Warren Fries 42205

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Warren Fries 2941 Corte Diana Carlsbad, CA 92009-5913 (949) 487-0830

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Warren Howe 42620

See attachment

Warren L High 57261

No mining should be allowed in this area because of the destruction of the fresh water applied to Lake Superior and our extreme world problem for potable water. Environment is most important to human survival. Warren HighDuluth, MN 55806

Water Legacy 52178

See attachment

Wayne E Holmberg 54860

See attachment

Wayne E Potratz 58137

The monitoring of the mine site will required hundreds years of support. The mining co and the government will more than likely not fulfill its obligations for cleanup and mitigation This is the pattern for most mining and industrial pollution sites historically. The trace off is too great ... 200 jobs and 20 years of extraction vs centuries of pollution and destruction. I do not trust the corporation to fulfill its obligation once it has extracted all the metal wealth ... short term \$ long term problems.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wayne Hoklas

45766

Mar 12, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." Dear Mrs Fay, I am greatly concerned with the future prospect of what the Polymet Mine means to our great states water resources and the overall health of our states environment. I understand that there is a great need for high paying jobs in the northern iron range area, but I feel that the potential costs that the Polymet proposal holds are so huge that the possibility of several hundred high paying jobs for twenty years pales in comparison to the enormous negatives that this project represents. At a time when the world is running out of drinkable water, we are looking at the possibility of one our our states watersheds being poisoned for potentially hundreds of years is absolutely insane. I feel that the potential costs of this project are so large that the process of reviewing the proposal should be stopped immediately. But I also understand that the corporations, both domestic and foreign, hold so much sway that our regularatory agencies cannot simply stop and protect the public without a lengthy review. That being the case I would like at a minnimum that the DNR do the following: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." I do not want the resources of our state to ber squandered for this and future generations so that a twenty year windfall can be realized by a few interests.

58107

The proposed project by PolyMet Mining is a rash and irrational proposal. The questions raised by the speakers regarding the inaccuracies of the watershed in the area around the proposed site need to be addressed and possibly investigated as to why the watershed was not shown correctly. The insanity of this proposal and the cost environmentally of proceeding with this project far exceed the benefits that will be realized for an estimated 20 year period.

Wayne Kivela

43005

Alphabetical by sender's first name

wayne sheridan

40365

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, wayne sheridan custer sf, CA 94124 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wayne Sticha

16223

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Wayne Veasey

54211

I believe you shouldn't build a mind because it's gonna pollute the air and also flood the lake with mud and bad chemicals. It's gonna hurt people and ruin the nature. It affects lakes, rivers. Over just getting copper. You can get copper somewhere else.

Wehr Jeff

21355

I have owned land and fished the ely area for the last 20 years. Big birch lake was one lake that was mined over the years and since then the fishing has been bad. These people did not bring the jobs that they claimed to bring to the state. I no longer fish that lake because of the mining. What makes you think this company will bring any jobs to the area. Problem with big mining is the ones setting back collecting all the cash do not care about and they don't come out and look what they have done to the state environment they just sit back and laugh and lie to people. We as the people of this great state of Minnesota should have learned long ago about these people instead of letting big money win all the time. The walleye is the most reason why people come vacation to the state. Are these waste ponds going to be controlled for runoff. The problem with that is by the time we find out about runoff it is to late and giving them a fine ha they have so much money they don't care. I am going to go to one of these public meeting to see if I can put one of these people on the hot seat and see what the answer are. These mining people do not care about the state and we need to send them on there way and they can mine in there own backyaRd Thank You. Jeff Wehr

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendall Maijala 42550

See attachment

Wendy Griffin 18146

My name is Wendy Griffin. G-R-I-F-F-I-N. I live in Lake Elmo, Minnesota, which is on the east side of St. Paul. I am a natural resource specialist. And for the better part of my career I have been doing water quality testing on the east side of the metro area. And I'm sure we're all aware of some of the water issues that are going on down here in the metro. People that live east of me have been dealing with bad water, groundwater, for a number of years as the plume is moving closer to the Saint Croix. I'm asking that the state step up their control and oversight on the PolyMet site. If the state can step up and do their job, it should be a good go for both of us. The state was built on the backs of agriculture, tourism, and mining. I would like to think that we in this state, who voted for an increase in taxes to keep our water clean and clear and useable for our future, would be able to get through this issue that we all can get along peacefully and still make an income and keep our clean water. I'm speaking behalf of a friend of mine who is from Stillwater, Minnesota, who is now living in Spain. They had a television program that said, "If you had 24 hours to live, what would you do?" She said, "I would get on a plane and go to the Boundary Waters for the last eight hours of my life." It's a great place to go. It's peaceful. It's wonderful. It's a gem. One of the gems of the world. And I would like to see it stay that way. But I would also like to see the fact that we would be able to keep people employed not only in the mining area but also out in the outstate of Minnesota, who people in agriculture are also losing jobs as their young people are moving to the metro. Thank you. And thank you all for coming.

Wendy Haldorson 6196

I truly would like to see the permits issued and to have this project move forward I grew up in Silver Bay MN and my father was a miner all of his life. Having come from a family with six children and raised on the wages of one mining job, all six of us kids work and pay taxes in the state of MN. We are all married, have children and all of our children also work and pay taxes in the state of MN. I own my own company in Duluth MN, operated it for 21 years as of today. I have has several employees through the years. My oldest brother founded/owns a company in MPLS for the past 30 plus years, employing over 100 employees, mostly high paying engineers, all paying state taxes, etc Again, all from the one mining job my father was blessed with for nearly 43 years. If it was not for that one mining job, we would have potentially been raised in another state where mining is more accepted and I can guarantee we wouldn't be living in this state as we probably would have stayed in the state we were raised. It is extremely important to let PolyMet prove the can mine safely in this state with the technology we have today. Not only does our state need jobs and revenue, our country needs this. Thank you, Kirk D. Haldorson Sent from my iPad

Wendy Hansen 44397

I am writing to state that I am against the proposed PolyMet Copper Mine in Northern Minnesota. I don't feel that putting jobs ahead of public safety can be justified. I have made my living in Grand Marais, Minnesota and our economy is founded on clean water. Please don't let a company from India put our safe, clean water at risk. Thank you. Mark Hansen, boatbuilder 1217 Old Shore Road Grand Marais, MN 55604

Wendy Jerome 4190

Dec 22, 2013 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The public may be easily misled into welcoming sulfide mining into the state, since we have a long history with iron ore mining and taconite. However, sulfide ore mining will change the face of northern Minnesota forever. Our watersheds are huge porous underground resources that sustain a world-celebrated wilderness. 100% of sulfide mines leak toxic carcinogens and sulfuric acid. The ancient Greek and Roman mines around the Mediterranean are still leaking today. We can count on the death of aquatic life and the terrestrial life - including human beings - dependent on it, if sulfide mining is allowed in Minnesota. Some think that sulfide mining would bring jobs to MN. On the contrary, it would bring a few hundred part time and full time jobs, that would be intermittent, given world ore prices. The mining would last 20 years. Minnesota would loose a slowly, but steadily growing recreation economy - and wilderness that is a world treasure for the world. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Ms Rev. Wendy Jerome 37 Upton Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55405-1943

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Jerome 54734

See attachment

58111

Thank you for the care and detail in the studies done to date. I believe permitting sulfide ore mining in MN is a risky undertaking that is nearly certain to destroy a growing recreation economy, water quality, wildlife, plant life and aquatic life and a natural heritage we preserve for the world. 100% of mines leak. Exchange of mine lands for private lands still robs wild life and future human visitors. They lose ultimately, irretrievably with land exchange.

Wendy Moylan 40188

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. I am very sympathetic to the need for jobs in northern Minnesota, however I strongly urge to you stand strong in supporting ONLY projects that will move forward the goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Thank you for your consideration of my position. Sincerely, Ms Wendy Moylan 800 Lakeview Ave Saint Paul, MN 55117-4022 (651) 731-5370

WENDY OREWYLER 40369

Dear Ms Lisa Fay, I am writing out of deep concern over PolyMet's NorthMet mining project. The proposed open-pit mine is the first of multiple attempts to mine copper and nickel from sulfide ores in northeastern Minnesota. The initial draft environmental impact statement for this proposal was harshly criticized by the Environmental Protection Agency, and the supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) remains inadequate. PolyMet's proposed mine would result in unacceptable, irreversible environmental impacts and should be denied. The PolyMet mine would include three open pits, with two of the pits at depths of more than 600 feet. Nearly 1,000 acres of high-quality wetlands would thus be destroyed in this region, which has already lost many thousands of acres of wetlands to iron ore and taconite mining. The region of the proposed mine is also home to endangered lynx as well as moose, which are dramatically declining. The SDEIS acknowledges that the mine would "adversely impact" over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat - much of which is critical lynx habitat. But the document barely mentions moose except to recognize that the mine "will affect moose individuals." Furthermore, a number of the lakes and streams near to and downstream of the mine site already exceed state standards. To meet water-quality standards for sulfates, mercury and other pollutants, the SDEIS acknowledges that PolyMet would need to mechanically treat its wastewater for at least 500 years. But the SDEIS fails to explain how PolyMet can provide financial assurance that the necessary funds will be available for hundreds of years after the mine has closed. According to the EPA, hardrock mining is the country's most toxic industry, and 40 percent of our nation's Superfund sites are devoted to cleaning it up. How will PolyMet's mine be different. The SDEIS supplies no answers. Finally, the proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service recognizes that open-pit mines are prohibited. But instead of rejecting the mine or considering an underground mine alternative, the Forest Service is proposing to exchange these lands with PolyMet to allow the open-pit mine to proceed. The Forest Service has yet to provide the public with sufficient information concerning this proposed land exchange in order to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. In sum, the SDEIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed PolyMet mine will comply with all environmental laws and that it will not result in unacceptable environmental impacts - and so it should be rejected. Thank you, WENDY OREWYLER 10960 56 CT S LAKE WORTH, FL 33449 US

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Paulsen

46979

Please accept my comments regarding The PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“PolyMet” / “SDEIS”). As an organic inspector I constantly observe and work with the push and pull of utilizing natural resources rationally, reasonably and as sustainably as possible while simultaneously maintaining productive and successful businesses. The organic agriculture industry provides examples which show that with good intention it is possible to find reasonable middle ground. It is clear that natural resource extraction such as mining and logging are necessary and it is quite clear that there are better and worse ways of doing them. Equally, if not more important, is that there are better and worse places to do these activities. We do not log the ancient Sequoia trees or other timber in our national parks. Likewise, mining sulfide containing ore in a wet, pristine environment like northern Minnesota is akin to grazing dairy cattle in the deserts of Arizona - some things just don't make sense. Obviously technologies and circumstances do change over time making things possible and reasonable where they were not previously - for example where 200 bushel corn was unheard of decades ago, it is common now. But there are too many concerns and not enough changes in technology or circumstances to experiment with mining in a place as spectacular and unique as northern MN. First I would like to say there are parts of the proposal that I do very much appreciate - including the re-use of the existing mine buildings, and the use of Reverse Osmosis, however there are simply too many open questions and issues to allow mining to proceed as proposed. Among my concerns are: 1- PolyMet would pose an ongoing pollution threat to the St Louis River and Lake Superior, long after the mining stops. The company’s own models show that hundreds of years after the mine closes, water at the site will be polluted with heavy metals and sulfates from the mine. Unless all of this water can be captured and treated, the mine will pollute groundwater and surrounding streams and rivers. Unfortunately, even the company admits that millions of gallons of polluted water will escape untreated every year. And it is my understanding that fractures in bedrock have not been adequately addressed. The SDEIS has no contingency plans for mechanical breakdowns in the complicated filtration system that PolyMet proposes to treat the polluted water, even though that system would have to operate for centuries. PolyMet's water treatment system isn't prepared for the super-storms that are growing more frequent due to climate change. Planners used old climate models to assess impacts of heavy rain on the operations and pollutants. As the 2012 flood in Duluth showed us, we need to be prepared for much more severe storms to happen more often. Worse, PolyMet’s model doesn’t even prove that the pollution stops after 500 years. Instead, the company simply stopped modeling at 500 years. In other words, the pollution could go on for even longer. 2- In the PolyMet mine plan fails to discuss financial assurance adequately - there are no details of the amount and type of damage deposit adequate to cover the cost of treating polluted water for hundreds of years. Minnesota has never permitted a mine that would require hundreds of years of expensive water treatment. This public comment period is the best chance for the public to weigh in on whether the financial assurance required of PolyMet would be adequate, but there is only a brief mention of it in the mine plan. 3- The tax estimates in the PolyMet mine plan lack detail and are full of discrepancies. From one draft of the mine plan to the next the estimated taxes jumped 500% without explanation. This is important, since the state taxes that would apply to a copper-nickel sulfide mine have never been used before. The copper-nickel mining industry is exempt from several state and local taxes, s

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Reid

14890

Feb 11, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Robertson

18349

Wendy Robertson. R-O-B-E-R-T-S-O-N. I am trying to sound as clear as I can with a bit of laryngitis, but I am a retired Duluth educator for the Duluth schools and also was a coach for the St. Louis River Watch Program, where I supervised students that work with monitoring the St. Louis River, with help in various scientific projects hands on. I currently live in northern Fairbanks Township, which is south of the PolyMet mine site, St. Louis River. I am also concerned and alarmed of the SDEIS plan to mitigate the 930 million (phonetic) acres that wasn't previously mentioned. The wetlands that will be eliminated by PolyMet's infrastructure, mine, waste piles (phonetic), et cetera, it is crucial that we take a look at it. The Federal US Army Corp of Engineers' mitigation role requires that (inaudible) before mitigation, which replaces the loss of wetlands, function within the same Hydrological Unit Code, HUC. The word to focus on here is "function." And the digit code refers to the St. Louis River Watershed and the Lake Superior basin. With this plan, functions of the wetlands will be lost by having the mitigation outside of our area. Having the compensatory sites in Simm (phonetic), Aitkin and Hinckley will not replace the loss of wetlands' functions to nature and the public. We are losing the services of these wetlands, which took nature thousands of years to develop, by accepting this plan's proposal to have 60 to 70 percent of the wetlands replacement in credits (phonetic) and other areas. The lands surrounding these wetlands are also indirectly altered and these will not be even considered in the total. The loss of wetlands' function will be a part of rampant and ongoing human and wetland destruction that is happening worldwide. I urge the Army Corps of Engineers to reject this SDEIS and require that Section (inaudible) insist on proper mitigation for the disturbance and destruction of these wetlands within the St. Louis River Watershed. If the people regard public input as vital to their decision making, I also request that the lead agencies extend the time for public comments by three more months; 108 days. And 2,000 plus pages is a lot to digest and make educated comments. Lastly, I protest having these three public hearings in January, which is the coldest winter month. The cold and icy weather may impair comments by the elderly, sick and the disabled. You are disenfranchising these groups. A public hearing does not expect to be disenfranchising the public.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Robertson

44426

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025 Polymet SDEIS Commentary This brief commentary addresses several omissions, failures, shortcomings, and oversights within the Polymet SDEIS. First, this document fails to place the prospective mine within a larger historical, economic, and environmental perspective-the big picture (tbp)-necessary for comprehensive understanding and evaluation of its proposals; without such contextual broadening the document is reduced to a mere roster of data. Indeed, the SDEIS itself eschews any such contextual analysis (p. 6-1, "It is not possible, however "). Second, and as a result of the first, it fails in a host of particulars. TBP: AWOL from the SDEIS The primary failing of the SDEIS is that, seen from a broader perspective, it is internally inconsistent, reflecting a larger social schizophrenia wherein we demand both economic growth and a functional environment. Because the planet is already over-populated and over-engineered, environmental impact must inescapably accelerate as function of economic growth. The proposed mine is but an increment in both these latter processes. All economic activity necessarily involves material and energy transactions with our environment. These are three: 1) sourcing materials and energy (depletion), 2) spacing (eviction of nature), and 3) sinking (pollution). These requirements follow from the first two laws of thermodynamics, to which all technology is subordinate. That is, to manufacture any material object one has to source the constituent matter and transformative energy from the environment (the conservation law), make room for it within the environment (the conservation law), and release a compensatory waste stream into the environment (the entropy law). Each of these imposes environmental impact. Historically environmental impact has been of sufficiently small scale-reflecting a smaller human population and its required supporting economy-so that the impacts of the above transaction streams have been of little concern and have imposed few to no costs on the human population. With the meteoric growth of industrial society and the resulting impact, it has become increasingly evident that a degraded environment has serious implications for human well-being. At some scale the costs of growth outweighs the benefits and additional economic expansion becomes irrational: we end up poorer rather than richer, worse off rather than better off. This is happening because many costs are not being internalized, primarily, though not exclusively, environmental. The function of the SDEIS is to give the conditions under which mining is permissible, namely, that external costs will be adequately internalized. Approval of the SDEIS is neither a denial nor a mandate to mine. It is up to Polymet to make that decision-to balance expected costs and revenues under the stated conditions of the permit document. Only upon the condition of cost internalization does the interest of the company reflect the interest of society. If all costs could be internalized, the profit motive would be an effective "hidden hand" assuring that society's interests are being met, but costs-especially environmental costs-are complex and difficult to quantify, even difficult to understand and predict. Also, there is a historical complication to consider. Except for a passing remark in reference to iron mining (6-92, first full sentence), the SDEIS fails to explain the historical and geologic dilemma which all non-renewable resource (herein, nrr) extraction faces. Most people have heard of "peak oil" but do not understand the reasoning behind it, nor realize that this same reasoning applies, not just to petroleum, but to all other nrrs. Humans have been extracting and employing nrrs for thousands of years. As these are geolog

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Robertson

44641

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155-4025
March 8, 2014 I live in NE Minnesota just SE of the Polymet mine and processing site. I harvest wild rice, venison, waterfowl and have an organic garden to sustain my family for the year. I live 1 mile from mineral exploration drill sites on land in the Superior National Forest For 33 years, I taught science in the Duluth Public Schools and supervised the St Louis River Watch Environmental program that provides monitoring and water quality bi-yearly as an after school program in co-ordination with Fond du Lac College. The focus is water chemistry and macro-invertebrates studies related to the health of the river and streams that are part of the St Louis Watershed. I was honored by Friends of the St Louis River as their 2006 educator of the year. The SDEIS has several issues in watershed mitigation that are not addressed. I related these concerns during the public hearing in Duluth at the DECC. I was fortunate to be selected as one of the 80 plus speakers to give testimony. Given that many others did not have the opportunity to speak only reflects the insufficient amount of time for public comment at hearings and the refusal to extend the comment period on this SDEIS. I am asking that the agencies involved to extend the comment period for an additional 90 days. The SDEIS does not address the cumulative effects of the additional mining companies that are waiting in the wings for future permits. They are watching to learn what happens as the Polymet process breaks ground in asking to be permitted. By ignoring this glaring omission, I can only conclude that you are not reading the investment brochures of mining companies that are seeking worldwide investors currently. Please read excerpt from next page. Excerpt from: press release 3/3/14 Duluth Metals Limited [mailto:HYPERLINK "mailto:info@duluthmetals-com"info@duluthmetals-com] Duluth Metals Continues to Identify Additional PGM Mineralization in the East Shore Area of their Exploration Lands Duluth Metals Limited is committed to acquiring, exploring and developing copper, nickel and platinum group metal (PGM) deposits. Duluth Metals has a joint venture with Antofagasta plc on the Twin Metals Project, located within the rapidly emerging Duluth Complex mining camp in north-eastern Minnesota. The Duluth Complex hosts one of the world's largest undeveloped repositories of copper, nickel and PGMs, including the world's third largest accumulation of nickel sulphides, and one of the world's largest accumulations of polymetallic copper and platinum group metals. Aside from the joint venture, Duluth Metals retains a 100% position on approximately 40,000 acres of mineral interests on exploration properties adjacent to and nearby the Twin Metals Minnesota LLC joint venture. I am asking you as a taxpaying resident in obviously the "emerging mining camp area of NE MN" for the state to not permit Polymet project. The SDEIS is inadequate in addressing the cumulative effects of additional mining proposals in the Lake Superior Basin. To deny that other national and international mining companies are just waiting to be the next in line for this extraction of finite resources is a crime of untruthfulness. All permitting agencies need to subscribe to the publications of the "Economist" magazine and Mining News if you doubt my comments. Respectfully submitted, Wendy Robertson 1998 Fairbanks Rd Brimson, MN 55602 218-848-2940

54513

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Saliin

39118

Dear DNR friends, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the PolyMet mine for the following reasons. 1- ENVIRONMENT Natural beauty and a healthy natural environment are not only important to the health and well-being of Minnesotans, they are also a crucial component of state, local and regional economies. A. Duluth recently reported \$7-6 million in total tourism revenue in 2013- Certainly the primary draw for these tourists is natural beauty. Duluth is merely one of Minnesota's many tourist destinations. B. In the coldest winter in 139 years, over \$10M has been spent by visitors of the Apostle Island ice caves, because of the powerful human desire to get outside and the human thirst for clean and beautiful places. These are but two small examples. Minnesota boasts countless beautiful natural spaces; it is what draws people to Minnesota and what holds them here. Therefore, preservation of clean water and wilderness will provide a more sustainable economic stimulus to state, local, and regional economies than mining. 2- SHORTSIGHTED ECONOMIC BENEFIT History has proven that mining is a boom and bust industry. With so many uncertainties surrounding this project, why would we take this risk with the potential burden falling on such irreplaceable forces as clean water, robust ecosystems, and human health. A. There is a tremendous market for copper scrap metal. A copper scrap metal recycling project would be a sustainable alternative to the boom and bust cycle of mining. Copper scrap metal fulfills 1/2 the US demand for copper. The US provides 23% of the world's supply of recovered copper. B. PolyMet "promises" jobs for iron range communities. How many of these jobs are a guarantee. What percentage of these jobs will actually be allotted to local workers. What percentage of the vast profits of mining will actually fall into the hands of Minnesotans versus a few wealthy individuals who arrive along with the mine and leave when it closes its doors. Minnesota does not deserve to bear the burden of so much risk when likely so little lasting benefit, economic or otherwise, would exist 3- BURDEN ON INDIVIDUAL MINNESOTANS The current PolyMet review fails to address in particular what potential burdens the individual Minnesotan might bear as a result of the mining project. A. TAXPAYER BURDEN - Once again, there are many unanswered questions here. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in efforts to clean up industrial pollution of the St Louis River and cleanup is still not complete. Meanwhile, as a part of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, momentum has been recently building for significant federal funding (TAXPAYER DOLLARS) to be directed towards Great Lakes cleanup projects. Despite these ongoing projects, we are mulling over the possibility of a mining project that we acknowledge will pollute regional waterways for a minimum of 500 years.. B. HUMAN HEALTH RISKS - Mercury contamination is already a problem in area lakes, posing a major problem to humans and animals who consume fish from these waters - we already know that this is especially dangerous to pregnant and nursing mothers, infants, and young children. Sulfide mining is known to increase mercury levels in water. C. HEALTH RISKS TO POLYMET MINE WORKERS - The WHO lists 10 chemicals of major public health concern. Sulfide mining involves 5 of them: mercury, arsenic, lead, asbestos, and air pollution. All Minnesotans could potentially suffer the ill effects of these chemicals, but this is especially of concern to potential future employees of the mine. The current review is insufficient and leaves many unanswered questions, most specifically in regard to human health, environmental impact, duration and nature of cleanup and how the cleanup will be funded. Without knowing precisely what the risks are to the health of Minnesotans, the health of Minnesota's beautiful forests, wetlands, and waterways, and the burden on taxpayers, it would

Wendy Schlueter

10936

On behalf of the Babbitt City Council, we strongly support the PolyMet copper-nickel project. We have utmost confidence that the State and Federal Agencies involved are extremely competent and thorough in their studies. We are also confident that the mining company and its entities will be in compliance in every aspect to promote this very important and necessary economical job source to Minnesota. The City of Babbitt also thanks PolyMet and the State of Minnesota for being open to the advanced technologies and compliances adhered to for fulfilling and challenging employment opportunities the mine will provide. Reported by Wendy F. Schlueter, Administrative Assistant

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Schreier

17009

Feb 18, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wendy Sjoblom

39299

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Wendy Smith

9788

Dear Department of Natural Resources, Please do not issue mining permits to Polymet. I am concerned and quite fearful of the multiple negative impacts that the operation will have on our state. About a year ago I drove to North Carolina through West Virginia and was so saddened to see the economic and personal degradation that mining has left in an otherwise beautiful portion of our country. Several weeks ago, I narrowly missed being personally poisoned when I chose to drive to North Carolina circumventing West Virginia because of weather and road conditions. Listening to media reports of the impacts to the region during the week I was in North Carolina and now seeing that the leaks are far greater than initially reported is horrifying. My first concerns are about water supply both current and centuries long, and I shudder to think that Minnesota would invite an industry into essentially pristine environment on the short-term profit of so few when we know the consequences are so drastic in the multiple times this has happened to our neighbors in West Virginia. Please have the courage and confidence that you are backed by many, to say no. Thank you very much, Wendy Smith
wendywally@msn-com 5017 3rd Ave S Minneapolis, M 55419

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wenonah Skye

25461

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Once the resources are affected cumulatively, short-term, and long-term, it takes a long time for recovery. Permanent damage stays with us for a long time, especially in the ground water and seeps into the food chain. It's not just the purity that's lost but the quality of all life as well. Try to think about this in terms of the land as having its own right to exist because it is the land who takes care of us. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Wenonah Skye 2537 Mutchler Rd Fitchburg, WI 53711-7011 (920) 857-8401

25468

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Once the resources are affected cumulatively, short-term, and long-term, it takes a long time for recovery. Permanent damage stays with us for a long time, especially in the ground water and seeps into the food chain. It's not just the purity that's lost but the quality of all life as well. Try to think about this in terms of the land as having its own right to exist because it is the land who takes care of us. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, Wenonah Skye 2537 Mutchler Rd Fitchburg, WI 53711-7011 (920) 857-8401

Wes Bailey

43244

I am writing to register my total opposition to PolyMet's proposed copper-nickel mine near Hoyt Lakes. My wife is originally from West Virginia where they have so many dead rivers and creeks due to acid mine drainage. These rivers and streams ran clear, beautiful, and brimming with life for thousands of years until companies came along and extracted a couple decades of short-term profits from the land. The jobs and companies are long gone, but the rivers still flow dead- and in some cases yellow and orange. We CANNOT risk this happening in northern Minnesota. The short-term gains (the vast majority of which will go to out-of-state shareholders) are absolutely not worth the risk to our state's clean and living waters. Thank you, James Wesley Bailey 2505 Elida Dr Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Western Lands Project

42975

Attached are comments of the Western Lands Project. Janine Blaeloch, Director Western Lands Project PO Box 95545 Seattle, WA 98145 tele 206-325-3503 cell 206-498-6695 Public land is our common wealth.

48497

Attached are comments of the Western Lands Project. Janine Blaeloch, Director Western Lands Project PO Box 95545 Seattle, WA 98145 tele 206-325-3503 cell 206-498-6695 Public land is our common wealth.

Weston

45272

I am strongly against the mine. It will destroy the environment in northern minnesota. Since the white man has arrived in this state, he has systematically destroyed the natural way things were here since time immemorial. It is time minnesota decides to do the right thing and say no to this mine. Tate Weston 1812 Munster St Paul Mn 55116 6512603677

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wever Weed

43073

March 13, 2014 Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit Dear Ms Fay ~ My comments on the PolyMet mining proposal tell a different story than the two being told. My story does not now question the accuracy of information provided by the SDEIS and environmental groups, though it might in the future. It is not meant to sway you and the DNR one way or the other. Rather it is meant to ask you consider a third story. One of the existing stories is about environmental damage and a tourist-based economy. The other story is about economic vitality brought by hard rock mining. 31% of Minnesotans in a recent poll published by the Star Tribune (Feb. 21, 2014) say we are not sure of either story. So I am asking you to consider a third story. This story is about patience Minnesota used to get it right without doubt. It is a story about sulfide mining in Minnesota that is being done without any concern of acid mine drainage, because hard rock mining techniques and technologies have been refined and proven many times over elsewhere. It is a story about northern Minnesota communities having attracted job creation industries and businesses with the help of environmental groups that finally understood they must be a part of the solution to job growth. It is the story about how an antiquated 1872 Mining Act was finally abolished and how Minnesota reaped far greater profits from its minerals. It is the story about how the Minnesota DNR took a stand against impatience, and how it was able to say to Minnesotans that in the realm of the copper and other precious metals under our northern lands, a few or twenty more years will make no difference, but getting it wrong now will. And, it is the story about how environmental groups finally did something about the greatest threat to our natural treasures on our northern lands and waters, and helped find jobs that could compete with hard rock mining jobs. Sincerely, Wever D. Weed 2582 County Road 24 Long Lake, MN 55356 763-218-1849

White, Paul

15792

I am a proud graduate of the Ely Voyageur Outward Bound school. I have canoed, hunted and hiked in the area for decades. My sisters live in Embarrass and Edina. It is time to have jobs in the USA again instead of exporting our jobs and importing metals from foreign countries that pollute our planet. We cannot be a debtor nation for ever. We need jobs for all Minnesotans that want to work, not public aid because the government gets in the way of progress and employment. Companies like PolyMet that are complying with all state and federal regulations should be allowed to obtain the necessary permits to produce the metals our modern world demands. I have confidence in the DNR and believe the SDEIS process for PolyMet Mining's proposed NorthMet project has been sound and thorough. The state and federal regulators will ensure that PolyMet's project design, and its operations are legal and safe. The project should proceed. Thank you, Paul White 1104 Sanctuary Lane Naperville, IL 60540

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23560

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differences in the estimates. To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS differs in its estimates of federal and state and local taxes without explanation of what accounts for this difference. The 2010 NorthMet DEIS stated: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that during a typical year of operation the federal government would receive \$17-3 million and the state and local governments would receive \$14-5 million in taxes from the operation of the Project, excluding net proceeds tax" (DEIS 4-10-19). But the 2013 SDEIS says: "IMPLAN modeling estimates that, during a typical year of operation, the federal government would receive approximately \$30 million, and the state and local governments would receive approximately \$39 million in taxes from the operation of the NorthMet Project Proposed Action" (5-503). Table 5-2-10-3 in the SDEIS, showing estimated taxes paid for 2011 had the project been in operations, projects state taxes of \$15-6 million and federal taxes of \$64 million for 2011, a number far larger than the \$30 million described from the IMPLAN model. These figures lack explanation and rely on estimates provided by PolyMet without any verification. These estimates have also changed dramatically from the draft versions of the SDEIS circulated earlier in 2013 without any explanation. In the Track Changes Version 2-0 of the PSDEIS, Table 5-2-10-3 shows annual estimates of \$3-12 million of state taxes and \$12-8 million in federal taxes, increased by 500% to \$15-6 million and \$64 million. No explanation of the change is provided, and no source provided other than personal communication with PolyMet. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated taxes paid and provide independent confirmation of these estimates from state and federal agencies 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide consistent numbers in estimated taxes across all sections of the document or explanations of the differ

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23561

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit Backfill alternative is also discarded prematurely. Backfilling the East and Central Pit with Category 2 and 3 waste rock is considered both feasible and desirable and is part of the proposed action. The offered reason that backfilling the pit would "encumber" resources in violation of PolyMet's mineral leases is irrelevant, since these resources are currently encumbered by 696 feet of soil and rock. As the Tribal Cooperating Agencies note in Appendix C, the backfill alternative "meets the purpose and need, is available, is technically feasible and is economically feasible." Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the economic models used to simulate the costs of underground mining and its economic feasibility 2) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate assertions that the Underground Mining Alternative does not offer environmental benefits, since the co-lead agencies found that it would offer significant environmental benefits 3) Revise the SDEIS to include the Underground Mining Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action 4) Revise the SDEIS to include the West Pit Backfill Alternative as an alternative to the proposed action To Lisa Fay, The NorthMet DEIS does not consider a range of practicable alternatives to the proposed action. As the DEIS states: "NEPA requires that a 'range of alternatives' must be discussed in the environmental documents prepared for a proposed action (40 CFR 1502-14). This includes all practicable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated . . . The emphasis is on what is practicable rather than on whether a proponent or applicant prefers or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative" (1-13). But the SDEIS provides no meaningful consideration of alternative means to achieve the project Purpose and Need as required by law, it only looks at a No Action alternative and the same action with a smaller land exchange. The Underground Mine Alternative is discarded, mostly as a result of an InfoMine model used to determine economic feasibility, for which there is no detail provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS states that the underground mining alternative "would not offer substantial environmental or socioeconomic benefits" and was therefore discarded. However, in Appendix B, the co-lead agencies found that "compared to the proposed open pit mine, the underground mining alternative would offer some significant environmental benefits. . ." and that underground mining is "technically feasible." The West Pit B

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23622

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. To Lisa Fay, Ten percent of Minnesota newborns in the Lake Superior basin already have unsafe levels of mercury in their blood at birth. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin with no safe dose, and the accumulation of mercury in fish that people eat means that mercury is a significant public health issue. The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS describes a project that would add to the airborne and waterborne mercury load, has inadequate science to back its claim that the mercury emitted will be adsorbed by soil and tailings, and inadequate study to support its conclusion that no additional mercury methylation will occur. Please take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to provide more evidence to support the claim that the LTVSMC tailings will act as a mercury sink contained in wastewater from the plant site. Particularly, address concerns raised by the tribal cooperating agencies that the LTVSMC tailings may become saturated and may even become a mercury source, rather than a mercury sink. 2) Revise the SDEIS to include estimates of the amount of indirect airborne mercury emissions from the electrical power used by the NorthMet project 3) Revise the SDEIS to include discussion of the mercury methylation potential from additional sulfate loading and mercury released from stripped peat at the Mine Site. 4) Revise the SDEIS to include quantitative modeling of the effects of the proposed action on mercury in fish in addition to the qualitative discussion in the current draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23623

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS understates the impact of the proposal on greenhouse gas emissions and does not account for reasonable mitigation measures for the carbon emissions associated with the project. The PolyMet SDEIS argues that the direct and indirect increase in carbon dioxide emissions from the project would be to increase Minnesota CO2 emissions by less than 0-5%. However, the project would rely heavily on electricity from the most coal-heavy electrical utility in Minnesota, and should be evaluated against the backdrop of Minnesota's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 by 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025- Over the proposed life of the NorthMet mine, its proportion of Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions will increase, unless there are additional mitigation measures added to the mine plan. Please take the following actions: 1)Revise the SDEIS to specify the plant sources of electrical power drawn on by the PolyMet NorthMet project and the proportion of coal, natural gas, hydropower, wind, solar, and other forms of electricity generation. 2)Revise the SDEIS to consider on-site, carbon free alternatives like on-site wind and solar for a portion of the electrical power needed by the NorthMet project. 3)Revise the SDEIS to analyze the feasibility of purchasing electrical power generated by wind, solar, and hydropower for a portion of the electrical needs of the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23628

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Metals and Teck American projects are listed as "speculative" in Section 6-2-2-1-21 and are not analyzed for their cumulative effects. No evidence or rationale for excluding these projects from the cumulative effects analysis is offered. In Section 6-2-3-6-4, the Gray Wolf is the only "Special Status Species" for which even limited analysis of cumulative effects is conducted, despite the Canada Lynx's status as a federally threatened species. Please take the following actions: 1) Include the Twin Metals and Teck American projects as reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative effects analysis in section 6-2-2, since the disposition of the NorthMet SDEIS and subsequent permitting decisions could make these projects more likely to be built. 2) Include the Canada Lynx as a "Special Status Species" in Section 6-2-3-6-4 and conduct a cumulative effects analysis of the impact on Canada Lynx. 3) Analyze and include mitigations such as tunnels and fencing to limit the possibility of incidental take of Canada Lynx by increased road traffic associated with the NorthMet proposed action. 4) Remove contradictory language in SDEIS about Canada Lynx utilization of roads as travel corridors. For example, on p. 5-628 the SDEIS states "Lynx utilize snow packed trails and roads as travel corridors," while on p. 5-366 it says "this species does not rely on roads for travel." 5) Analyze and include mitigation such as accelerated re-vegetation of the mine site after closure to decrease the amount of time the mine site would be inhospitable to Canada Lynx. To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation and loss on the Canada Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*). The Canada Lynx is a threatened species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The NorthMet project area is in designated critical habitat for the lynx, and the SDEIS notes that the proposed action would destroy over 1,400 acres of critical lynx habitat at the mine site. The designation of this area as critical habitat is supposed to trigger analysis of whether the proposed action, and the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable actions place the Canada Lynx in jeopardy. In addition, the incidental death of Canada Lynx due to increased vehicle traffic between the mine and plant site is noted, but inadequate attention is paid to mitigation measures that could limit incidental deaths of lynx. Despite this, the SDEIS contains contradictory statements about the use of roads as travel corridors by lynx. The cumulative effects analysis section of the NorthMet SDEIS fails to adequately account for a number of reasonably foreseeable projects. Specifically, the Twin Metals and Teck American p

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

23629

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS inadequately characterizes the wetlands loss and proposes inadequate mitigation measures. The PolyMet mine site is located in the middle of one of the most valuable wetlands in northern Minnesota, the 100 Mile Swamp. This wetland complex was deemed an Area of High Biodiversity Significance by the Minnesota Biological Survey, and the US EPA has stated that it is likely an Aquatic Resource of National Importance due to its high biodiversity. PolyMet proposes the largest permitted destruction of wetlands in Minnesota history. Wetlands replacement plans in the SDEIS are inadequate for replacing the biological function lost from these wetlands, and the SDEIS fails to adequately account for indirect wetlands impacts. The SDEIS lacks support for its assertion that 70% of the coniferous bogs on the site would be unaffected by groundwater drawdowns. 1) Revise the SDEIS to specifically outline measures that will be taken to reduce indirect wetland impacts and compensatory mitigation, as opposed to deferring such contingency planning to permitting 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide a range of estimates of indirect wetlands impacts and plans for mitigation based on these estimates, instead of waiting to see what the indirect wetlands impact will be 3) Revise the SDEIS to remove assertions that coniferous bogs would be unaffected by groundwater disturbances, as this is unsupported by scientific literature and field data 4) Revise the SDEIS to outline what types and amounts of financial assurance for wetland replacement would be required if indirect wetland impacts exceed the predicted area and extent of damage Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

23630

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS contains inadequate analysis of risks to public health from the proposal. The DNR should conduct a health impact assessment (HIA) to fully analyze the public health implications of PolyMet's proposed mine. Health impact assessments are a tool used in environmental review. The State of Alaska has adopted HIAs as a best practice for environmental review of mining and natural resources extraction proposals and has established procedures and a toolkit for conducting an HIA in that context. In Minnesota, HIAs have also been conducted as part of the environmental review for Minnesota projects, such as the Central Corridor LRT project in the Twin Cities. Please take the following action: Conduct a health impact assessment for the PolyMet project, and include the results of the assessment in the EIS. The HIA should include examination of all aspects of public health affected by the proposal, including analysis of the social determinants of health. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24332

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby communities, and describe contingency plans to address the risk to public health and worker safety if asbestos-like fibers are detected during construction, operation, closure and post-closure 3) Revise the SDEIS to eliminate inaccurate characterizations of the University of Minnesota mesothelioma study. Specifically, eliminate statements that imply that commercial asbestos is the primary risk factor for mesothelioma risk To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS does not adequately examine the risks to worker safety and public health from asbestos-like fibers found in the rocks that they propose to mine. I ask the DNR to require a more comprehensive public health assessment of the risk to workers and the public than what PolyMet has provided in the SDEIS. The SDEIS acknowledges that amphibole fibers are present in the rock to be mined, that crushing the rock for processing releases these fibers, and that these fibers are suspected of causing mesothelioma in workers. The SDEIS further acknowledges that there have been few studies of the risk from fibers of the size that would be created at the PolyMet mine and plant site. A number of mesothelioma cases were found in mine workers who worked in the LTV Erie Plant that PolyMet proposes to use as part of their mine plan, and the SDEIS inaccurately characterizes a University of Minnesota study of mesothelioma in mine worker as showing that this risk came exclusively from the use of commercial asbestos products in the mine. In fact, the University of Minnesota did not exonerate dust from crushing ore, and is continuing to study the health impact of exposure to short amphibole fibers of the type contained in the ore that PolyMet would mine and process. Specifically, the DNR should: 1) Revise the SDEIS and conduct a formal health assessment of the risk to public health and worker safety from the amphibole fibers present in the ore at the PolyMet mine site. The SDEIS should specifically conduct a formal health assessment of the risks from asbestos-like fibers less than 5 microns in length 2) Revise the SDEIS to provide details of the air monitoring at the mine and plant site and in nearby commun

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24333

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity To Lisa Fay, The PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS relies on a water model (GoldSim) to make predictions about the amount of water pollution generated at the site and how quickly it will travel into surrounding groundwater and rivers. The GoldSim model significantly understates the base flow of groundwater due to inaccurate and inadequate data. A DNR Hydrology memo shows that the average flow of the Partridge River is 1-5 CFS, while the GoldSim model uses a 0-5 CFS average flow. That figure was based on one year of data from 1984, a year of significant drought in the area. The memo suggests that to be accurate, additional field data may be needed beyond what is in the SDEIS. If the model understates base flow, all of the conclusions in the model are called into question. Pollution will move further and faster off of the site, and the amount of water that would need to be treated will be higher. This could present technical challenges, increase the costs of water treatment after closure, and add to the amount of needed financial assurance to pay for long-term water treatment. Lastly, the water model does not account for seasonal variations in groundwater and surface water flows on the plant and mine site. The GoldSim model should be run with accurate seasonal data to reflect the movement of pollution from the site in both high and low flow conditions. Please take the following actions: 1) Redo the GoldSim water model using assumptions based on adequate and accurate field data 2) Gather field data to fix gaps in flow data for the Partridge River near Dunka Road, as suggested in the DNR memo written by Greg Kruse on December 17, 2013 3) Recalculate and rewrite sections of the SDEIS based on the GoldSim water model predictions, including water quality, water quantity, post-closure maintenance, and financial assurance 4) Redo the GoldSim water model to account for seasonal variations in base flow and soil conductivity Thank you for the opportunity to provide

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24334

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consistent with the mandate that the closed mine site be "maintenance free." To Lisa Fay, Please revise the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS to accurately and clearly predict the length of time that active water treatment would be required, and to clarify whether hundreds of years of water treatment complies with Minnesota Rules requiring that mines be "maintenance free" at closure. The GoldSim water quality model used to predict levels of pollution, movement of contaminated water, and effectiveness of water treatment predicts that water captured at the site will exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after the mine stops operating. On page 3-72, the SDEIS says that "Based on current GoldSim P90 model predictions, treatment activities could be required for a minimum of 200 years at the Mine Site " Other graphs and data in the water management plan that supports the SDEIS show that sulfates and heavy metals will dramatically exceed water quality standards for hundreds of years after closure. Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 sets a goal that after closure a mine site should be "stable, free of hazards, minimizes hydrologic impacts, minimizes the release of substances that adversely impact other natural resources, and is maintenance free." The mine plan calls for hundreds of years of maintenance and operating active water treatment plants, and violates this rule. I ask that you take the following actions: 1) Revise the SDEIS to clearly state how long the need for active water treatment (reverse osmosis or other mechanical treatment) is predicted, according the models used in the SDEIS. Extend the water model timeline as far as needed to show when all pollutants would meet applicable water quality standards and provide the public with a clear statement of the best available prediction for the time frame of mechanical water treatment. 2) Revise the SDEIS to address Minnesota Rules 6132-3200 and clarify how the post-closure activities described in the mine plan are consist

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24335

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment To Lisa Fay, The financial assurance section of the SDEIS is inadequate and needs to be changed to reflect details about how much money would be required to pay for cleanup and in what form it would be held. In 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency called PolyMet's first draft Environmental Impact Statement "inadequate." One significant reason was that the 2010 DEIS did not show that financial assurance would be enough to cover the cost of long-term water treatment at the site. "EPA believes that the adequacy of financial assurance for these activities could make the difference between a project adequately managed over the long-term by the site operator, or an unfunded or underfunded contaminated site that becomes a liability for the federal government and the public " As your revise the SDEIS, please take the following actions: 1) Provide details of the calculations used to arrive at the estimated closure and long-term treatment costs in the current draft 2) Provide details of the forms that would be used to ensure that financial assurance is both bankruptcy-proof and would provide adequate income for hundreds of years of water treatment 3) Identify other responsible parties (eg major investors like Glencore) that will be held responsible for long-term cleanup should PolyMet go bankrupt or be unable to meet their obligations 4) Account for reasonably foreseeable challenges that might increase the costs of cleanup and long-term site maintenance, and factor that into the calculation for the what would constitute adequate treatment Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24336

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this test PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams grams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untreated every year. In fact, the SDEIS predicts that many years after closure this could violate the sulfate standard to protect wild rice, requiring additional measures (5-142). The SDEIS is contradictory, on the one hand relying on mechanical water treatment for hundreds of years in order to seemingly meet the sulfate standard, but also describing possible passive treatments that may be developed that would seasonally violate the protective sulfate standards. The EIS should eliminate that contradiction. Lastly, the SDEIS inadequately characterizes wild rice waters downstream of the PolyMet sites. The Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Council has provided additional wild rice sites other than those included in the SDEIS. The EIS should be revised to include these additional wild rice waters. To Lisa Fay, Wild Rice is Minnesota's state grain, and crucial for its cultural significance and importance for subsistence of Minnesota's Native Americans. Manoomin (wild rice) is recognized as a significant resource for Minnesota's tribes, access to which is protected by the Treaty of 1854- Even low levels of sulfates are proven to affect wild rice stands, a fact recognized by Minnesota's protective wild rice sulfate standard The PolyMet mine plan identifies wild rice beds downstream of the mine and plant, including part of the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers and Wynne Lake. Since sulfate levels in wild rice beds downstream of the proposed mine already exceed the standard, the proposal must demonstrate it "would have an acceptably high probability of not increasing sulfate concentrations in these areas" (p. 5-5). The mine plan does not meet this test PolyMet claims they will meet this standard by using water treatment (including reverse osmosis) to eliminate sulfates before wastewater is released. However, the mine plan predicts that 5-2 million gallons per year will seep out without treatment at the Mine Site after closure, and 11 million gallons of untreated water per year will escape the Tailings Basin (5-8). This seepage will surface and enter streams and rivers nearby. The standard to protect wild rice is 10 milligrams grams per liter of water. The waste rock left behind at the Mine Site will create runoff with sulfate levels of 2,000 to 4,000 micrograms per liter after closure, 5 million gallons of which will escape untre

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Morgan

24337

Mar 4, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. To Lisa Fay, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Sincerely, Ms Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave W Duluth, MN 55808-1715 (218) 626-2857

57248

While receiving and looking at other research and the current Polymet Environmental Review, the danger of pollution brought on by sulfide mining is something that needs to be closely examined in the review. In the review it is stated that potential exists for the release of amphibole mineral fibers from the proposed operations, which could pose a potential public health risk of uncertain magnitude” this is extremely alarming to me. The fact that, that statement can be made in a project’s Environmental Review should let alone be the deciding factor in not approving sulfide mining in Minnesota. The health risks from mineral pollution isn’t accurately reported in the review, but should be required from Polymet, for the health of my state depends on it. Whitney Morgan 1220 – 102nd Ave West Duluth, MN 55808

57249

While reviewing and looking at other research of the current Polymet Environmental Review, I believe the detrimental effects from mercury that would be emitted is not accurately reported. In a letter approved by many Duluth area physicians it is stated that the review doesn’t report the amount of mercury that will discharge into our local watersheds. Due to this lack of information, the review is not complete for mercury pollution is extremely dangerous to our communities health and eco systems. Being a lifelong citizen of Duluth, I am so grateful for Lake Superior and its water supply. It is unjust that the quality of our watersheds would be threatened due to sulfide mining. Whitney Morgan 1220 – 102nd Ave West Duluth, Mn 55808

57250

While reviewing and looking at other research on the current Polymet Environmental Review, I believe the health effects of sulfide mining is not accurately reported. Many Duluth area physicians have come out to state that the review doesn’t properly deserve all of the health impacts that would come with sulfide Mining. As a lifelong citizen of Duluth and current UMD student, sulfide mining would threaten my entire communities health by exposing lead, arsenic, lead, asbestos and mercury pollution into our air and water. These threats need to be included in the projects environmental review, along with the major health impact they will have on my family, friends, and community. Whitney Morgan 1220 102nd Ave West Duluth, MN 55808

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Whitney Snyder 12288

As a property owner in the Babbitt watershed, I would like to see the proposed PolyMet open pit copper mine stopped. There is no such thing as clean mining and we should stop putting profits before before the environment.

whonka80 . 36502

No evidence exists (to my knowledge) that this can be done safely. Not worth it. I take clean water over jobs.

Wiggs 42912

will erickson 38655

Stop all efforts to move Mining in Minnesota. It will not be good for minnesota. It will not be good for me. It will not be good for you. Will Erickson, 5500-164th LN NW, Ramsey, MN 55303

Will Mayer 39869

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Will Mayer 1883 N Ruby Ct Eagan, MN 55122-2173

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Will Munger

13652

To: Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Environmental Review Unit 500 Lafayette Rd St Paul, Mn 55155-4025 To submit comments by email, send to: [HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us Attached please find my written statement stating opinions and recommendations on the NorthMet SDEIS. Sulfide Mining Testimony Comments to the Supplemental DEIS February 12., 2014 Presented by: Will Munger 401 Snively Road Duluth, Minnesota My name is Will Munger and I live in Duluth, Minnesota. I own and operate the Willard Munger Inn in West Duluth. This business has been in our family for over 50 years and depends upon people coming to Duluth to experience our natural areas. These activities include but are not limited to fishing on the St Louis River, hiking the Superior hiking Trail, Bicycling the Willard Munger State Trail, skiing and other out door recreational activities at Spirit Mountain and birding on the Western Waterfront Trail. Being in the hospitality business I fully understand the need for the encouragement of job creating development in our area. At the same time I fully understand what makes this area attractive for people to live here, visit here, and grow business here. Those qualities are, the abundance of clear clean water, beautiful albeit diminishing unspoiled forest areas and a natural habitat which produces bountiful and varied wildlife. In our country's short history there are fewer and fewer places within the continental United States where you can still experience vast wilderness areas that are available to large population centers. One such area is the water rich area of Northern Minnesota. This fact must be considered when we consider permitting any activity that will effect this. One way I have chosen to work for the preservation and protection of our beautiful North Country is by serving as an active member of the following organizations: Save Lake Superior Association, St Louis River Alliance, Issac Walton League, Clean Water Action and the Superior Hiking Trail Association. While I do not speak now for these organizations I can say that the vast majority of the membership of these organizations share my concerns about the effects of Sulfide mining on this area. While all contamination of our water and air is and should be a concern, a specific concern that I would like to voice is in regard to the Lower St Louis River which very much impacts everyone who lives in Duluth. Currently we have fish advisories on this portion of the river which recommend consumption limits for eating Walleye and other game fish caught in the river because they already have high levels of Mercury. I am concerned that with the introduction of Sulfide mining this problem will only be exacerbated. With this in mind, I would like to see the EIS specifically address issues that can assure us that conditions, with specific regard to water quality, can continue to improve or at least be maintained on the river if permitting of sulfide mining is approved. It is my understanding that the Minnesota DNR was originally put in place to manage and protect our states natural resources. It is unfortunate that the DNR, is often now perceived, rightly or wrongly, as an agent or advocate of pro-mining interests. The DNR is perceived to willingly weaken it's own regulatory powers. With this in mind I would like to call for the contracting of an objective third party consulting firm to evaluate all aspects of the permitting process to insure that a fully objective evaluation process for approval or disapproval is done. As part of this I would like to request that a cost benefit analysis be done of the proposed North-met Project to determine if the benefits of sulfide mining outweigh the seeming high risk experienced with this kind of mining and the known impacts that such mining is known to hAve While I have many concerns about the EIS as presented, I have not been to the propos

will perry

38534

Water, not minerals, is the real resource of Northern Minnesota. I am concerned that over time pollutants will leach into the water and work their way into Lake Superior and other water systems in the area. I read in the reclamation section that PolyMet will engage in "Capturing and treating affected water using mechanical and/or non-mechanical methods for as long as needed". And that "Financial assurance (provided by PolyMet) would ensure that environmental management, including planned water treatment needs, would occur for as long as needed to meet environmental standards". I have several concerns with the "as long as needed" part of these statements: How, exactly, for the long run of years necessary to fully reclaim this site, will PolyMet remain financially available to pay the continued costs of reclamation. Will there be the political will to continue the monitoring of this site into the future. Will there be an economic downturn that leads to siphoning the funds for other needs or a drying up of the funds. As much as I respect engineers and what they do (my daughter is a civil engineering student at the U of MN) we all know that the best laid plans sometimes can go awry. Things fall apart or don't hold up. What can we learn from the 35W bridge collapse. What can we learn from the collapse of the dam above Jay Cook State Park. Was it natural wear and tear, lack of political will to engage in up keep, inherent engineering miscalculations or shortcuts, design flaws, economic downturns that bled out repair and upkeep funding, or a perfect storm of multiple impacts. Will there be a climate change that leads to unforeseen impacts. The plan looks good on paper. But we are talking about long-term impact on a precious resource in exchange for short-term gain. I think there are too many areas in which something could potentially go wrong for this project to occur in this vulnerable area of our state. Sincerely, Will Perry 13415 Europa Ct. N. Unit 8 Hugo, MN 55038 651-246-0084

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Will Tajibnapis 7202

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Amid the swirl of data, claims and counterclaims, one fact that no one disputes stands out: the pollution from mine tailings and waste heaps would last for at least 500 years. Setting aside money and resources, and making plans to control pollution for 500 years or more is simply impossible. So I propose that at this time permits be denied and the plan to mine copper be scrapped. I am confident that in the not-to-distant future technology will become available to mine the copper in a safer manner. Then the mining can commence. The copper isn't going to go anywhere. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Will Tajibnapis 3722 Grand Ave South Minneapolis, MN 55409

Willa Caldwell 42073

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Willa Caldwell Minneapolis, Minnesota

William (Bill) Gramer 43358

Dear DNR It appears that the SDEIS thoroughly vetted all the key environmental issues to insure Minnesota Environment is protected. Great work. I believe now the approval for initial permitting should be accelerated in further assist Minnesota environment through new form of tax revenue as the IronRange Job market experiences the positive economic multiplier effect of new safe jobs. Please contact me if you have any further questions. William (Bill) Gramer 7144 Jenner Bay S Cottage Grove, MN 55016-1373

William A Dotter 57218

Check the area north of our border with Canada, north of Hwy #61 to Thunder Bay, for damage to forests and streams from copper mining. We don't need copper that badly. I say no to copper mining. William A. Dotter PO Box 3247 E Riverside Rd Esko, MN 55733

William A Illegible 54798

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William and Karla Forsyth

40115

From: wforsyth@hensonefron-com [wforsyth@hensonefron-com] Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 5:23 PM To: Fay, Lisa (DNR) Subject: PolyMet / NorthMet Comments Dear Ms Fay: If allowed to move forward, the PolyMet mine proposal would set a dangerous precedent for Minnesota's environmental safety. As a concerned citizen, I am asking you to send their proposal back to the drawing board. Minnesota is uniquely vulnerable to climate change, particularly the boreal forest of northern Minnesota. PolyMet would be a huge consumer of electricity, much of it coming from dirty, inefficient coal power plants in Minnesota. As the SDEIS states, PolyMet would emit 707,342 metric tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere every year. This would contradict Minnesota's goal to reduce carbon emissions. The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set a goal of reducing Minnesota's greenhouse gas emissions 15% from 2005 levels by the year 2015, and 30% from 2005 levels by 2025. The Minnesota DNR, through the mine plan, should require use of clean energy to reduce impacts of pollution. The PolyMet mine site has large amounts of peatlands that have been storing carbon for thousands of years. When PolyMet's regular mining practices disturb the peatlands, they will release nearly 200,000 metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. In order to stay on track for Minnesota's carbon reduction goals, these peatlands and their stored carbon should be left undisturbed. The SDEIS (page 5-124) uses 1980s data to plan for extreme weather events. It fails to examine the impact of precipitation events any greater than the "100-year storm." Given climate change, this design is insufficient. PolyMet must be designed to handle larger volumes of wastewater. The Minnesota DNR should include a 500-year storm analysis of both the mine pits and the tailings basin. Heavy rainfall such as occurred in June 2012 in northeast Minnesota could result in an overflow of contaminated water into the environment. This trade-off is not worth the risk. These are just a few of the reasons why the SDEIS should have included a thorough discussion of financial assurance - how much money, and in what form, the mining company should put down to cover the costs of cleaning up the site and addressing problems. The SDEIS is over 2,000 pages long, but includes just a couple pages generally discussing financial assurance. There is no indication of how much financial assurance the agencies are thinking should be required, and there is no discussion of the agencies' thought process in arriving at a figure. The agencies view that financial assurance be addressed in permitting is contrary to the intention of environmental review, and reduces the public's ability to comment as effectively as is possible during the SDEIS comment period. I'm a Minnesotan concerned about the impact of the PolyMet mine proposal and urge you to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. In addition, the SDEIS has serious flaws that need to be addressed. I urge you also to reject the SDEIS. Thank you. Sincerely, William And Karla Forsyth 2212 Irving Ave So. Minneapolis, MN 55405-2523

William Brown

39557

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr William Brown 8288 131st St W Apple Valley, MN 55124-9709 (952) 432-4231

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Cunningham

36344

Lisa Fay EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Dear Ms Fay, I request that the MDNR allow a longer time for public comments on the SDEIS and a correction of the document to address issues of water flow measurement and mapping as well as the lack of convincing financial assurance for several centuries of monitoring and treating effluents from the project. Since 1970, I've been following the proposals to mine copper, nickel and other precious metals from deposits along the edge of the Duluth Complex in northern Minnesota. The mining companies always say they have "new technology" that will prevent pollution from escaping from the mine site, but I don't believe it's true. I've visited Sudbury, Ontario; Butte, Montana; and other former copper mining and smelting sites to see to see the effects of this process on the environment. I believe there has never been a sulfide ore mine that didn't eventually cause catastrophic pollution to its surroundings, and I don't believe the PolyMet mine will be any different. PolyMet says it will provide adequate insurance to treat effluent from the mine for hundreds of years. I don't believe it's true. Historically, once the ore has been plundered and the profits extracted, mining companies declare bankruptcy and simply walk away, leaving the public to clean up the mess. I think that's going to be the case if PolyMet is allowed to proceed. Glencore, the parent company of PolyMet has an extremely poor history of environmental, human rights, and labor abuses. This is an even greater reason to view PolyMet's claims with suspicion. The company has neither the reputation, financial resources, or responsibility to monitor and ameliorate pollution from their operation for centuries. It's especially important to get this decision right because there are other proposals, as you know, waiting to be submitted once they know PolyMet's fate. If PolyMet is allowed to go ahead, it will be much harder to stop other mines that are closer to the BWCA. It is criminal to consider polluting the water in Lake Superior, and it is even worse to consider poisoning the water flowing through the BWCA. Sulfide releases from mining and processing this ore will destroy important wild rice resources and violate treaty agreements with Native American tribes. The state of Minnesota should enforce strict sulfide pollution standards in all wild rice waters. There are technical problems with the Draft EIS that make it imperative to do a new and more thorough job of assessing the environmental impacts of this project. The fact that water flows in the Partridge River were miscalculated mean the the water model used in the Draft EIS is flawed and needs to be redone. Furthermore, I think there's an error in assuming that no water will flow out of the mine site and processing area into the BWCA. Groundwater contours in the "One Hundred Mile Swamp" where waste rock will be stored, show drainage into Langley Creek, which is a tributary of the Kawishiwi River, which flows through the BWCA and along the Canadian border lakes. Pollution of this waterway is an international issue as well as an environmental disaster. Thank you, William P. Cunningham 1764 Lindig St Falcon Heights, MN 55113

William Daniels

42262

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. I have a strong connection to the region, having worked as a dogsled musher and fishing guide in the area. The thought of ripping a hole in the ground and the other environmental risks that go along with it really make me cringe. Please make a wise decision. Sincerely, Mr William Daniels 1201 Elm St Northfield, MN 55057-2907

Alphabetical by sender's first name

WILLIAM DOW

17310

Feb 17, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

William Durbin

42524

See attachment

42823

See attachment

William Emery

54526

I think granting the permits for Polymet Co. mining sulfide would be very damaging to the environment and especially the water system in the state of Minnesota. Pollution of water entering Lake Superior is totally unacceptable and should not be allowed.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Fischer

36314

As a citizen and taxpayer of Minnesota, the available evidence leads me to strongly oppose the proposed PolyMet copper mine. I'm all for creating jobs on the Iron Range, but a simple arm's length look at the situation should lead anyone to the conclusion that the short term projected benefits (mainly geographically specific jobs of dubious long-term value) could not possibly justify the long term likely cost externalities (mainly perpetual environmental costs) associated with the proposal. Unsustainable (one-time) resource extraction industries are precisely the type of industry that MN should be trying to get away from, I would much rather have my tax dollars spent on investing in the people of Minnesota, rather than on consuming our natural resources - and would gladly do so. Furthermore, corporate or business promises of paying for the cleanup are irrelevant - as soon as the mine is no longer profitable it will be closed and the shell company will just be bankrupted leaving MN with the damaging legacy of this project. Even if this were not the case, most companies today that do not employ practiced bankruptcy as a SOP simply do not exist long enough to pay for this type of coSt William Fischer 1070 11th Ave SE Minneapolis, MN 55414

William Forsberg

42002

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, William Forsberg Ely, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Goldenberg

16227

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

William Gustavus Heeguard

57205

1.Please explain why no health impact study was not performed both in regards to human, animal (moose) etc. and aquatic species (plants and animals)2.What exactly is the contingency plan of the Polymet mine3.Is there a parent company4.What protection do we Minnesotans have if this mine goes bust in 10 years – will we have to pay for cleanup like Butte, MTWilliam Gustavus HeeguardAssoc Professor – Univ of MN Medical School4915 10th Ave SoMinneapolis, MN 55417

William H Duncan

1769

<https://mail.google-com/mail/u/0/images/cleardot.gif> To all concerned: A twenty-year mining boom, 200 years to filter the waters. It is something very like epic hubris, arrogance, to think that we have the right to force this on future generations, on even the young now, who have no say. I'm assuming if Polymet readily acknowledges a 200 year necessary clean-up, it could be considerably longer. Justice is a hard enough thing to find for the living. What injustice will those unborn generations feel, to be burdened with the toxicity of today's relentless, ruthless pursuit of GDP growth. It is delusion to think this is ok. Insanity, to let it happen. Generational injustice, in the EXTREME. It is not merely enough to stop this Polymet venture. It is necessary to Outlaw sulfide mining in the state. William Hunter Duncan 5254 40th ave s Minneapolis MN 55417 612-306-2129 On Mon, Dec 9, 2013 at 11:12 AM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd. If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William H Duncan

1770

To all concerned: A twenty-year mining boom, 200 years to filter the waters. It is something very like epic hubris, arrogance, to think that we have the right to force this on future generations, on even the young now, who have no say. I'm assuming if Polymet readily acknowledges a 200 year necessary clean-up, it could be considerably longer. Justice is a hard enough thing to find for the living. What injustice will those unborn generations feel, to be burdened with the toxicity of today's relentless, ruthless pursuit of GDP growth. It is delusion to think this is ok. Insanity, to let it happen. Generational injustice, in the EXTREME. It is not merely enough to stop this Polymet venture. It is necessary to Outlaw sulfide mining in the state. William Hunter Duncan

William Hane

18150

My name is William Hane. "Hane" just like the underwear. I'm a concerned citizen. I certainly know that we need jobs. It's nice to have a high-skilled job. I was a high-skilled worker. I'm now a low-paid worker. So I understand that scenario. There's never been a copper-nickle-cobalt mine that didn't pollute. We can't afford the pollution. That area is well polluted enough. Global warming is definitely affecting it and will continue to affect it well into the future. If the mining is so valuable, let's wait a while until we are really desperate and it will be even more valuable.

William Herzberg

9840

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, William Herzberg 1541 Sheridan st 6971 Cramer Rd Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Herzberg

18628

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, William Herzberg 1541 Sheridan st 6971 Cramer Rd Ely, MN 55731

50704

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamMs • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, William Herzberg 1541 Sheridan st 6971 Cramer Rd Ely, MN 55731

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Hommeyer

43834

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This is an urgent matter that will negatively impact Minnesota's water quality. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and stream
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site.

The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Will Hommeyer William Hommeyer 1004 Lincoln Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Hommeyer

43837

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: This is an urgent matter that will negatively impact Minnesota's water quality. Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures:

- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streams
- The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge.
- The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures.
- The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come.

Sincerely yours, Will Hommeyer
William Hommeyer 1004 Lincoln Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55105

William J Higgins

42617

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William K. Dustin

41985

The attachment is the same as below in case there are any problems. Comments and Questions on the PloyMet SDEIS Full Disclosure I had a fortunate childhood growing up in Buffalo NY because I spent eight summers at a camp just outside Algonquin Park north of Toronto. This camp provided the opportunity to take canoe trips all over the park and instilled in me a deep love and appreciation for the beauty of the natural world. When I moved to Minnesota, it was because the Boundary Waters are here, and we purchased land outside Ely before purchasing a house in the Twin Cities. Now the Boundary Waters are threatened, and I am extremely upset and angry about it. My opinion is not humble. I will begin with general comments on the SDEIS and then move to more specific comments. A Comment about the Oral Comments I am a strong advocate for lotteries, having argued at length that we should be selecting members of the legislature by lot. (Dustin, 1999) However, there was a provision that allowed a speaker selected by lot to cede his/her speaking opportunity to another person. This provided the opportunity for a group of people to enter the lottery with an agreed upon plan to cede their speaking opportunity to a particular individual. This gave that particular individual much greater odds of getting an opportunity to speak. Since there were groups that attended more than one of the public meetings on the SDEIS, it is quite likely that this strategy was employed, particularly at the last of the three meetings. A Comment about Jobs No corporation is in the business of creating jobs. Jobs are just a cost of doing business. However, every rent seeker uses an appeal to job creation and national security (which politicians suck up) to obtain special favors such as tax breaks or the use of a resource. A Comment about No Action There is a built in bias against the No Action Alternative because the idea of no action is unheard of in capitalist economies. If anything, they are hyperactive in using the earth as both a source of raw materials and a sink for the pollutants resulting from their use. It is estimated that we need between three and five earths to support our current levels of consumption. A more nuanced conception of no action is found in the Chinese concept of wu-wei in the Tao Te Ching. (Star, 2001) A Comment about a Permanent Fund The mineral resources in question here are being given away for the permanent benefit of an alien corporation and a temporary economic benefit for a relatively small, but extremely vocal, group of Minnesotans. What has not been addressed is that the proposed action violates the ethical principle of generational equity. Future generations will be deprived not only of the use of the minerals, but they will be handed the negative externalities resulting from the pollution of the environment and opportunity costs in terms of enjoying the beauty of northern Minnesota and seeking recreational and spiritual opportunities therein. Since this low grade mineral resource is not going to get up and walk away, I suggest that, at the very least, permitting be suspended to allow the citizens of Minnesota to consider a constitutional amendment that would establish a permanent fund to compensate future generations for these losses. The fund would work as follows: Any corporation making a profit on the exploitation of Minnesota's resources will be required to make annual royalty payments into the fund. Corporations exploiting non renewable resources would contribute a much higher amount such as one half of their gross revenues. Corporations exploiting renewable resources would contribute a lesser amount, perhaps one quarter of gross revenues. The fund will be managed and audited by entities that are completely isolated from political control. Once the fund has accumulated sufficient assets, it will begin the payment of dividends to all citizens of the state. This will compensa

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William McKechnie

14475

Feb 13, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centur

William O O'Neill

57177

Mining with sulfide in northern Minnesota would be a short-sighted action that would deteriorate the health of the ecology and quality of life in the area. Long after the resources are tapped, our children will still be dealing with the toxins left behind. William O. O'Neill 1702 North 24th Street Superior, WI 54880

William R Whiteside

18307

My name is William R. Whiteside. I am from Hibbing. I'm pleased be able stand here today in solid support of PolyMet and the crew of people who have been working so hard to make this a successful venture. They've spent \$50 million or more trying to satisfy the demands that this kind of a project requires to assure that we are able to do this in a safe and efficient manner. I'm really pleased that the people who at PolyMet are local people of the highest caliber of talent in mining. It's very comforting to know that we have such fine people working there. And I'm very happy to see as we're looking forward the huge amounts of money -- billions of dollars -- that are going to be available to young people not only of the Iron Range, not only of Duluth, Northeastern Minnesota, but all of Minnesota to assure better educational opportunities, more solid infrastructure, better bridges, highways, hospitals. All the things that are necessary to a healthy and a good environment for people to live in. I still have a minute left. Seems like a long time when you get up here. So I think this is a great opportunity for all of us. I think it's a great opportunity for the people of Northeastern Minnesota. I'm glad that the glaciers have left for a little while and made these resources available to us. And I hope we can go forward as a state and as communities into a future -- I'm very confident in the water quality issues that will have been addressed, all the work that has been done. Thank you very much.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Robbins

46971

Comment: PolyMet Supplemental Draft EIS From: William Brewster Robbins 2277 Stillwater Avenue East Maplewood, MN 55119-3621 Supplemental Draft EIS is full of general information, but very short on details, especially details relating to control of water pollution and airborne dust pollution. I suggest that the lack of details would not allow a decision maker to know and understand enough to make an informed decision on this project. Control of water pollution: Reverse osmosis (RO) is given lip service in the Supplemental Draft EIS as the "cure" for water pollution. RO could help improve the situation, but only if the RO system is properly engineered, properly operated, constantly monitored and rigorously maintained. Of course, RO only separates the water into a cleaner stream and a more concentrated waste stream. Choice of operating pressure in the RO sets the ratio of flow of cleaner water to flow of wastewater. Without knowing the design operating pressure, a decision maker would not know the following: How much wastewater will have to be stored or treated by secondary methods. The intended size and cost of the RO system, including pre-filtration equipment. The costs of long-term maintenance, monitoring and repair of the RO system. Without adequate maintenance, monitoring and repair, the cleaner water stream will soon cease to meet even the minimum water quality standards. There seems to have been a focus on controlling water effluent from tailings. This is important, to be sure, but the huge amount of water, both meteoric and ground source water from the open pit will likely dominate water flow which needs to be treated, so sizing of the RO system needs to accommodate large, erratic flows from storm runoff. I understand that agencies that write permits and regulations often are expected to resolve many questions relating to operational details, but I suggest that such details are often overlooked by such regulating agencies. Control of airborne dust pollution: All the following generate airborne dust: Removing overburden, mining, transportation, milling to reduce size preparatory to froth flotation, and tailings storage. I found little mention in the Supplemental Draft EIS of sources of dust, design of equipment and engineering processes to minimize dust generation and remediation procedures to contain and dispose of dust. Boom and bust nature of the mining business: By planning for a 40-year period of mining, rather than a 20-year period, the removal rate of copper/nickel would need to be reduced. I understand that the up-front costs would be recovered more slowly, and this would generate reduced profits. Benefits to the long term economy, the people in the area, and the environment would result, and those uncertainties would decrease, issues associated with the long term needs of maintaining the site after active mining operations cease.

William Rudie

27497

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. This has happened within years, not decades or centuries and the impact of this pollution is devastating to our environment. The short form of the environmental impact statement could easily say " the unique and delicate environment of Northern Minnesota will be damaged. Mining companies have been unable or unwilling to do what is required to prevent pollution caused by such operations in the past and there is no reason to think that this mine will be any different " As someone who grew up in Duluth and who has spent considerable time in Northern Minnesota, the Superior National Forest, and the Boundary Waters I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on our region's natural resources and public health. I appreciate the desire of those living in this area to have an opportunity for economic advancement if only for a limited time but the cost in permanent damage to this land and these waters is simply too high. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forest land to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest Sincerely, William Rudie 4985 S Las Mananitas Trl Gold Canyon, AZ 85118-1853 (480) 288-5429

William Simmons

35263

Mar 4, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fey MN Dear EIS Project Manager Fey, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining should not be allowed in Minnesota as it will threaten wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region of Minnesota, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. If Lake Superior is affected so too will the rest of the Great Lakes. We know that acid mine drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. There is no reasonable expectation that a different outcome will be seen in Minnesota. With this great danger, I ask that this mine be stopped. It is not in the long term best interests of the United States, or Canada for that matter. As the leader of the World, the United States must take the lead in supplying long term solutions to environmental issues. Sincerely, William Simmons 6326 Van Buren Ave Hammond, IN 46324-1238 (219) 933-7477

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Smith

16299

Feb 20, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

54493

See attachment

William Turek

41968

Mar 8, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, I urge you to reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Mr William Turek 2372Como Ave,#2 Saint Paul, MN 55108 (651) 645-7671

Alphabetical by sender's first name

William Wenger

9794

I support the PolyMet mining plan assuming all safeguards to the environment are in place. This is a big assumption, but I trust the agencies and regulatory bodies have done thorough due diligence. I would not support the PolyMet plan if there is a 1% chance that MN could end up with a disaster like what has happened to the Upper Clark Fork River Watershed in Montana as described in Brad Tyer's book Opportunity, Montana. PolyMet must prevent, with 100% certainty, any "oops." in the form of water or air contamination, or any breach to the complete, long term containment of toxic byproducts within the mining operation. We do need copper, and I would prefer it be mined under close government scrutiny in Minnesota, than in other parts of the world where such oversight is missing. Regards, William K. Wenger, PhD 500 Robert St N Unit 619 Saint Paul, MN 55101

William Wilton

57215

We cannot let economics or oil exploration and mining of our resources decide whether we will live or not. There is no question that unless stopped, life will end or be badly mutated. Research to recycle and reuse what has been already extracted can bring many jobs is just a start. Remember tailings dumped in Lake Superior! Corp's fought responsibility. NO PolyMet! Please protect you and I and everyone. William Wilton 524 Anderson Rd Duluth, MN 55811

William Youman

58168

As a M.D. physician and BS in Wildlife Biology (MSU) my research and education on this issue concludes the mining should NOT go forth and be NOT approved due to wildlife, water quality and health issues for local residents and all of MN and the water resources.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

william youmans

46190

Dear Ms Fay and Mr Westlake: MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Kenneth Westlake US Environmental Protection Agency RE: PolyMet NorthMet Sulfide Mining SDEIS Dear Ms Fay, Mr Westlake: This comment letter is submitted on behalf of the undersigned doctors, nurses and other health professionals. We are concerned that the proposed PolyMet NorthMet copper-nickel mine project could have significant adverse impacts on human health as a result of pollutants released to air, surface water and drinking water. We also believe that the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("PolyMet SDEIS") fails to adequately assess important risks to human health from the pollutants that would be released from this project. The absence of any professionals from the Minnesota Department of Health from the List of Preparers of the PolyMet SDEIS is particularly troubling. We would respectfully request that the PolyMet SDEIS be deemed inadequate due to unresolved concerns and insufficient assessment of health risks of the proposal. We would further request that, in revising the PolyMet SDEIS, a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be prepared under the guidance of the Minnesota Department of Health. In this letter, we summarize some issues and concerns leading to these requests. Mercury contamination of fish and impacts on neurotoxicity in the developing fetus as well as in infants, children and adults is a significant public health concern in Minnesota. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. The percentage of infants thus at risk for neurologic impairment was higher than in the Lake Superior Region of Wisconsin or Michigan. We are aware that many of the bodies of water downstream of the proposed PolyMet mine and plant are legally impaired due to mercury in fish tissue. The lower reaches of the St Louis River, where the estuary for Lake Superior fish is located, contains a particularly high level of mercury. We also know that other mine facilities release both mercury and the sulfates that increase bioaccumulation of methylmercury. Reviewing the PolyMet SDEIS, we believe that the information on mercury releases and the potential for mercury bioaccumulation is insufficient. The SDEIS does not disclose releases of mercury from seepage and does not analyze the effects of local deposition of pollutants or of hydrologic changes on mercury bioaccumulation. The SDEIS does not provide evidence to justify its claims about collection and containment of mercury and sulfates. The PolyMet SDEIS also provides an insufficient analysis of the human health risks of other pollutants, such as neurologic morbidity resulting from manganese and lead release; and carcinogenic effects of air emissions of diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates, and of arsenic releases to water. The PolyMet SDEIS fails to analyze health risks to workers who would work on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant and fails to assess impacts of tailings groundwater seepage on nearby residential. The PolyMet SDEIS does not discuss impacts of exposures to vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, the elderly and persons who rely for subsistence on fish, wild rice or game species where pollutants may bioaccumulate. For these reasons, we would first request that the PolyMet SDEIS be revised to provide more complete information on mercury and sulfate emissions, deposition, and seepage from various sources, and the potential conversion to and bioaccumulation of methylmercury resulting from releases to the environment and hydrological changes from the proposed PolyMet project. We would further request that the PolyMet SDEIS be determined inadequate pending supplementation to include a Health Impact Ass

Willmar Chamber of Commerce

54636

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Wintergreen

10185

My name is Paul Schurke, from Ely, MN, and I'm deeply concerned about recent revelations of a fatal flaw in the PolyMet SDEIS. The situation brings to mind the pivotal scene from the Apollo 13 mission: "Houston, we've got a problem." We've got a huge problem with the PolyMet SDEIS. But this problem is not rocket science. This problem is so alarmingly simple that we should all be pushing the eject button on the PolyMet impact study. For 5 years PolyMet and various government agencies have studied the potential impacts that the nation's most polluting and toxic industry might have on the nation's most water-rich ecosystems. For 5 years, we've been told to trust the science. Don't worry, they've told us, PolyMet's models will get it right. These models will determine whether a mine slated to operate for just 20 years is likely to pollute a headwaters of the Great Lakes watershed – the world's most significant freshwater resource – for hundreds of years if not forever. But now we learn that PolyMet's models got it wrong. They based the study on the wrong data. Their key parameter, stream flow volume, was incorrect. It's simple: to determine how much pollution might travel from the mine site to Lake Superior, you measure the flowage of the headwater stream that connects the two – the Partridge River. But the scientists we are asked to trust did not measure the flowage. They simply guessed using computer models. They guessed wrong. New data shows that at least 3 times as much water flows down the Partridge River than was wrongly assumed in their study. And here's the kicker: For 5 years scientists with native American tribes who know the lay of the land better than any of us warned the agencies that PolyMet's stream flow data was incorrect. The warnings of the tribal scientists were ignored. Why. Is it because much greater flowage might mean much greater pollution treatment costs than PolyMet is willing to pay. Is it because much great flowage might spread the pollution to a much larger area than PolyMet is willing to clean up. Is it because PolyMet's proposed treatment plants will have to process larger volumes of water for hundreds of years than any financial assurance package could ever possibly pay for. If the agencies that prepared this SDEIS could not get a simple key parameter correct – the amount of water currently flowing from the mine site – how can we possibly trust them to accurately predict the impact of this mine on our watershed hundreds of years from now - when it will still be releasing toxins into our surface and groundwater. Because of this fundamental flaw, this SDEIS is fundamentally inadequate. We're told to rely on science to get it right. How can we if the agencies that are doing the science got it wrong. Let's start over before we risk permanent damage to Minnesota's lakes and streams and our nation's most significant watershed."

Wump

45062

To Whom it May Concern, Please reject the Polymet proposal as it would destroy the natural environment and compromise our waters. This cost significantly outweighs any short term financial gain that may result from the copper mine business. Thank you, Leila Jindeel

Wynter George

54182

Dear DNR, I think building a mine is a bad idea because it will effect our environment. It will destroy our rivers and are boundaries water.

Xa Peter Vang

54209

I am a student at Como Senior High School. I think we should not turn the boundary waters into a mine. I believe we should protect an environment that holds such beauty and serenity. The boundary waters is our last and biggest ecosystem in Minnesota. Pollution is a big problem all over the world and we all want to stop pollution, so why build something that will create more pollution. Sulfide mining will have a large impact to the environment; sulfide will turn into sulfuric acid and pollute the boundary water. We even created a low to protect the boundary water. The boundary water has been our largest wilderness since 1978 and it should be kept like that. The boundary waters is the icon behind Minnesota.

XAKk G. Asphodel

40153

Thank you. -XAKk On Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 3:26 PM, *NorthMetSDEIS (DNR) <[HYPERLINK](mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us)
"mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us> wrote: Thank you for providing comments on NorthMet Mining Project and Land Exchange SDEIS. We will review the comments you have provided. Responses to all substantive comments will be included in the official recoRd If you have provided your address, you will be included in mailings or electronic distribution of the recoRd - Just remember that you're alive. -Joe Strummer, R.I.P. 2002

Alphabetical by sender's first name

XAkk G. Asphodel

40215

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Yancy Rowlette

43503

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS •The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. •The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. •The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Yancy Rowlette 2749 polk St N.E. 28 th ave N.E. Minneapolis, MN 55418

43504

Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner and Mr Dabney: Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and acknowledge that the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts on surface and ground water quality for hundreds of years, if not forever. I'm also sending a copy of my letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency. In my opinion, the PolyMet SDEIS and the PolyMet sulfide mine plan still deserve a failing grade and both should be rejected. Recent news of internal DNR documents showing that base flow at the mine site was seriously underestimated confirms my opinion. Neither the SDEIS nor the sulfide mine project are based on good science. The PolyMet SDEIS relies on a number of improper and unsupported assumptions to minimize the threats of the sulfide mine plan and wastes on drinking water, surface water, wild rice, mercury contamination of fish and human health. The SDEIS must be redone, because its rosy predictions are completely unreliable and its methods conceal, rather than analyze environmental impacts. Here are a few critical failures: • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable calculation of the amount of groundwater flow in the Partridge River watershed. Both tribal hydrologists and MDNR staff have determined that the real baseflow is two to three times higher than the number used in the SDEIS. Baseflow affects pollution seepage and impacts on wetlands and streamS • The SDEIS must be redone to use a reasonable range of probabilities for the collection of polluted seepage from the Category 1 waste rock pile and the tailings piles, rather than just choosing one very optimistic number. The assumption that more than 99% of total seepage will be captured from the tailings basin (SDEIS, p. 5-159) has no support in the real world, yet allows PolyMet to minimize threats that wild rice, fish and human health will be harmed by tailings basin discharge. • The SDEIS must be redone using accurate and complete predictions about effects on pollution seeps of fault lines and fractures under the mine site, the tailings basin and the proposed HRF waste dump. Geological survey maps and PolyMet's own reports for the Canada stock exchange reveal significant faults and fractures. • The SDEIS must be redone to include a specific and reasonable plan for financial assurance of treatment for hundreds of years and to ensure that taxpayers won't end up paying for clean-up if the PolyMet mine or plant site becomes a Superfund site. The PolyMet SDEIS is not a fair and scientific analysis of water pollution threats. It is a biased document that relies on unjustified assumptions, conceals important facts, and won't allow members of the public to understand risks of accidents, failures or even routine violations of water quality standards. Please reject the SDEIS and the experiment in very long-term if not permanent pollution that the PolyMet sulfide mine plan would bring to Minnesota. This project would violate water quality standards for generations to come. Sincerely yours, Yancy Rowlette 2749 polk St N.E. 28 th ave N.E. Minneapolis, MN 55418

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Yasmina Antcliff

6073

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: The Environmental Impact Statement doesn't tell us how much mercury pollution will be seeping out of the PolyMet tailings into surficial waters. The bottom line is that we need MORE INFORMATION. Our children's health is at risk and people in the North Land aren't willing to risk that kind of potential harm. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely Yasmina Antcliff, Honors Student at UMD, Mother of a seven year-old little girl, INFORMED VOTER Yasmina Antcliff 602 E 5th St #203 Duluth, MN 55805 2182607048

18870

Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager MDNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Douglas Bruner, US Army Corps of Engineers Tim Dabney US Forest Service Dear Ms Fay, Mr Bruner, Mr Dabney: I'm writing to request that you increase the length of the comment period for the PolyMet NorthMet Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) from 90 days to 180 days. Please listen to the community – there is too much at stake to rush this. Please also consider rescheduling the public meetings proposed for January 2014 so that they take place later in the comment period. At the very least, please provide an additional public meeting toward the end of the extended comment period in May 2014- PolyMet and the agencies have had more than seven years to put together the PolyMet SDEIS. Yet, you are expecting the public to read everything and be ready to speak up about the project after just a few weeks, just after the winter holidays. This isn't fair or reasonable. Here are some reasons why we need more time to comment and to prepare for public meetings: * The SDEIS is too long. The SDEIS is 2,169 pages long. It is neither clear nor concise. In places, it is internally inconsistent. In others, it only makes sense after reading additional technical documents. * The SDEIS is not written so that members of the public can understand it. The SDEIS is confusing and repeats the same information over and over without providing the basis for its conclusions. It's going to take a lot of work just to make sense of what it is saying. * The SDEIS doesn't explain some of the most important issues. The SDEIS does not explain why other alternatives that could reduce pollution and impacts on wetlands weren't analyzed. No data is provided to support the level of financial assurance proposed. * The SDEIS is often one-sided. Well-documented tribal "Major Differences of Opinion" call into question many of the main points in the SDEIS, like claims that mine pits, waste rock piles, and tailings heaps won't seep pollution; that mining won't dry out wetlands; and that mercury contamination of fish and other toxic chemicals won't increase. * The SDEIS doesn't allow members of the public to find or check on the references claimed to support the SDEIS conclusions. The SDEIS has a long list of references, but they were not made available to the public. How can we tell if the conclusions in the SDEIS make sense. * The SDEIS comment period and public meetings come at the worst possible time. Release of the SDEIS right before the winter holidays and scheduling public meetings in January (when bad weather is likely) seem designed to make it hard for us to both review the documents and to travel to hearings. The PolyMet NorthMet sulfide mine proposal is very controversial, and there is a lot of mistrust about whether government decision-makers are really interested either in the science or the financial risk of the proposal, let alone what the public has to say. Extending the SDEIS comment period to 180 days and setting public meetings later in the comment period would go a long way to reassure us that the PolyMet sulfide mine project will receive a fair evaluation and that opinions of Minnesota citizens, not just the interest of foreign corporations, will matter when the government makes its decisions. Sincerely yours, Yasmina Antcliff 602 E 5th St #203 Duluth, MN 55805 218-260-7048

42577

See attachment

Alphabetical by sender's first name

yvonne eckstein

40197

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: I believe PolyMet's open pit mine plan is deeply flawed and my concern as an old Minnesota resident is the long term potential harm to the environment.-water and air pollution from the mine site, leaching of heavy metals into wetlands and lake drinking water, loss of public lands in Superior National Forest, destruction of irreplaceable wetlands. PolyMet should be denied a permit to mine until the potential impacts of their proposal receive further study, and questions such as-will mercury loading in wetlands pose a risk to fish, to human and animal health; what are the actual costs of treating the water pollution from the permanent mine site waste rock and how long will PolyMet pay for it. The groundwater flow rates in SDEIS are inconsistent with "real world" date. What is PolyMet planning to do if their modeling predictions of no risk of water pollution from seepage both from the waste rock pile and the tailings pile do not hold true. I would ask the SDEIS analyze and study the potential impacts of some alternatives to an open pit design-like underground mining, putting liners under the permanent waste pile and the tailings pile. The opportunity to provide employment from the PolyMet project has strong appeal to some residents in the area-and jobs are are a real concern BUT I think the short term benefits of these few jobs are vastly outweighed by the longer term and possibly permanent damage to health and environment of Minnesota residents. Surely there are other better ways to provide employment. Please reject the PolyMet SDEIS and deny permits - like a permit to mine or a Section 404 wetlands permit - that would allow this open-pit sulfide mine to harm Minnesota's fresh water for centuries, if not forever. Sincerely, Yvonne Eckstein yvonne eckstein 1912 dupont ave so #407 minneapolis, MN 55403

Zabelle Stodola

4698

Jan 6, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Let me say immediately that as a new resident to northeastern Minnesota, I am strongly opposed to the proposed open pit mine and land exchange. My husband and I retired to Duluth in 2013 to live near natural and recreational areas and to be closer to our cabin in the Superior National ForeSt We did not move here anticipating that an open pit mine and its processing facilities would open in the Arrowhead region and pollute the area. Whatever short-term economic gains might accrue regionally are simply not worth the long-term risks to the environment, to residents' health, and to the local tourist economy. I would like to remind decision makers that in the past, the taconite industry put private economic gain over health and environmental protection and dumped waste into Lake Superior with disastrous consequences. It has taken years to deal with that mess. The location of PolyMet's proposed NorthMet open pit mine is near important tributaries such as the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers. Therefore, the potential for acid mine drainage polluting the St Louis River and, crucially, Lake Superior is significant. In addition to the mine itself, the nearby Erie Plant, formerly a taconite facility, will be used for additional processing and will connect to the mine by a private rail system crossing public lands. Even worse, the mine and associated facilities could be expanded later because other deposits exist in the surrounding area. Allowing construction of the NorthMet mine is an open door to further expansion. I am also opposed to the land exchange PolyMet has proposed which would zero out critical federal environmental protections such as the Weeks Act. Strip mining is not permitted on Weeks Act land, so special legislation removing environmental regulations would be necessary in order for PolyMet to move forward with the process. Protection provided by the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act would also be removed by the exchange. Shame. Further, if this project goes forward, we could see legislation in the future that would fast track a land exchange largely to benefit multinational mining companies. The NorthMet Project would occur on land that has never been mined before. I understand that the Swiss corporate mining giant, Glencore, financially backs PolyMet and plans to sell the metals globally. This company, which owns approximately 25% of PolyMet, faces accusations of human rights abuses, environmental damage, and labor violations elsewhere. In short, the proposed pit and land exchange are not benign and will not benefit the area in the long run. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public intereSt The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Zabelle Stodola 131 N Hawthorne Rd Duluth, MN 55812-1934

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zabelle Stodola

51512

Jan 6, 2014 Tim Dabney, USFS Dear Dabney, USFS, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Let me say immediately that as a new resident to northeastern Minnesota, I am strongly opposed to the proposed open pit mine and land exchange. My husband and I retired to Duluth in 2013 to live near natural and recreational areas and to be closer to our cabin in the Superior National Forest. We did not move here anticipating that an open pit mine and its processing facilities would open in the Arrowhead region and pollute the area. Whatever short-term economic gains might accrue regionally are simply not worth the long-term risks to the environment, to residents' health, and to the local tourist economy. I would like to remind decision makers that in the past, the taconite industry put private economic gain over health and environmental protection and dumped waste into Lake Superior with disastrous consequences. It has taken years to deal with that mess. The location of PolyMet's proposed NorthMet open pit mine is near important tributaries such as the Embarrass and Partridge Rivers. Therefore, the potential for acid mine drainage polluting the St Louis River and, crucially, Lake Superior is significant. In addition to the mine itself, the nearby Erie Plant, formerly a taconite facility, will be used for additional processing and will connect to the mine by a private rail system crossing public lands. Even worse, the mine and associated facilities could be expanded later because other deposits exist in the surrounding area. Allowing construction of the NorthMet mine is an open door to further expansion. I am also opposed to the land exchange PolyMet has proposed which would zero out critical federal environmental protections such as the Weeks Act. Strip mining is not permitted on Weeks Act land, so special legislation removing environmental regulations would be necessary in order for PolyMet to move forward with the process. Protection provided by the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act would also be removed by the exchange. Shame. Further, if this project goes forward, we could see legislation in the future that would fast track a land exchange largely to benefit multinational mining companies. The NorthMet Project would occur on land that has never been mined before. I understand that the Swiss corporate mining giant, Glencore, financially backs PolyMet and plans to sell the metals globally. This company, which owns approximately 25% of PolyMet, faces accusations of human rights abuses, environmental damage, and labor violations elsewhere. In short, the proposed pit and land exchange are not benign and will not benefit the area in the long run. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Dr Zabelle Stodola 131 N Hawthorne Rd Duluth, MN 55812-1934

Zac Cerwinski

54335

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing this letter to let you know that I don't want the NorthMet Mining Project approved. The reasons I do not want the mine is because I am worried about the environment, especially the loss of almost three fifths of our wetlands on the proposed site. Wetlands can decrease flooding, remove pollutants from water, recharge groundwater, protect shorelines, and provide habitat for wildlife. Wetlands act as natural sponges that trap and release surface water over time. This ability to store water during heavy rainfall means that wetlands can help prevent flooding. Wetlands along the Mississippi River used to be able to store at least 60 days' worth of floodwater, but now can only store 12 days' worth of floodwater because most have been filled or drained. Without this natural flood protection people will also have to buy flood insurance. Wetlands have the ability to improve the quality of water by filtering runoff, removing sediment, pesticides, metals, and other types of pollutants. Wetlands act like a strainer that filters out the bad stuff. When this stuff enters a wetland, the wetland plants will take many of the harmful substances into their roots and change the harmful substances into safer ones before they are released into the water. As amazing as wetlands are, they do have their limits. A partially filled or damaged wetland can't fully control floods, or help to improve water quality. A badly degraded wetland can lose its ability to remove excess sediments, metals, pesticides, and other pollutants. Wetlands have the ability to provide environmental benefits, but they are not indestructible. If we want wetlands to continue to perform their ecological functions, then we have to do our part to protect them, and this is why I don't want the NorthMet Mining Project to be approved. Thank You, Zac Cerwinski

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zac Kenoyer

54345

Dear Ms. Lisa Fay, EIS Project Manager, I am writing this letter concerning the PGE mining in Minnesota. I have read the Project and Land Exchange Overview, Cultural Resources, And Water Quality Fact sheets on the DNR website. I think PolyMet mining has a good plan. I think they should find a way to minimize the Cultural resources effect They should change their plan so they do not bother the Ojibwe people. I think this mining will benefit Minnesota by creating jobs and getting us needed resources to use or export. Some disadvantages though would be the affect on the Ojibwe people by inconveniencing them during construction and ruining some of their historic land. Also another disadvantage would be the possible affect on water quality and the surrounding area. Some advantages of this project would be the creation of more jobs. Also getting resources that we could export if needed. This will affect cultural resources because it will affect three of five historic places during construction, excavation, filling, etc...Also the 1854 treaty specifies that its reserved for fishing, hunting, and gathering on this land that would be affected. I do agree with the land exchange offer although its affects on the Ojibwe. This will most likely not affect me right now. Depending on the affects of the project and possible pollution there is a possibility it could affect me later when they finish the mining. Although there are disadvantages and advantages of the project, I am in favor of the mining. I think it is good because it will create needed jobs for at least twenty or more years, depending on how construction goes. 8th grade student, Zac Kenoyer

Zac Quandt

41926

Dear Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I just signed National Audubon Society's petition on Change-org. Minnesotans are very concerned with protecting our clean water. We have serious concerns about PolyMet's plans to mine sulfide ore in northeastern Minnesota described in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). I believe that the SDEIS is insufficient and should not be approved because it is lacking vital information about long-term water treatment and how it will be paid for - information that is necessary to decision-makers. PolyMet would like to mine in high quality wetland habitat that is presently in federal ownership as a part of the Superior National Forest the largest designated Important Bird Area in Minnesota. In addition to this direct destruction of habitat, sulfates and toxic metals such as mercury, copper and nickel that are not captured for treatment will affect the aquatic organisms and habitats downstream. Birds that depend on fish and other aquatic organisms for food will be affected, including Belted Kingfishers, Hooded Mergansers, Common Terns and Common Loons. In addition, four bird species of greatest conservation need will likely lose suitable habitat if the mine is developed as proposed: Black-backed Woodpecker, Spruce Grouse, Northern Goshawk and Boreal Owl. I urge decision-makers to reject this risky proposal by PolyMet to mine sulfide ore in the headwaters of the St Louis River. Twenty years of mining, threatens hundreds of years of water pollution to sensitive birds and habitats. This trade-off is not worth the risk. Sincerely, Zac Quandt Rochester, Minnesota

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zach Colatch

41142

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Zach Insheep

54190

Building this mine will bring us both positive and negative outcomes. We would be getting a large amount of copper, but the type of mining, sulfide mining, will pollute our watershed. In the process of building the mine we would be destroying natural water filters, wetlands, peat. Which would you rather have, clean drinking water or water that polluted by sulfuric acid? Worldwide we only have 0.024% of clean drinking water. We should not take our water for granted even if it is for copper.

Zach Kunkenborg

54193

I believe that we shouldn't mine – especially if the consequences are going to be bad. I mean we have one of the most pure watersheds up there, near the boundary waters and all, so why would you put a sulfuric mine up there and risk tainting the water? Also you get a lot of waste from this mining, think of all the waste this will create. I want my kids to grow up in a waste free world.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zach Pesch

15368

Feb 9, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overspills into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsible for centuri

Zachariah Mitteness

37824

To whom it may concern, The polymet mine would jeopardize sacred manoomin (wild rice) which Is almost exclusively here in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and parts of Canada. not only that but the polymet mine would have an effect on the serene beauty of the boundary waters. It is one of the last serene places in Minnesota and the country. A high stakes mine such as polymet is not worth the risk. Thanks, Zac Mitteness 609 Bemidji Ave Bemidji, mn 56601

Zachary Behnke

54219

Dear Ms. Fay: I am Zachary Behnke, a 10th grader who attends Humboldt High School. I am writing about PolyMets proposal to start mining. If I don't stand up and take care of the environmental impacts, we aren't really a democracy. PolyMet has many problems with their plan and environment impact statement. One of the major problem with PolyMet, is that they re-drew maps to disguise the fact that the runoff from the mine waste piles will enter the BWCA. Not only do they need to get new, ACCURATE maps from the DNR, but they also need to test how much waste will flow to the BWCA and how long it will take to get there. Another major problem is the environmental impact statement shows the water will have toxic levels of metal at LEAST for 500 years. That will need constant treatment to make it safe. The MN DNR needs to get a water model that is capable of telling how many years it will take for the waste water metal levels to drop to the safe range. That being said, the environmental impact statement is a set up deal. It's a way for PolyMet and people to provide jobs for 20 years at max, for at LEAST 500 years of toxic pollution that will destroy not only BWCA, but also destroy any natural parts of Minnesota left. I hope you do not allow these scandals to ruin generations of the great outdoors, and take away from the Minnesota culture. If you have any questions, or comments, please contact me at (651)-373-6605 or send mail to 2520 Rose Ave East, Maplewood, MN 55119.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zachary Blankenheim

40036

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, The NorthMet Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has a critical gap in describing and mitigating the impact of habitat loss on *Alces Americanus*, the moose. Despite being listed as a species of "Special Concern" by the State of Minnesota in 2013, the suspension of the 2013 moose hunting season, and a 50% decline in Minnesota's moose population since 2005, the SDEIS describes moose as a "regionally common wildlife species," and a "game species" (p. 5-635). According the SDEIS, Moose have been observed in the NorthMet project area (p. 4-210), and the NorthMet project area is in the range of moose in Minnesota. According to the SDEIS, 2,775 acres of moose habitat would be lost if NorthMet is built as described (p. 5-377). In addition, despite the special significance of the moose to tribal members, there is no cumulative impacts analysis of the loss of moose habitat in the SDEIS. "Habitat fragmentation and loss" is recognized as a cause of the moose population decline, and the NorthMet project would add to existing habitat disruptions. The tribal cooperating agencies have noted this deficiency, but it has not been addressed in the SDEIS (Attachment 3, pp 45-46). As you revise the SDEIS, please include a cumulative impacts analysis that examines the impact on moose, recognize the changed status of the moose as a species of "Special Concern," and require PolyMet to mitigate the habitat loss for the moose caused by the NorthMet project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the PolyMet SDEIS. Due to the problems with the draft mine plan outlined above, I believe the mine should not be built as described. The moose is a truly iconic symbol of the Northwoods in Minnesota. The population is already in drastic decline with studies just getting underway to search as to the reasons why. Further decline in moose numbers may also impact the wolf population. Without the moose as a food source the wolf population will possibly rely more heavily on the white tail deer. If the numbers of white tail deer decline that will impact hunters and the amount of revenue that the area receives. Cause and Effect, period. Sincerely, Mr Zachary Blankenheim 3014 142nd Ln NW Andover, MN 55304-3242 (763) 432-6155

40037

Mar 10, 2014 Ms Lisa Fay, Department of Natural Resources To Ms Fay, Department of Natural Resources, I am writing regarding the PolyMet NorthMet supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In my view, the SDEIS is inadequate and the proposed mine plan would have unacceptable environmental impacts. PolyMet Mining Company's proposed NorthMet sulfide mine fails to meet four fundamental, common sense clean water principles, principles the mining industry previously agreed to. The proposed mine plan does not keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The best case scenario for the mine anticipates at least 500 years of polluted water that will have to be actively treated. And, not all of the polluted water will be captured and sent for treatment. Every year, 11 million gallons of polluted seepage from the tailings basin will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. Every year, over 5 million gallons of polluted seepage from the mine site will enter groundwater and the environment without being treated. In addition, the model used to predict impacts to water quality has many flaws that may significantly under-represent pollution risks. Indeed, the model has been shown to be inaccurate in representing current conditions for water quality surrounding the mine site undermining confidence that it can accurately predict future water conditions. The proposed mine plan does not put safeguards in place for when things go wrong. There are no contingency plans outlined for expected accidents that occur at all mines of this type, mishaps such as pipeline spills, accidental releases, failures of water collection and treatment systems, tailings basin spills. These are foreseeable events that should have emergency plans developed and articulated so the public has confidence in the company's ability to respond to a crisis. During operations, over 6-2 million gallons of polluted water a day will need to be treated. The mine plan does not describe what will happen if the water treatment plants break down. Will this pollution be discharged into the environment. The mine would contain a complex network of miles of pipelines, carrying polluted and treated water to and from various locations. The mine plan does not describe what would happen if a break were to happen in a pipeline carrying high concentrations of toxic metals and sulfates. The proposed mine plan does not leave the site clean and maintenance free. The plan for at least 500 years of active water treatment violates Minnesota Rules (6132-3200) that call for the mine to be left maintenance free at closure. 526 acres and over 167 million tons of reactive waste rock would be left on the surface after closure. Surrounding this would be a system to collect contaminated seepage that must be monitored and maintained for hundreds of years or longer. A synthetic and soil cover placed over the waste rock pile would require annual maintenance, repairing of erosion, and removal of plants that might perforate the synthetic material. A pit "lake" would be left whose water levels would need to be maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated overflows into the nearby Partridge River. A tailings basin pond would need to have its water levels maintained through pumping to prevent contaminated water from over-topping the dams and entering the nearby Embarrass River. A lengthy network of pipelines conveying polluted and treated water would need to be monitored and maintained for at least hundreds of years. The proposed mine plan does not protect Minnesota taxpayers. The plan commits Minnesota to at least 500 years of polluted water treatment without providing critical information about how this will be paid for and who will be responsible for it. Details about financial assurance a "damage deposit" the company provides are not outlined in the revised mine plan. The public does not know how much 500 years of water treatment will cost, how the company will be held responsi

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zachary Johns

38609

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Federal and State Agency Leaders: Back in the 1950s and 60s, there was a push to put dams in the Grand Canyon. Yes, you read that correctly, the GRAND CANYON. There were actually people who thought it would be ok to flood a large section of one of the world's most magnificent landscapes. Why. The promise of jobs and money of course. And, of course, the American public yelled and screamed and protested, and finally after a fight of nearly twenty years, the plan was dropped. Today, just the thought of flooding such a sacred place is almost laughable. How dare they put a price tag on the Grand freaking Canyon. It's America's Sistine Chapel. Well, that's exactly what is happening in the Northland today. One of our holiest landscapes is being threatened by people who just want to make a buck. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, yes, our beloved Boundary Waters, is being threatened by the scourge of Sulfide Mining. Now, it's taken a while for me to speak out against this, because frankly, I didn't think it would get this far. It is the BOUNDARY WATERS after all. I thought the people of the Northland would rise up en masse and scream, "Oh, no. Not here. You can take all your foreign money and mine or drill somewhere else." But apparently dangling this golden carrot has blinded some people to what is really at stake. Now, I could get all into the science behind how this form of mining has never been proven safe and what it could do to wildlife, wild rice, water, etc, but all of that has been written about time and time again. Even with all the evidence, some people are still not listening. There are still money-hungry zombies with dollar signs in their eyes. But I think there is a very simple way to snap them out of their trance and make them understand what is at stake. Just take them there. Take Governor Dayton, Senators Klobuchar and Franken, Representative Nolin and any other person with a stake in this issue and bring them to the Boundary Waters. Put them in a canoe and have them paddle for a week or two - let them listen to the loons, see the northern lights. Have them smell pine needles baking in the sun, feel the fantastic strain of a portage - let them live the "strenuous life" that shaped Theodore Roosevelt into our greatest president - a man who over 100 years ago created Superior National Forest and who would be appalled at the thought of destroying this very land. After spending some time paddling and portaging; sleeping under the stars and sitting quietly upon a rock; returning to their basic primordial rhythms, no one would think any sort of risk to this special place would be a good idea. I dare say that even Tony Hayward himself, the villain of the Gulf oil spill and chairman of Glencore (PolyMet's largest investor) would even say, "Blimey. We need to leave this place alone." Once, while skiing in Utah, I rode a chairlift with a family from Maryland. When they heard I was from Minnesota, the first thing they asked was, "Do you live near the Boundary Waters. We go there every year. You are so lucky to live there. It's our favorite place in the whole country." There are many people around the nation who feel the same way. We may not know it, but many around the United States put our BWCA on the same level as Yellowstone, Yosemite or the Great Smokey Mountains. If we screw this up, it will be a national disaster. It'll be like we flooded the Grand Canyon. Sincerely Zachary Johns 7 Southview Dr Apt 7F Hibbing, MN 55746 218 340-8954

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zachary Johns

38617

Dear Ms Fay, Dear Ms Fay and Mr Bruner, Please reject the PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS as inadequate and reject the PolyMet open-pit sulfide mine and wastes proposal due to its unacceptable risks to human health. Mercury is a huge concern for me. The Minnesota Health Department found 1 out of 10 infants in Minnesota's Lake Superior Region are born with unsafe levels of mercury in their blood. Fish in the lower part of the St Louis River are more contaminated with mercury than those in other regional waters. Downstream of the PolyMet project, the St Louis River and Embarrass, Wynne, Sabin, Esquagama, Colby and Whitewater Lakes are legally impaired due to mercury in fish. The PolyMet SDEIS analysis of mercury risks is inadequate and misleading. The SDEIS' claims that mercury and sulfates - which increase mercury in the food chain - will be "captured" are unreliable. There are huge gaps in the SDEIS where there should be information on mercury concentrations and seepage from waste rock, peat overburden, tailings and liner leaks. The SDEIS inadequately analyzes human health impacts of PolyMet's pollution. Not just mercury in fish, but impacts of manganese, lead and aluminum in water on the brain; impacts of air emissions including diesel, asbestos-like fibers, nickel and other particulates on cancer; and impacts of arsenic on cancer. The SDEIS does not explain potential harm to human beings, particularly for bottle-fed infants, children and the elderly, who are more vulnerable to the impacts of toxic pollution. The SDEIS completely fails to analyze any risks to workers on-site at the PolyMet mine or plant. The SDEIS fails to assess impacts on nearby residential wells from tailings basin groundwater seepage. The SDEIS inappropriately reduces the 70-year "lifetime" to 30 or 40 years to mislead the public about cancer risks at the PolyMet property boundary. The SDEIS arbitrarily denies effects of water pollution on the St Louis River. The SDEIS fails to recognize environmental justice effects of pollutants, such as methylmercury and arsenic, that may be found in fish, game and wild rice as well as water, and may cause particular harm to tribal members or low-income families who rely on fish, game and wild rice for subsistence. The PolyMet sulfide mine project and SDEIS plan should be rejected due to unresolved serious issues regarding mercury and other pollutants that affect human health. •Reject the PolyMet sulfide mine project due to its unacceptable health and environmental health impacts on Minnesota infants, children and adults, including low-income families and tribal members who fish, hunt and gather for subsistence. If you are not ready to reject the PolyMet project at this time, the SDEIS must be redone to address major gaps and flaws in the analysis of impacts on human health: •Redo the SDEIS to disclose mercury concentrations and how much mercury is released directly or indirectly into surface waters from all PolyMet sources. •Redo the SDEIS to assess mercury impacts without unreasonable assumptions, like the claim that almost all tailings seepage of sulfates would be captured. •Redo the SDEIS to evaluate methylmercury accumulation in the food chain due to hydrologic changes to peat and wetlands as well as due to air and water pollution. •Redo the SDEIS to require a separate and clear Health Risk Assessment prepared in conjunction with the Minnesota Health Department to analyze impacts of all PolyMet sulfide mine and plant pollution releases and accumulations on health, including: 1-Description of the known human health impacts of all pollutants in PolyMet's air emissions and water discharges in language understandable to the public. 2-Assessment of potential impacts on residential wells from tailings seepage. 3-Health risk assessment for on-site workers at both the PolyMet mine and plant. 4-Assessment of cumulative mercury risks, including actual hazard levels in lakes already impaired for mercury

Alphabetical by sender's first name

ZACHARY LORTON

3225

Dear Minnesota DNR, I am a resident of Minnesota who is 17 years old. I love the work you do and all the resources and wildlife refuges that you manage and care for. I am an avid hunter and fisherman and love to see what you do to keep the pristine wilderness healthy. However, recently I saw on the news that mining in the boundary waters might take place. I have taken it upon myself to research what kind of mining would be permitted and what the effects on the Boundary Waters may be. When mining in Areas near bodies of water it is inevitable that chemicals will reach and contaminate the water. When sulfuric acid leaks out from the metal mines it contaminates not only the lakes but also the groundwater. I can remember from the time I was young how clear the waters of the boundary waters are. I love to fish and have often found that fishing in the boundary waters is some of the best fishing I have ever had. Much of the reason is due to the abundance of fish in the lakes. If the lakes were to be poisoned by chemicals, much like many city lakes, the fish population would surely decrease. I couldn't help but research the effect that mining has had on other wilderness areas and I have found that in all the cases the measure taken to keep the chemicals out the lakes were only practiced at the beginning. No situation ever was able to have the wilderness back that they lost. I ask you to carefully contemplate the risks that you are taking. Will the Boundary Waters still be the same. What will happen to the wildlife. I know that you care a lot about the environment and I hope you can see why I have expressed concern. I love our state and hope that you do too. I wish that you will make the right decision, and help keep the integrity of our Department of Natural Resources. file:///C:/Users/JL-Home/AppData/Local/Temp/msohtmlclip1/01/clip_image002-jpg Here is a Picture from my last trip to the Boundary Waters, I hope when I return it will be the same and I hope that it would stay the same for future Minnesotans. Sincerely, Zack Lorton ----- Please report any abusive, or inappropriate use to HYPERLINK "mailto:admin@isd271-org"admin@isd271-org. This electronic mail transmission may contain private or confidential data and is intended only for the person named. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender, and delete it. Bloomington Public Schools reserves the right to monitor and review, without further consent, any messages created, sent, or received on its electronic mail system.

Zachary Nelson

47577

Hello, my opinion is to not go ahead with the mine. The reasons are short and simple. First think of this project in the long term. The US is only 238 years old. At 200 years of clean up, we would just be finishing up Revolutionary War era mining projects. Secondly, the "jobs" created would be short term and would put Ely in the same position as Duluth in the 80s when it was dependent on mining and almost died when the industry fell through. Lastly, it is your purpose to protect the environment, period. We only have one northern Minnesota, please help us keep it amazing. Thanks Zach Nelson Duluth, MN Sent from Zach's iPhone

Zachary Pera Cole

39583

Mar 11, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Mr Zachary Pera Cole 3522 Newton Ave N Minneapolis, MN 55412-2314

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zack Heuring

47400

Hello I am writing to you today as a concerned Minnesotan on the subject of the potential Polymet operation in Northern Minnesota. After doing my own research on Polymet, sulfide mining, and the environmental impacts I must voice my objection to this type of mining in Minnesota. My wife's family has deep roots in the Hoyt Lakes and Aurora and thus I've spent quite a bit of time in the area. Her Grandfather and many other family members have and had worked in the mines for years so the mining concept is not unknown to our family. What Polymet is looking to do has not worked in other locations and has almost always ended in huge environmental catastrophe for the area surrounding the mine. This part of our state is beautiful and raw, we cannot afford the hundreds of years of harmful effects for maybe twenty years of jobs. This is a short term fix to a long term problem on The Range and will not serve or state or economy well in the future. Please stand with me and help bring light to the realistic reality of Polymets proposal. Thank You, Zackary Heuring 2168 Cleveland Lane South Cambridge, MN 55008 763-913-6905 Sent from Yahoo. Mail on Android

Zdenek Mestenhauer

21373

TO: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources HYPERLINK "mailto:NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us"NorthMetSDEIS.dnr@state.mn.us FROM: Zdenek Mestenhauer, 4800 Lyndale Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55419 HYPERLINK "mailto:mesten2958@msn-com"mesten2958@msn-com DATE: 2/24/14 I attended the public comment event on Jan. 28 in St Paul. This event was rigged with an intent to skew the outcome. It did not allow equal time for true public comment vs. industry comments. The DNR set the event up to favor industry input by allowing the unions to submit requests to speak, when there was actually no intention to speak and provide public input. The intention was to cede their time to industry leaders and elected official with prepared remarks. Industry has their time to present their side. This invalidated the public input and limited public. The public hearings have to be repeated to allow true public input in order to be valid. It would be immoral to approve this plan that promises the endless pollution of water and our environment. The PolyMet SDEIS has been shown to rely on an inaccurate water model and provides incomplete information about the health and environmental consequences of its proposed sulfide mine in Minnesota. I feel strongly that Minnesota DNR must require PolyMet to provide a plan that addresses the following: 1- Is water value estimated. Value of clean water is not calculated for the next 500 years. Climate/drought will make water more valuable. Climate change impact was not considered in the SDEIS. This need to be analyzed to better understand the long impact such a mining operation would hAve Several scenarios need to be considered. Raising sea levels will displace population; raising temperature will make Minnesota a better place to live. More severe and extreme storms will happen in the future. Calculations for 5,000 year storms need to be considered in the study. The water treatment plants have to be able to withstand those. 2- Reliability of water treatment addressed. As an engineer, I am quite aware that designing a machine with a life span of 20 years is typical. 30 year reliability is difficult. It is virtually impossible to design a system that will last 500 years. The plan has to address this topic to a great detail in order for experts and the public to assess if the design of such a facility would be adequate. The cost of such a facility has to be estimated. 3- Are industry assurances that it could be done safely valid. PolyMET claims that this process could be done safely. PolyMET has to show facts to support this claim. Research shows that there is not a single sulfide mining operation that does not pollute. There is certainly not one operating in such a water rich ecosystem. No approval should be granted unless the technology proposed is shown to be reliable operational for an extended period of time, such as 10 years. Perhaps a demonstration project in a reduced scale to something like 3% of proposed size should be approved firSt Only after this technology is validated on a much smaller scale, could that be increased in small increments. Such a controlled approach is the only responsible way to mitigate the extent of damage to our environment. 4- Is fish mercury contamination evaluated correctly. The DNR currently limits the amount of fish humans can safely consume. The proposed mining will increase the contamination of water with heavy metals including mercury. The SDEIS does not adequately estimate the impact of mercury contamination of fish downstream and including all the great lakes. The cost of mercury contamination in fish and other aquatic species could not be estimated. 5- Does the proposed mine plan keep Minnesota's water safe and clean. The USEPA gave the proposed mine its lowest ranking: Environmentally Unsatisfactory and Inadequate. Polymet's SDEIS clearly shows that after 20 years, there will be three enormous pits up to 696 feet deep full of water polluted with sulfuric acid and toxic heavy metals.

58127

Based on available information, pollution of clean water is inevitable. Today, we are advised not to eat fish because of mercury pollution. It will only get worse. Financial assurances are insufficient! The cost of investigating pollution will be up to the public. It is not worth the risk. This technique has never been used successfully. Please do not gamble with our natural resources! Do not permit this mining plan. It could not be done safely. Clean water value goes up and will be going up with climate change. Let's not damage it if it is not necessary.

Alphabetical by sender's first name

Zindzi McCormick

39588

Mar 11, 2014 EIS Project Manager Lisa Fay 500 Lafayette Road, Box 25 St Paul, MN 55155 Dear EIS Project Manager Fay, Please reject the proposed PolyMet mine. The project presents unacceptable environmental risks and should not be allowed. This dangerous sulfide mining operation threatens to pollute Minnesota water with sulfuric acid and heavy metals for 500 years and endangers clean water and habitat in the Lake Superior basin. If approved, this first-ever sulfide mine in Minnesota would open the door for future mines that would endanger the Boundary Waters wilderness. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject the PolyMet mine. Sincerely, Ms Zindzi McCormick 1128 Portland Ave Saint Paul, MN 55104-6941 (651) 983-5011

Zoerhof Peggie

39755

Mar 10, 2014 Lisa Fay, DNR MN Dear Fay, DNR, Please accept these comments on the PolyMet Mining Corp. NorthMet mining project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Sulfide mining has never been done in Minnesota and threatens wetlands, rivers, lakes and streams across the Arrowhead Region, including Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Acid Mine Drainage and heavy metal contamination have polluted waters in all other places where sulfide ore mining has occurred. I have grave concerns about this project's potential impacts on Minnesota's natural resources and public health, including: risks to water quality, loss of wetlands, harm to wildlife such as the threatened lynx and declining moose populations, and cumulative impacts from mining. The Federal land exchange of protected Superior National Forests to facilitate PolyMet's destructive and polluting open pit sulfide mine is not in the public interest. The proposed mine poses unacceptable risks to our waters and communities. I ask that the comment period be extended to 180 days, and I support the No Action Alternative. Sincerely, Zoerhof Peggie 2530 Bridle Creek Trl Chanhassen, MN 55317-9372 (952) 937-5801